United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2003 No. 146

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, October 17, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB SIMMONS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Most Reverend Thomas Wenski, Coadjutor Bishop of Orlando, Florida, offered the following prayer:

O God, all powerful Creator and loving father of all mankind, Maker of nature and nature's law:

You are the source of the inalienable rights which our union was formed to protect and to promote.

We ask You to look lovingly upon this Congress as its Members convene this morning to seek to provide for the common good of our people.

You know what is in the human heart and You justly judge the rectitude of our intentions.

May these representatives in their deliberations today be guided by Your wisdom.

And, may they rely on the protection of Your Divine Providence which You in Your goodness have extended over our Nation from its beginnings.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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. 618. An act to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326–A–1, 326–A–3, 326–K, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING THE MOST REVEREND THOMAS WENSKI

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and high honor to have Bishop Wenski visiting with us today. The Bishop was born in West Palm Beach, Florida, and grew up in Lake Worth, my hometown, where he attended Catholic school at his home parish, Sacred Heart.

Bishop Wenski has provided for the pastoral and spiritual needs of the Haitian communities of south Florida. Through the 1980s, he conducted a circuit-riding ministry that led him to help establish Haitian-Catholic communities from Homestead in the south to Fort Pierce to the north, Immokalee to the west and Fort Lauderdale to the east.

In late 1996, he spearheaded a relief operation that delivered over 150,000 pounds of food to Caritas Cuba, the social service arm of the Catholic Church in Cuba, for distribution to people left homeless by Hurricane Lilly. This was the first time that Cubans in Miami participated in a humanitarian relief effort directed to their native land of Cuba.

In 2001, Governor Jeb Bush appointed him to the Florida Council on Homelessness.

Bishop Wenski speaks Haitian, Creole and Spanish fluently and preaches and celebrates mass regularly in both languages. He also has knowledge of Polish, the language of his immigrant father and Polish-American mother, as is my family of Polish-American descent.

Pope John Paul II appointed Bishop Wenski as coadjutor bishop of the Dioceses of Orlando on July 1, and I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY), among others, join me in welcoming their new bishop of Orlando. He is the only native Floridian serving as bishop in our great State of Florida, and Bishop Wenski's motto is: All things to all men, Corinthians 9:22.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches per side.

AMERICA CONTINUES TO FIGHT WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a significant day in the War on Terror with countries all over the world joining in to

Printed on recycled paper.

help the United States bring civil order to Iraq. The morning began with Japan announcing $5 billion in aid for Iraq redevelopment. The Washington Post reported Ambassador Howard Baker, Jr., thanked our Japanese allies for being ''generous.'' This was followed by the unanimous vote of the Security Council to approve a new resolution backed by America. The New York Times today editorialized ''President Bush won a big victory yesterday at the United Nations.''

Later, there was an historic meeting here at the Capitol of Speaker Ognyan Gerdjiko of Bulgaria with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the first meeting ever of speakers from Bulgaria and America. Speaker Gerdjiko pledged partnership in the War on Terror, substantiated by providing 500 Bulgarian troops currently in Iraq.

With the supplemental vote today, America is proving its determination to win the war on terror by making all efforts to complete our commitment for victory to protect the American people.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

BUREAUCRATIC INCOMPETENCE, INDIFFERENCE AND INTRANSIGENCE AT PENTAGON

(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 will vote to borrow $87 billion to continue the conflict in Iraq and build and revitalize the Iraqi economy. They say it is necessary to support the troops. It is not for dearth of funds that our troops lack ceramic body armor or armored Humvees and other essentials. There are ample, unspent funds, billions from the $79 billion we borrowed for this war last April, but it is bureaucratic incompetence, indifference and intransigence at the Pentagon. Secretary Rumsfeld and his advisors did not order armor because they did not think that we would need it, and they could never admit they were wrong. It did not fit their scenario.

They say it is necessary for the security of the American people that we are going to borrow $20 billion in the name of working Americans to invest and stimulate the Iraqi economy, to build their infrastructure, roads, bridges, highways, state of the art telecommunications, sewer and electric.

Well, it is not going to boost our economy here at home, and that is the security that my constituents and most Members' constituents are worried about. If we invest in the economy as the Democrats have advised, it would provide 1 million jobs for Americans.

WHY ARE WE BEING SO GENEROUS?

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about our reconstruction efforts in Iraq, and why are we doing it, why are we not lending them the money at some exorbitant interest rate? Why are we being so generous? Well, there are five real reasons.

Number one, Iraq is saddled with a $200 billion debt already. If we give them a loan, what is going to happen is similar to what happened between France and Germany after World War I with the reparations: It will not help Iraq become independent and free and strong.

Number two, practicality. There is no ruling authority in Iraq at this point to make a loan to, and it will take a lot more time if we go that route.

Number three, we need to lead by example. As the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) just said, because of the U.S. efforts, we already have other donor nations stepping forward.

Number four, perception. There is already an anti-American, anti-Western mood amongst Arab countries in the Middle East, and by doing this, we will become free of that suspicion.

Number five, it is in our national interest to have a stable, secure, democratic country emerging in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we are doing what we are doing. It is an important vote, and it is the right vote.

NATIONAL GUARD GETS HAND-ME-DOWN EQUIPMENT

(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. Mr. Speaker, under current practices today, the National Guard gets hand-me-down equipment from the regular Army. In many instances, it is never really anticipated those Guard units will go into combat. Now, because of manpower shortages, we are reaching so deeply into the Guard that we are having the Guard show up in Baghdad with old-generation Humvees without the proper equipment.

We will have an amendment later today to transfer $300 million out of the weapons of mass destruction search by David Kay that has turned up a vial of botulism that we are now told by the experts has never been turned into a weapon, and it was sold by an American company back in the 1980s and given to the National Guard so that when they rotate into Baghdad and into other parts of Iraq, they will have modern equipment.

We cannot sacrifice the lives of these young people because we failed to provide them the equipment or we gave them old equipment 7, 8, 10 years ago and they have to take that equipment into battle. This is absolutely crucial in terms of the safety and protection of our fighting men and women who are in the Guard who now find themselves stationed in combat zones in excess of a year.

RUSHED DEBATE ON SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION INAPPROPRIATE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning we discovered that one more MP lost his life in the midst of Operation Iraqi Freedom. I heard yesterday the majority leader say ''our war.'' This war was rendered by a resolution of this House, but not by a Constitutional vote under the Constitution that required this Congress to declare war. This war was rendered on the premise of weapons of mass destruction and the fact that the United States of America was under imminent attack. We found both of those to be fallacies and untrue.

Mr. Speaker, today we are asked to abrogate our responsibilities as Members of Congress and do a circumscribed debate on issues important to the future of this Nation. I spent time with those young women and men on R&R from Iraq. Their courage has not been diminished, but their morale has been obliterated. Eleven of them have committed suicide. They recognize they do not have the proper equipment that they need; and I respect the appropriators for doing the best they can, but this rush to judgment in this debate on this particular appropriation is not appropriate. If we are to stand with the troops, we should be debating this through the weekend, and we should talk about the quality of life and provide them the resources necessary. This is a travesty and a farce because we are not doing what we are supposed to do, in supporting in the fullest way our U.S. troops by a thoughtful deliberative process of debate.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 396 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3289.

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, October 16, 2003, the bill had been read through page 2, line 2, and amendments considered under a previous order of the House had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, before consideration of any other amendment, except pro forma amendments by the chairman or ranking minority of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments: An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) or the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN); an amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD); an amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL); an amendment by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE); an amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) or the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE); an amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER); an amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK); an amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES); an amendment by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO); an amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER); an amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH); an amendment by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ); and an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated or a designee, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KIND

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KIND:

Page 48, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 2213. The dollar amounts otherwise provided in this chapter under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'', are each reduced by 50 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last week I had the opportunity to travel to Iraq visiting our troops in the field, and they are doing an incredible job under difficult and dangerous circumstances. Clearly, our Nation is paying a very high price in both lives and money due to the unilateral action that was taken in Iraq. Their high level of sacrifice, quite frankly, has not been met by the high level of planning that is required for this mission. I believe we have been derelict in our duty in Congress in demanding more accountability and more justification in regards to the expenditure and the use of the funds that are before us today and have been appropriated earlier this year.

That is why the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and I are offering this amendment which could be titled The Enhanced Accountability and Detailed Accounting Amendment, which would slash the reconstruction funds by one-half, not because we do not believe in the mission, but because we believe the administration should come before Congress to justify in a detailed fashion what current funds are being used for and what future funds are being requested and for what purpose.

The World Bank and IMF released a report last week that indicated that for the next year in Iraq, we cannot spend, more than $5 billion without running into difficulty, and yet we have a $20 billion reconstruction request before us today.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, it has been very frustrating trying to get detailed listings of the amount of money being spent and for what purpose. Mr. Zakheim, Comptroller for Defense, indicated yesterday before us that it was the administration's intent to keep coming to Congress for future supplemental requests which do not have to be offset, which will result in more deficit financing, instead of budgeting it in the normal budget process.

We think it should be budgeted with future requests. I also believe by slashing funds by one-half, we would encourage greater savings and cost efficiencies.

I met with Kuwaiti officials last week who indicated that they did not understand what the administration was doing in Iraq. They were sitting on multiple 3,000 megawatt generators not being used and not being requested by the United States for use in Iraq. They are also sitting on multiple desalinization machines that could be used in Iraq to help with clean water difficulties; but again, they were not being asked to contribute.

General Petraeus of the 101st Airborne, when he discovered from U.S. engineers that it was going to cost somewhere between $15–$20 million to restore a cement factory in northern Iraq went out and talked to local Iraqi officials and was able to get the job done for $80,000.

I believe this Congress has an obligation to the American taxpayer, an obligation to our children and to our grandchildren to ask questions and to demand accountability in regards to the use of these reconstruction funds, and I would encourage support for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), one of the most fiscally responsible Members of this Congress.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) for offering this amendment. The gentleman has brought forward an important amendment that I hope we will consider and pass.

Regardless of how one may feel in support of the supplemental appropriation, I hope we all agree that reconstruction aid requires a higher level of scrutiny. That is exactly what this amendment does. It provides 50 percent of the money now. That is consistent with the analysis of the World Bank, the United Nations, and the International Monetary Fund as to how much funds can effectively be used by Iraq in the next year. It is consistent with our initiative to get our allies to pay a larger share of the reconstruction act.

The vote in the United Nations Security Council yesterday was encouraging. If Members believe our allies should be paying more of these reconstruction funds, Members should support the Kind amendment.

It is also consistent with our desire to have the Iraqis repay some of this money. We know that the other body has already taken action in that regard. If Members believe that we should be considering whether the Iraqis have the resources to repay some of these funds later, then Members should support the Kind amendment.

It is consistent with our responsibility for oversight. It is our responsibility to make sure these monies are properly spent, to monitor the use and get more accounting. If Members believe we should exercise that responsibility, they should support the Kind amendment.

It also allows us to get a plan from the administration to transfer authority to the Iraqis and bring our troops home. We should have that information. This amendment is consistent with that request.

Then if more funds are needed, this body can take it up with the condition, and in the form, that is consistent with the goals that we are trying to achieve. At that time, the Congress can take up additional resources and act on that request. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It is the right thing for us to do in order to successfully complete our mission in Iraq.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and would like to point out that this is a little different amendment than we originally thought we would be looking at today.

This issue was debated twice yesterday on this floor, once with the Obey

amendment which would have cut the amount by half and put some in loans, the other time during debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) which would have done the same thing. We have had a lot of discussion about the idea of how much we should have and whether we should reduce it, and whether some should be in the form of a loan or not. I believe that issue has been dispensed with.

I have just heard a couple of arguments from the other side that this amendment will require more scrutiny. Where in the words here does it require any more scrutiny? It just says it will cut it by 50 percent. It says that we think that the Committee on Appropriations' work is insufficient, we are just going to cut it in half.

Where does it say that it is going to require some repayment by the Iraqis? There is nothing in here about repayment or loans. It just says we are going to take the aid and the assistance we are going to provide to the Iraqis, and we are going to slice it exactly in half because we think that they do not really need that money for reconstruction.

Mr. Chairman, what we have heard over the last several days, and I know I am sounding like a broken record by repeating this, as General Abizaid, Ambassador Bremer, and many others have told us over and over again, every dollar for reconstruction is just as important as every dollar we provide to our men and women in uniform in Iraq. It is just as important.

If we are going to get our men and women home from Iraq, we have to turn the security of the country over to the Iraqis, and that means we have to train the Iraqis. We have to train the police force and the national army. If we are going to get our men and women home, we have to restore the Iraq economy and put Iraq back on its feet. Cutting the assistance to Iraq in half is not the way to accomplish that. If we want to be sure that our men and women in uniform stay in Iraq a lot longer, this is the amendment Members want to vote for.

I have great respect for the gentlemen who have offered this amendment, they are very thoughtful people, but I must say this amendment is absolutely the wrong direction. It does not accomplish what they want. It does not accomplish the kind of scrutiny they want, which is what we will find in the general provisions of the bill. We have a lot of oversight. We have more reporting, we have more oversight requirements, we have requirements that if there are changes in the amount of the funds, if it is moved from one to the other, there has to be notification to the Congress. We are doing that oversight. That is the responsibility of Congress. But cutting the amount of assistance to Iraq in half is not the way to proceed. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

In the paragraph in chapter 1 of title I under the heading ''Military Personnel, Army'', insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $188,420,000)''.

In the paragraph in chapter 1 of title I under the heading ''Military Personnel, Navy'', insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $12,616,000)''.

In the paragraph in chapter 1 of title I under the heading ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $11,643,000)''.

In the paragraph in chapter 1 of title I under the heading ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $52,322,000)''.

In the paragraph in chapter 2 of title II under the heading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'', insert after the aggregate dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,007,000,000)''.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 17, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

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

I ask that my amendment to provide a $1,500 bonus to the men and women who have served in Iraq be joined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), and all those who have cosponsored my base bill, H.R. 3051. They have all asked to join with me in providing this bonus to the men and women who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan during fiscal year 2004.

This amendment provides a $265 million increase in the base pay for all of our military services' troops. This is the amount that is needed to provide a $1,500 bonus to each person serving, including our National Guard and Reserve units serving in Iraq or Afghanistan.

This $1,500 bonus is paid for by cutting the appropriate sum from the bill, from the amount set aside to import petroleum products into Iraq. In this $87 billion supplemental appropriation for Iraq, we surely can afford to boost the pay of the service men and women by $1,500.

What this amounts to when we look at the total bill, for every $328.30, we are giving our troops $1. Certainly, we can afford $1 for every $328 we spend in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our troops are really carrying the true burden of our commitment to Iraq and Afghanistan, and at least we can give them $1 compared to $328 which we are pouring into Iraq and Afghanistan.

Our soldiers have lived basically in nearly primitive conditions. We had an amendment yesterday on the floor, the Obey amendment, which would increase the quality of life for our Armed Services while there, and when they come home. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated. This is an opportunity to show our troops that this Congress is united behind them in the service they are providing.

These deployments that we are now undertaking of our troops, our Guard and our Reserve units, is the longest deployment we have had of military personnel since Vietnam. They have now been deployed for up to a year in Afghanistan and Iraq. Recently, the Pentagon provided a 2-week leave for our troops after they serve 12 months. We know some 700 soldiers a day come back to the United States. They are only paid to fly into BWI, Baltimore-Washington International Airport, and then they are stuck. If their family is in Michigan, Iowa, Tennessee, they have no way of getting home. They do not even get a government rate to finish the trip home. The military does not provide a ticket for them to see their families.

And how about our National Guard and Reserve units over in Iraq and Afghanistan, first they were only going to be called up for a few months, then 6 months, and now it is a year. While our National Guard and Reserve units are proud to serve, and are willing to leave their civilian jobs to serve, how do they support their families back home, when they leave their civilian jobs?

In my district, National Guard Unit 1437 from Slt. St. Marie, Michigan, just came back. They told me about the financial hardship it is to make ends meet at home while they are over in Iraq.

□ 0930

Right now the U.S. Army Reserve Unit 652, a bridge-building unit, is in Iraq. It is from the Harvey and Marquette, Michigan area. What about their financial burdens? What about the financial burdens we place on the families? Well, this $1,500 bonus is not going to solve all of these financial burdens for these people, and I do not believe that asking for $1 out of every $328 we are going to pour into Iraq and Afghanistan, to give our troops $1 is asking too much.

Again, to pay for this, in the amendment we propose to cut the oil import into Iraq. Iraq possesses the second largest oil reserves in the world. I did not know why we even have to import into Iraq, but I think we should at least be able to cut that and provide this bonus to these people.

I know some may argue that Iraq may not have enough diesel fuel or kerosene to see them through the winter. Therefore, we somehow ask the American taxpayers to make sure that they will have the diesel and kerosene to get through this winter to heat their homes. But what about our own energy needs here in this country? What about this winter? Heating oil, natural gas, and propane is expected to go sky high, and we will be in short supply here at home. Americans will be scraping and sacrificing to get through the winter. The Iraqis should at least share in this sacrifice when it comes to their oil needs.

Mr. Chairman, it still does not make much sense to me to have oil imported into Iraq which, again, possesses the second largest oil reserves in the world.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, on the first amendment offered today, the amendment offered actually was different than the one that we had agreed to last night in the unanimous consent request, and that is okay; we have no problem with that. But I would just ask my colleagues that in the event that any amendment that they would offer, if it is different than the one that we agreed to last night, please let us know that when they actually offer the amendment, so that we are prepared to deal with the proper amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the time be controlled by the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) of the Subcommittee on Defense.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and welcome back. The Chairman carried forward a very full day yesterday, and we appreciate his help.

This amendment, and amendments like it that we have seen much of the day yesterday, is a very appealing sort of amendment, for it essentially says we have money in this package, and why do we not take some of it and add additional funding for our troops one way or another. Obviously, that has appeal.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is a very fine Member from Michigan and he has expressed his concern about the troops before. Yesterday I heard people who had never expressed concern for our troops and, in fact, had not even voted for our bill in the past who were suddenly very, very concerned, and that is a little disconcerting. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I, my colleague and partner, have made every effort in this package and packages before it to aggressively increase funding available for our troops, especially those who are serving our country overseas and those who are in harm's way.

This specific proposal adds $265 million to the military personnel accounts. It suggests that it is enough to pay for a $1,500 bonus for each serviceman who is in the region. The offset is to reduce $1 billion for the reconstruction effort in Iraq.

I must say, one of the strongest arguments regarding this, besides the fact that we have done everything we can to help our troops in the previous bills and in this one, is the reality that the experts, the generals in charge of our military effort over there, say that their number one priority is reconstruction, because it is the way to, first of all, secure our troops while they are there and, secondly, the way to make certain they get home as quickly as possible is to see the economy of Iraq move forward, get it back on track, and that is part of what this bill is about.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I know that there is no one in this Chamber who has more concern about the Reserve and Guard than the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK). He has units that have been deployed, as all of us have. I am getting questions and concerns from the families in my district, and all over the country they are writing to me. I had a 67-year-old say that he was retired for 10 years and they were trying to call him back.

But I do not think, as hard as we work for pay, I do not think an amendment like this helps us. I think we really have a problem. I know we all want to help the troops, but we struggle all the time trying to make sure we balance out the money they make. I just do not think this is the right way to do it. I think what we have to do is certainly take a look at it, working with the services themselves.

Mr. Chairman, 65 percent of our money right now goes to personnel. We put a big health care package in. Our subcommittee works helping the troops; that is what we concentrate on. I think it is just something we cannot accept. I would ask the Members to vote against this amendment, no matter how all of us would like to see the troops get more money.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. The last amendment cut 50 percent of the reconstruction dollars; this only cuts 1 billion of the dollars out of reconstruction. But I am still left with the question, what is it that members do not understand regarding the importance of reconstruction assistance? We have been told over and over again by our commanders, by everybody that is out there, that the dollars we are spending on reconstruction is part of national security. It is just as important as what we do for our Guard and Reserves. It is just as important as what we do in terms of providing ammunition and vehicles and all the armor and the other items that are needed by our troops that are over there.

The reconstruction is a vital part of this program; and if we short that, all we are doing is saying to the men and women in uniform who are there in Iraq that we are going to leave you there better off, with maybe more creature comforts, maybe with more vehicles, but we are going to leave you in this bleak, hostile landscape.

Where is this billion coming from? Is it coming from what we are going to do to try to create a new constitution? Is it coming from the governing council? Is it coming from the kerosene funding? Is it coming from the clean water for the children over there? Where is it coming from?

Mr. Chairman, to take this money out of the reconstruction is the wrong approach. We should not be doing that. I hope my colleagues will reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

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

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the participation of Iraq in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC).

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon

(Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

This amendment will not, as has previously been criticized, deduct from the funds that will be used to build Iraq or, I should say, the money we will borrow to build Iraq. It is a simple amendment. It says, none of the funds made available in this act, U.S. taxpayer dollars, may be used for the participation of Iraq in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

Now, why would we want to restrict that?

Well, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries is a cartel. It is an energy cartel. They flout international law, the World Trade Organization, and other agreements by artificially constraining production in violation of the World Trade Organization's precepts to drive up the price, to profit themselves; and, of course, U.S. consumers are the losers.

Now, OPEC controls about 40 percent of the world's oil production, three-quarters of the reserves, and they set these production quotas for its 11 members.

We have heard a lot about how Iraq is going to become a free market economy. It is going to have a tremendous impact on world oil prices when its production hits the free market. If they join OPEC, they will be assigned a quota; and their quota will be controlled in the interests of OPEC, not international oil supply, not the consumers of the United States of America, but solely to benefit members of a price-fixing oil cartel.

This same cartel agreed to cut oil production, they just voted a couple of weeks ago, on November 1, by 900,000 barrels a day, which is already raising the price of gasoline at the pump here in the United States, jacking up the price of home heating oil as we go into a home heating season here in the United States. And the Iraqi representative who was sent to the last meeting at the behest of Mr. Bremer and the United States, in all probability with U.S. funds, Ibrahim Bahr al-Uloum said Iraq should play an active role in achieving the objectives of this organization, which translated, means Iraq fully intends to participate in the price-fixing, the manipulation, and the cartel.

I do not believe that U.S. taxpayer dollars should participate in this activity, which is contrary to the United States, the precepts we advocate in world trade, and our own consumers and taxpayers.

Now, why do we need the amendment? Well, Mr. Bremer has supported the membership of Iraq in OPEC, the price-fixing cartel. There are ample discretionary funds in the bill in addition to the $2.1 billion that will go to rebuild the Iraq oil infrastructure and flows through the Iraqi oil ministry which could be used to facilitate the participation in this price-fixing cartel. I just do not think that the United States taxpayers should be asked to foot this bill.

Hopefully, in fact, the U.S. will try and convince the Iraqi council and others that it would not be in their best interests to participate in a price-fixing cartel, particularly if they are going to depend upon us for so many billions of dollars to fix their oil infrastructure.

I know the gentleman from Arizona believes very much in the rule of law and is a big advocate of the World Trade Organization, their dispute mechanism, resolution mechanism; and I am certain he is very well aware that the quotas of OPEC violate the precepts of the WTO. They are not based in a shortage; they create shortages. The only way we can constrain supply under the WTO in this manner is if we have a certified shortage or conservation of resources. This is neither. This is price-fixing to gouge American consumers and others in oil-importing countries, and the United States taxpayers should have none of this.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition. I will not take 5 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree with most everything the gentleman from Oregon has said. I certainly do not believe the taxpayers of the United States should be paying for Iraq when there is a newly constituted government there to be participating in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, known as OPEC. The fact is they most certainly, almost certainly, will continue to be a member of that organization; and, in fact, they have already attended meetings in kind of an observer status. But none of our funds should be used to do that, since they are generating a fair amount of oil funds now that are paying for much of their internal costs of government, although not enough to do the reconstruction, which is what we are having the discussions today about. That would be the funds that they would use to do that, but I quite agree that funds from the United States taxpayers should not be used for that.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MILLENDER-MCDONALD

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

In the paragraph in chapter 1 of title I under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', insert after the aggregate dollar amount preceding paragraph (1) the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000) (increased by $50,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of October 16, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes on the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I am offering an amendment that directs $50 million from the Operation and Maintenance Defense-Wide account to the Family Advocacy program that is administered by the Defense Department. This amendment addresses the fundamental needs that will be facing our returning military personnel and their families when they return home from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The Family Advocacy program provides support services to families that are transitioning from the frontline to the home front. This additional $50 million in funding will enable military families to get personal and marriage counseling which will work to reduce the incidence of domestic violence and suicide among our military personnel.

□ 0945

As we are all aware, Mr. Chairman, domestic violence occurs within all groups and levels of society. However, the military presents families with particular challenges not normally found in civilian society.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentlewoman yielding, and she is in the midst of a very important statement, but I wanted to share with her, as well as my colleagues, that I believe she is highlighting a very important problem.

We do provide for $22 million within the bill, but frankly, the Department tells me that the challenges are very real, we may need more money, and rather than taking my 5 minutes, I am inclined to let the gentlewoman know that we are going to accept her amendment.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman so much.

Mr. Chairman, I need not say anymore. I appreciate the other side accepting this.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), I move to strike the last

word, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to introduce an amendment. There will be a better time under the rules to do that, but I will just take a couple of minutes to explain what that amendment would have done, if that is okay with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

The amendment that we had been prepared to introduce, and which, actually, we will execute in another way as the chairman of the Committee on Small Business regards the reporting requires of H.R. 3289, and, essentially, what we are trying to do here is two things.

The first thing is to have the reporting requirement so that every 60 days the Federal Government will have to file a written report with the United States Congress stating the nature of these contracts that are being used for the reconstruction of Iraq, the country of origin of incorporation or entity getting the contract and the country of origin of the services or manufactured items. There is a very rich opportunity in this country to help restore the crumbling manufacturing base by taking the $21 billion in money to rebuild Iraq and to target that at United States' manufacturing companies which have lost nearly 3 million workers in the past 2½ years.

The present reporting requirements of H.R. 3289 are not adequate for Congress to perform the oversight functions. The present bill requires no reporting to Congress where a foreign company wins a contract to assist Iraq in a free and open competition. The bill, however, does require a report to Congress where a contract is awarded on the basis of restricted competition such as a small business set aside awarded to U.S. small business.

The issue here is accountability and, essentially, the issue is under Article I of the Constitution, section 9, where it says, No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law, and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

We simply would have asked in the amendment, had it been ruled in order, for the United States Congress to follow the constitutional mandate of reporting. So we will find another time to do that.

Meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, what we have going on in this country is 93,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost in the past 60 days in America. The slide has continued for over 3 years at the rate of about 57- to 60,000 manufacturing jobs per month, and this Congress should step up to the bat and say if we are going to spend $21 billion in taxpayers' dollars, let us at least use it to help keep the jobs of the hard-hit manufacturing sector in this country.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for the opportunity to speak, look forward to working with him. I will be writing to the people in charge of the conference to ask them to consider this extremely important amendment.

Another amendment that we would have introduced, had it been in order, would have been at least to request the people buying supplies in Iraq with American taxpayers' dollars to prefer American manufacturers and American suppliers of services. We need to find a way to help create jobs, to help stop the ebb of service sector jobs and manufacturing jobs in this country. We should be using this process to rebuild Iraq for that opportunity.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REYES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REYES:

In chapter 1 of title I, in the item relating to ''INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

This amendment is designed to address serious shortfalls in two critical areas to our national security, foreign language proficiency and diversity in their workforce.

Specifically, my amendment will cut $5 million from the general intelligence community management account and add $5 million for programs designed to increase language proficiency and workforce diversity in the intelligence community.

Success in the global war on terrorism and in Iraq demands that our Nation have the best intelligence collection and analysis possible. Officers with only a marginal understanding of the language and the culture of intelligence targets will only be marginally effective for this country.

The report of the joint inquiry into the events of 9/11 reflects my longstanding concerns about the lack of progress that has been made by the intelligence community in enhancing language proficiency and diversifying its workforce.

Specifically, it recommended that the intelligence community implement, expeditiously, measures to identify and recruit linguists outside the community whose abilities are relevant to the needs of counterterrorism.

The joint inquiry further recommended that the intelligence community should enhance recruitment of a more ethnically and culturally diverse workforce and devise a strategy to capitalize upon the unique cultural and linguistic capabilities of first-generation Americans.

To address these critical needs, my amendment will provide funds for training in critical foreign languages and language maintenance and award programs. It will also fund scholarship programs, recruitment efforts and other nontraditional programs that are designed to enhance the recruitment and the retention of a diverse workforce.

The intelligence community must have a diverse set of people that have the cultural awareness, the language familiarity and the skill sets that will allow our Nation to succeed against an increasing number of formidable foes around the globe. My amendment will provide funds for increasing diversity of the workforce and language proficiency, two vital and important national security imperatives.

I hope that I can get the support of all my colleagues on this very critical amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise very reluctantly to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) is pointing to an area that the committee is very concerned about, and indeed the intelligence community has been, as has our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence here in the House.

The amendment seems to have no real overall effect on the intelligence community's management account. It decreases the account by $5 million and then increases that same account, but the point that I would make is that this shifting of money would tend to have a direct impact upon both the FBI and the Department of Energy, as well as the broader intelligence community, in their efforts to develop our effort on the intelligence side in the war on terrorism.

In turn, in recent years, there has been sizeable adjustment in those accounts that addressed the question of linguistics, the training of people who know foreign language, et cetera, and as my colleague knows, identifying such people, first of all, takes time and takes time to train them, and so we just cannot throw money at it and cause a change like that. I mean, unlike a lot of accounts where we just put money in and something happens tomorrow, linguistic development, that kind of training is very difficult. So it is much more a regular order kind of process.

I could describe this in great detail in private between us, but some of the intelligence questions here really should not be discussed in this environment, but in turn, it is an important problem. If I thought a $5 million shift would make a difference and not affect other elements of our war on terrorism, I would support the gentleman's amendment, but I reluctantly oppose it.

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

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

I have a high degree of respect for my colleague. I have been on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence finishing up my third year, and the bottom line is that we have not seen a strategic plan to, in fact, diversify the workforce or specifically address issues dealing with language.

My purpose in offering this amendment is to continue to highlight the critical nature and the imperative challenge that we face when we do not have this as a priority for our country. That is really why I left this at $5 million because I did not want to try to hurt any one program or this account in particular, but I specifically wanted to highlight the critical need and the lack of a strategic plan by our intelligence community to work in this particular area.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REYES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this exchange with my colleague. We are really coming from the same position. These accounts are very delicately balanced now, as the gentleman knows, and the impact that this shifting might very well have on work that is vital within the FBI, et cetera, concerns me.

In turn, I think our dialogue here, I think, is highlighting the matter. There is no doubt that the committee is reflecting the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's concern about improving what we are doing relative to foreign language training and linguistics. There is little doubt that the Congress, the House of Representatives, has said very clearly in this bill in other sections, as well as this dialogue, that this is a priority. We expect the entire intelligence community to respond.

So, frankly, I want to be very complimentary of the gentleman's effort, but shifting the money here could make it very difficult to deal with the other body in a fashion that we hope to move forward with. So I am reserved relative to this amendment, but do very much appreciate my colleague's helping us highlight this important area.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, in deference to my colleague, I would close by saying I hope we can have a recorded vote, so that we can understand the importance of the issue. I hope the gentleman is in agreement.

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

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

We certainly will but, frankly, I will end up opposing, asking for a ''no'' vote on that vote. I frankly do not like to see us end it that way, and we could very well end it that way, and maybe that does not help with the highlighting.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I commend my colleague on the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence for his work on this issue.

Today, our Nation is fortunate to have General Abizaid leading our troops in Central Command. General Abizaid is an expert on Middle Eastern affairs, and fluent in Arabic. He is the perfect man to have leading our troops in this region.

Unfortunately, people like General Abizaid are rare in the United States. Our Nation has neglected programs that build proficiency in those languages, and we are struggling to catch up. Last year, the GAO reported that the FBI had thousands of hours of audio tapes and pages of written material that have not been reviewed or translated due to the lack of qualified translators.

The GAO also noted that the State Department suffers from a language proficiency shortfall whereby Foreign Service officers are put in positions with lower-than-desired levels of proficiency. These shortfalls have not existed without cost. These shortfalls have weakened the fight against international terrorism and drug trafficking; and resulted in less effective representation of U.S. interests overseas.

The lack of trusted interpreters and human intelligence sources is slowing down the work to expose Saddam Hussein's weapons programs.

Most critically, the lack of skilled interpreters has slowed our efforts in the war on terrorism. This amendment will help alleviate these problems by focusing on the critical need to address the shortfall.

We cannot ignore this shortfall—the need for improved HUMINT is an emergency that I urge my colleagues to support with this amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAMSTAD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSTAD:

Page 3, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(decreased by 98,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by 98,000,000)''.

□ 1000

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill to provide travel and transportation costs for our brave troops to return home during R&R breaks. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), for his work on this important legislation. I would also like to thank the chairman and ranking member for their tireless work on the underlying legislation, which is so critical to our mission in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, our military recently began employing its first Rest and Recuperation program during the Vietnam War. This means that soldiers who have served 12 straight months in Iraq qualify for R&R, and some 700 troops per day are currently returning to the United States to see their families. Unfortunately, once the troops reach our shores, they are too often stranded at the airport. That is because the airports to which they are flown are nowhere near their homes or families, and same-day airline fares are far too expensive for most of our troops to afford. Being stranded at the Baltimore Washington Airport will not provide much rest or relaxation to those who are making such great sacrifices to defend our freedom.

Anyone, Mr. Chairman, who has served in the military knows how important it is to get home, especially those serving in combat. The Ramstad-Moore amendment simply shifts $98 million in funds from the Iraq Freedom Fund to the Army's personnel account.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment stating Congress' intent to expand the R&R program to cover domestic travel costs was agreed to by unanimous consent during the other body's consideration of the Iraq supplemental. This amendment today would provide the funding necessary to pay for these costs and would put this body on record in support of this important initiative for our brave troops.

The Federal Government should clearly cover all travel and transportation costs necessary to return our brave troops to their homes, briefly reuniting wives and husbands, parents and children, friends and loved ones. Getting our brave troops home for rest and recuperation is the very least we can do to show our troops and their families that we appreciate their service and their great sacrifice, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though it is my pleasure to say that I am highly inclined to support the Ramstad amendment.

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the distinguished chairman for accepting this important amendment to show our troops that we truly do appreciate their important service to our country and their great sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), for his great work on this bill. This is a worthy bill that should be considered and adopted by this body, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Ramstad-Moore amendment.

Mr. Chairman, back on October 1, I introduced House Resolution 387, a bipartisan resolution that now has 127 cosponsors, and basically it did exactly what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) has written into this amendment, and that is pay for the rest and recuperation travel, full travel cost, for all of our military personnel serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I heard a story on NPR about 3 weeks ago and was frankly stunned to hear that young people who had been serving in Afghanistan and Iraq were being brought home for R&R after serving their several months in Afghanistan or Iraq, and then being deposited in Baltimore or some other port city, and said, you are here, you have to pay for your own travel home and back.

I was stunned. In fact, I did not believe that was really true. I asked my staff to check, and found out in fact it was true, that they were required to pay their travel costs home and back. This is not the way we show honor and respect for the young people who serve our military and protect our country.

So I applaud again the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) for his work on this, and I ask all of our colleagues to join with us in supporting this. Again, 127 have signed on a similar bill. There is broad bipartisan support in this body. And as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) said, the other body has already passed a similar amendment by voice vote.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I am prepared to accept the amendment and to yield back.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply would say that we certainly have no objection to this amendment on this side. We have had several other amendments, so it is about time it is accepted.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my support to the Ramstad-Moore amendment, which would allow troops on rest and recreation leave to return from Iraq to their home of record. This amendment benefits every member of the military serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom from across the United States, its territories and possessions. I am pleased that this amendment will enable servicemen and women from Guam to return home, even if only for a few days. This amendment will make a great improvement in the morale of our troops because they will be re-united with friends and family who are hoping and praying for their safe return. On behalf of the children that will be reunited with a parent and the couples that will see each other for the first time in months, I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $300,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $300,000,000)''.

Page 33, lines 19 and 20, after each dollar amount insert ''(increased by $70,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important as we proceed with this debate for the framework to be established that this is the largest supplemental in the history of our country. If we were to follow the instructions of the Federalist Papers, where this body was the place of speech and discourse and debate, our Members would be engaged in this very serious debate for an extended period of time.

Our Founding Fathers established this place of democracy so that we could represent our constituents. In a town hall meeting just a few days ago, my constituents asked about issues such as accountability and issues as to how this money will impact both the peace and harmony of the world we have come to know and come to love. They were concerned about some very important issues: their children, the 19- and 20-year-olds that we have on the front lines.

Over this past weekend, I had the opportunity to meet with many of our troops that are experiencing an R&R from the Mideast. Mr. Chairman, I was aghast at some of the issues that they were concerned about. And I respect the appropriators, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I know the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) have worked very hard, as has the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY); but it disturbs me not having the ability to offer important amendments. I hope I can work with both the authorizers and the appropriators so that we would have the opportunity to address the questions that I heard out of the mouths of these young men and women.

This young man, Mr. Chairman, is playing the song ''Amazing Grace.'' These young people are saying that it is important to understand what they are dealing with. Carpenters and electricians are being used as police officers without any training. Reservists and National Guard are not getting their pay on time. And they asked me the simple question of why they cannot rotate in a period of 7 to 8 months, as opposed to not knowing when they would leave. So I was going to offer an amendment that would ensure that if this is passed that no monies are expended until the Reservists and the National Guard monies are back on track and are being paid.

Secretary Wolfowitz said that we had enough money in Iraq so that we should not have had to have this supplemental of $20 billion; so the least we can do, if we are not using the Iraqi oil money, is to at least make sure our young troops are paid on time; that our young troops as well are able to come home in an orderly time. And I am going to engage the authorizers. I do not want their commentary to me, their plea for help to go on deaf ears. I hope there is someone on the other side of the aisle paying attention. Of course, Mr. Chairman, whenever a Democrat says anything, it is of no value. Most of our amendments have been voted down, and there is not a collegial and collaborative method of looking at this.

The amendment I intend to offer this morning is very simple. It responds to the concerns about Afghanistan, Iraq and human rights and the rights of women. And it simply asks that we move money out of the Iraqi oil, which is $2.1 billion. And, Mr. Chairman, if we want to put a new face on America and Iraq, if we want people to understand our values and the importance of protecting human rights, we want to move beyond the graves of bones and not have those who move into positions of power disrespect the diversity that is in Iraq, then we must invest in human rights.

If we are going to make sure that the Taliban stays out, then we must invest in the teachers of Afghanistan. Those

are the women. We must enhance human rights. We know recently that in the human rights area in Afghanistan, we have found that there have been 2,000 complaints. It is imperative that we have this money.

Mr. Chairman, we continue to shortchange Afghanistan's reconstruction and security, and at the peril of jeopardizing the rights of Afghan women and girls and hopes for a peaceful, democratic Afghanistan. The funding levels in H.R. 3289 neither adequately make up for the small amounts of reconstruction funding thus far nor do they meet the country's needs. In particular I am concerned about the rights of women and girls in Afghanistan. I am also concerned about human rights efforts in Iraq.

This amendment increases the funds for Afghanistan Relief and Reconstruction by $70 million in order to adequately support the human rights needs of Afghan women and girls. This amendment also addresses the human rights needs in Iraq by shifting $300 million within the funds for Iraq Reconstruction to the areas of human rights, education, refugees and democracy and governance.

My visit to Afghanistan in March 2002 demonstrated that we cannot abandon Afghanistan and must take necessary steps to help the women and children of that nation. In 1989 America turned its back on Afghanistan after Soviet withdrawal. The events of September 11th have proven that we cannot afford to turn a blind eye on a country that is still susceptible to deterioration, yet that is what we have done.

After the military intervention by a US-led coalition that led to the end of the Taliban regime in November 2001 Colin Powell, US Secretary of State, declared that, ''The recovery of Afghanistan must entail the restoration of the rights of Afghan women. Indeed, it will not be possible without them. The rights of the women of Afghanistan will not be negotiable.''

We must honor our promises to the women of Afghanistan, that is why a significant portion of the $70 million my amendment designates to Afghanistan relief and reconstruction must go directly to the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission. The Independent Human Rights Commission was established by the Bonn Agreement and is chaired by the courageous Dr. Sima Samar, the first Minister of Women's Affairs who was then forced from that position by fundamentalist forces. While there have been improvements since the fall of the Taliban, human rights violations continue to be rampant and the human right situation in Afghanistan has actually deteriorated over the past few months due to the lack of security. Since the Human Rights Commission was established in June 2002, it has received over 2,000 complaints of human rights violations, over 900 of these complaints have been since June 2003.

Under Dr. Samar's leadership, the Commission has established regional offices which create public awareness about women's rights and human rights and monitors rights violations, led human rights education programs, provided leadership for the inclusion of women's rights in the Afghan constitution, has established human rights training programs for police, and has intervened directly in numerous cases of human rights violations. As an independent agency, the Human Rights Commission is able to act on behalf of those whose rights are most vulnerable. We must strengthen the Human Rights Commission as a permanent institution within Afghanistan so that it can safeguard women's rights and human rights into the future. I urge that at least $10 million of the funds from this amendment be devoted to the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission to carryout their brave work.

Girls' schools are under attack by fundamentalist extremists. In the past year, more than 30 girls schools have been burned down or violently attacked. At most of the sites of these attacks, leaflets have been distributed threatening the families of girls who attend school or the teachers who teach them. Flyers distributed at the site of one of the first attacks read ''Stop sending your women to offices and daughters to schools. It spreads indecency and vulgarity. Stand ready for the consequences if you do not heed the advice.'' Some families are now afraid to send their daughters to school.

Recently, mosques in Kabul warned that if women did not quit their work with NGOs that jihad would be waged. Women who do not wear burqas routinely face harassment and threats. Trafficking of young women is a major problem in Afghanistan. Warlords in some areas continue to impose Taliban-like restrictions on women. In Herat, women are still forced to wear the burqa, are sometimes pulled off of the street for forced chastity tests, and are not allowed to attend classes taught by men.

Even if the constitution adopted by the Loya Jirga in December contains women's rights provisions, the work for women's rights will be far from over. Security in the country must be dramatically improved and rule of law established for the constitution to be enforced. Massive human rights and women's rights public education programs are necessary to make people aware of their rights, to deter human rights violations, and to bring the violators of these rights to justice, which is one of the reasons that the work of the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission is so essential.

Forced marriages are a major form of human rights violation faced by women. Under Taliban and also today, women routinely taken from their homes into forced marriages that are imposed against their will. Often these are underage marriages as well, with girls as young as 8 forced to marry old men. Some are cases where commanders force marriages on women in order to take control of land that the women have inherited.

Warring factions continue to fight, and in these areas of the country military commanders routinely rape women. In one case, women fled into a river and drowned father than suffer sexual violence at the hands of the commanders.

In the last two years only 1 percent of Afghanistan's reconstruction needs have been met. The country remains in shambles from two decades of war and lack of development. Most people in the country do not have access to electricity, health care, schools, and sanitation. Not only is the lack of reconstruction depriving people of very basic services, but it is contributing to instability in the country and a lack of confidence in the central government.

The transitional government in Afghanistan estimates that between $20–30 billion is needed over the next five years. In other post-conflict settings, an average of $250 per person was spent per year in aid. But in Afghanistan, donors spent only $64 per person in 2002.

The proposed $800 million Afghanistan reconstruction supplemental spending request represents less than 1 percent of the total $87 billion Iraq and Afghanistan package. The $20 billion request for Iraq reconstruction funding is 25 times as large as the Afghanistan request. Yet Afghanistan has approximately the same population size as Iraq and suffered more destruction over 23 year of war.

The administration has talked about modeling reconstruction efforts on the Marshall Plan. Yet funding proposed for Afghanistan in crucial areas is low or nonexistent—$49 million for health care, $191 million, for road construction and nothing specifically for human rights.

The mark to increase reconstruction funding for Afghanistan by $400 million is a step in the right direction. But still more must be done, especially for women and girls.

Women and girls continue to face severe hardship and violations of their rights in Afghanistan. Yet the Afghanistan request does not specify funds for programs to improve the status of women and to remedy the tremendous injustices they faced under the Taliban regime. My amendment proposes designating $70 million for women's programs in the area of political rights and human rights, education and training, and security, protection and shelters.

Some girls have gone back to school in Afghanistan, but the majority have not because there are not enough schools and those that do exist are in very bad shape. The Asian Development Bank estimates that an additional 13,851 primary schools need to be constructed, but the Administration request is only for 275 schools. Some 40% of schools in Afghanistan were completely destroyed during the war, another 15% were heavily damaged, and in many areas of the country there were no schools for girls.

We must provide direct support to help strengthen those women-led, permanent Afghan institutions whose mission it is to promote women's rights and human rights. That is why the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission and the Ministry of Women's Affairs should get support from this bill. These are funds already authorized in the Afghan Freedom Support Act of 2002, but which still for the most part have not been appropriated. We must take bold and meaningful steps to keep our promise to the women and girls of Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, In addition to my desire to express vehement opposition to the supplemental appropriation request for $87 billion of H.R. 3289 and the need for better accounting of this request, I rise at this time in support of amendment number JACKSO.150 that I offered to the Rules Committee for this bill. The amendment reads as follows:

> Effective as of the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, none of the funds made available in this Act for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended unless the backlog, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, in the payment to members of the reserve components of pay and allowances accrued by reason of active-duty service has been eliminated so that such payments are current and in accordance with regular disbursement cycles.

This language will give the Department of Defense a reasonable amount of time to make timely payment of compensation funds to reservist and National Guard personnel and

eliminate the backlog that causes these men and women financial hardship.

During my visit to the As-Sayliyah Central Command Base in Doha, Qatar last weekend, I heard first-hand accounts as to the extent of the delay in receiving pay experience by these ladies and gentlemen who protect our lives each day in the Middle East. These troops, many of who rely on military compensation to provide the lion's share of support for spouses and children. When the compensation is untimely or nonexistent, the troops suffer the compound effect of stress over delayed payment of personal bills and the problems that stem from the misallocation of duties, namely, ineffective directives and increased vulnerability to potential attacks.

Army reservists and National Guard members are fielding threatening phone calls from bill collectors because the federal government is not promptly reimbursing them for lodging costs and other expenses. Military officials have repeatedly confirmed that there are delays affecting thousands of reservists and Guard members, including those stationed at the U.S. Central Command in Tampa, FL. They said the scope of the war on terror has overwhelmed the Pentagon's check-writing office.

Our reservists receive repeated telephone calls demanding payment for overdue bills from the Bank of America, ironically the administrator of government-issued credit cards. A reservist at MacDill Air Force Base complained that bank representatives called at all hours—at home, at work and on a cell phone. A Pentagon official said that the backlog in compensation affects 23,000 reservists, both Army Reserve and members of the Army National Guard. The Pentagon is considering creating the Reserve Pay Center of Excellence in Cleveland to help resolve pay issues. Another official familiar with the back-pay issue at CentCom, the nerve center of the Iraq war said hundreds of Army reservists and members of the Army National Guard were having trouble getting reimbursed for travel pay.

A commander of the Army Reserve Forces learned of the problem in recent weeks during town hall meetings with reservists. Our soldiers surely do not need that kind of pressure.

An Army Reserve spokesman at Fort McPherson in Atlanta, Steve Stromball, blamed the money problem on the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, the accounting arm of the Defense Department. He said the accounting service's workload has tripled because of the number of reservists who have been mobilized to help fight the war on terror.

Since 9/11, 80,000 Army reservists have been mobilized. Over 78,238 members of the Army National Guard also have been deployed. At MacDill Air Force Base, where there are about 1,400 reservists from the various services, the problem appears to be especially acute for soldiers who live off base. The problem often boils down to rent payments. When reservists arrive at MacDill for assignments that range from six months to a year, they can get lodging on base at the MacDill Inn, which has 300 quarters assigned to military personnel. Often there is no room available, so reservists are assigned off-base housing. MacDill has contracts with 35 hotels and 10 to 15 apartment complexes.

Moreover, Reservists can choose to cover the rent themselves, but many charge it on government-issued Bank of America credit cards. The credit cards, used to cover business expenses, including rent, food and car rental, are issued depending upon how often reservists travel. However, the delay in compensation frequently leads to diminishing creditworthiness for these heroes. Each credit card has a limit of several thousand dollars and the entire balance must be paid off each month.

To cover the rent, reservists file a voucher for reimbursement and pay off the credit card balance when they get reimbursed. A transaction that used to take federal officials eight days to process, however, now takes as much as 23 days, according to a spokesman for the Defense Finance and Accounting Service. Some reservists have been unable to pay their credit card bills on time, triggering telephone calls from the bank and diminished creditworthiness. If payment is more than a month late, the bank freezes the credit card account. People who fight on the front line for our freedom and safety shouldn't experience this hardship.

Instead of creating hardship and compounded stress for our war heroes, we need to adequately and timely compensate them. It is bad enough that they must fight under extremely vulnerable conditions and with no known exit plan. The least we can do is pay them for their services.

Mr. Chairman, although the War in Iraq will cost all American taxpayers dearly, the toughest burden will fall on the shoulders of our troops serving overseas and their families here at home. This amendment states that none of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended until personnel policies have been implemented to ensure that none of our troops or employees are being required to remain in Iraq for more than six months at a time. This amendment will help ensure that our troops and their families remain mentally fit and rested, and that military tours will remain a reasonable commitment in service to this nation.

I would like to commend your attention to an article in today's Washington Post, titled ''Many Troops Dissatisfied, Iraq Poll Finds.'' I know that a lot of you do not believe our nation's biggest newspapers, and feel that they are painting an unfairly gloomy picture of the situation in Iraq. But this article is just reporting on a study conducted in Iraq by the Stars and Stripes newspaper funded by the Defense Department. That study questioned 1,935 U.S. Service members serving in Iraq on their attitudes toward the war, and the jobs they are doing.

Of those, half responded that their unit's morale is low. In a statistic with ominous implications for the future of our military, 49 percent reported that they did not plan to reenlist. The most troubled of our soldiers were reservists, who used to be known as ''weekend warriors''—many of whom have families and careers put on hold almost indefinitely, as this War continues without a clear exit strategy.

The president has stated that the War on Terror will be a long and involved one. Therefore, must pace ourselves and our troops, and we must ensure that our armed services can continue to recruit good people in the future. This amendment will help do just that. As the Stars and Stripes confirmed, life in Iraq is extremely stressful for our soldiers risking their lives trying to make the best of a difficult situation. Keeping our soldiers on six-month rotations will give them time to decompress and unwind—to see friends and family, or just to get a change of scenery.

If we plan to continue to have a voluntary service military, we must make every reasonable effort to retain the soldiers we have and to make service more palatable to potential recruits. There are many brave American men and women who would be willing to commit to protecting this nation and its interest. However, we cannot expect them to make unreasonable sacrifices. A six-month tour in Iraq is a great commitment, and it is reasonable.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yields 10 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) in support of the amendment.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me this time, and I stand in accord with what the gentlewoman from Texas has said.

It is critical, Mr. Chairman, that we recognize the importance or the violation of human rights in Iraq and the women's rights in Afghanistan. For years, I have worked with a lot of Members of the House in working on women's rights in Afghanistan and ensuring that they have more of a governance, more education, and the same as in Iraq. So I urge everyone to support the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I plead with my colleagues to understand that this is a monumental decision that we are making. We need to change the face of America and Iraq and Afghanistan. We need to engage by ensuring that they understand the true values of Americans, our love for democracy, equality, and our love and respect for women's rights, our respect for human rights. It is important that we overcome the undermining of our world status after 9–11 by a preemptive attack against Iraq.

It is important as well that we respond to the needs of our young troops who have been willing to give the ultimate sacrifice and who have lost their lives on the front lines in Iraq, by ensuring that we pay them on time and that we have an exit strategy to bring our troops home. With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues vote for the Jackson-Lee amendment that invests in human rights and women's rights in Afghanistan and Iraq and further I ask that my amendment regarding troop pay for Reservists and the National Guard adjusted so their pay is received by them promptly and my amendment regarding a date certain for the troops to return home to the U.S. be immediately addressed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I do rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin with noting my disappointment in the remarks

of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) that Democratic amendments have not been accepted or not been listened to. We are now in our third day of debate on this bill. We have had a large number of amendments, most of which have come from the minority side, and a number of Democratic amendments have been accepted.

When the gentlewoman said it is not done in a collegial way, let me just note specifically in the area she is talking about, education in Iraq, that there is $90 million specifically set aside for education in Iraq that was not requested by the President, because the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, came to me and talked to me about this issue. So we have these funds in there at the request of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), at the request of the minority, not because of the President's request, but because this body, this subcommittee, has worked in a collegial fashion.

Now, what the gentlewoman is suggesting is putting more money into that and more money into Afghanistan. But our committee, again not at the President's request, but recognizing the need for us to follow through with our commitment in Afghanistan and recognizing the deteriorating security conditions in Afghanistan, our subcommittee has increased the amount of assistance for Afghanistan by almost $400 million.

□ 1015

I have already noted that we specifically set aside $90 million for education in Iraq that was not requested by the administration.

As far as the areas where this would come out of, $100 million out of the IRRF fund, $300 million out of restoring the oil production in Iraq which, by the way, is the only way Iraq is ever going to generate enough funds that they can do their own reconstruction, that they can stand on their own feet, to take that $300 million out of there is to not only harm the infrastructure, the effort to reconstruct the infrastructure, but harm the immediate needs of Iraqi citizens to have heating oil and kerosene for cooking, the cooking and heating oil that is absolutely vital as we go into the winter months there in Iraq. It has to do not just with comfort for the people in Iraq but in many cases the very livelihoods, the very survival, particularly when children are involved.

I think the gentlewoman's intentions are good, but that is why we discussed this issue at length in the subcommittee and that is why we discussed it at the full committee level too. I think we have come with what, I think, is a fair and a balanced division of the funds as it is going to the various accounts in Iraq.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I think that this would upset that balance. I do not think it is the right way to go, though I respect the gentlewoman's intentions.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his very thoughtful explanation. This is the kind of debate I would like to see continue in this House. I respectfully, if you will, acknowledge our difference of opinion, but what my point was is that there were many, many amendments that we had on issues that were very important on this very historic and important vote and those were not allowed. But what I would like to simply ask the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) is on the amendments that I did not ask on the payment of the National Guard, and all of us have had certainly constituents in our district who have been on the front lines and who are Reservists and National Guards. One of the issues they raise, and it may be a logistical issue, is getting their pay on time. I did not get a chance to offer an amendment that said, let us ensure that we put procedures in place so that our National Guards and Reservists get their pay on time. Can we work together or can we just ensure that the logistics will ensure, since it is authorized pay, that they will be able to get those payments?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and the gentlewoman is much too young to remember this.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his compliment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. During the big war, there was a word, a phrase, it is really a word, a snafu was common among all people who were in the service. The military has often screwed up, I must tell you, and it is ridiculous. Absolutely, we agree with the gentlewoman's position. We will do everything we can to improve that process. Your highlighting it here is very helpful.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would urge the Members to reject this amendment.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEFFEL:

In section 2212(b) (relating to report on military operations and reconstruction efforts), strike paragraphs (7) through (9) and insert the following:

(7) A description of progress made toward the establishment of an independent, sovereign, and democratic government for Iraq, including an estimated schedule for the drafting of a constitution and the holding of free and fair elections.

(8) A description of the extent of international participation in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, including the amount and schedule for the provision of financial assistance by other countries and international organizations.

(9) The number of members of the Armed Forces (including national guard and reserve troops) deployed in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, an estimate of the period of time for which such forces will be deployed, and a description of progress made in replacing such forces with international or foreign peacekeeping units.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need more information about our situation in Iraq. I would like to offer an amendment to add additional requests for information to a section of the bill that the Appropriations Committee added, appropriately so, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that requires the President to submit quarterly reports to Congress on military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq. I think the committee did the right thing. I think we should ask for more information. And so my amendment would add additional requirements to three sections of the reporting provision already in the bill.

One provision in the bill asks for a description of progress made toward the holding of free and fair elections. My amendment would add to that section a schedule for the transfer of power to the Iraqi people, including the drafting of an Iraqi constitution.

A second section already in the bill asks for a description of the extent of international participation in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, including the amount of provision for financial assistance. I would add a schedule for the provision of financial assistance from other nations and from the United Nations be added as a requirement.

And, finally, a section of the bill asks for the number of Armed Forces deployed in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom be reported quarterly. I would

add to that section an estimate on how long our troops, including the National Guard and Reserves, will remain in Iraq and the progress being made in replacing them with troops from other nations or from U.N. peacekeepers.

I think these reports on a quarterly basis would help us understand the situation in Iraq, would help this Congress fulfill our constitutional duties of oversight and would help us better exercise our power of the purse. I am concerned that we have not had an adequate and a concrete plan to win the peace in Iraq. Our soldiers performed brilliantly and bravely and the military victory was a rousing success. I am concerned that we are not winning the peace. And we have a number of national goals in Iraq. We need to stabilize the country; we need to support and better protect our troops; we need to establish a pluralistic society and a representative self-government; we need to internationalize the construction and the security in Iraq; we need to put Iraqis quickly back in charge of Iraq. For us to do our job appropriately and to exercise our oversight and exercise our power of the purse, we need more information. I would ask the House to approve this amendment that would give on a quarterly basis more information to the Congress.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I will not oppose this amendment. This perfects some language that was adopted in the committee offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) on requiring quarterly reports to be made and placing some additional requirements in that report which, I think, is useful information for us to have. This substitutes some language in three of the paragraphs and adds to it, tightens that up, and, for the most part, I do not have any objection to it.

I do find a problem, and I just want the gentleman to know this because that is really an issue, I think, in the conference. I do have a problem with one issue in paragraph nine where it requires that the administration give the Congress an estimate of the period of time for which such forces will be deployed. That is probably not possible for them to do, to actually tell how long the forces are going to be deployed because we do not know the circumstances of what is going to happen in Iraq either with the democracy there or with external circumstances that might require them to be there longer than we would like. But other than that, I would think the language here is helpful, and we can deal with that issue in the conference. And so, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for his comments. Just two quick comments. I gave credit to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for this amendment in committee. The gentleman gave credit to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY). Whoever deserves the credit should get it, because the Committee on Appropriations did a good job with that. Regarding the requirement of an estimate of the period of time, I am asking for an estimate, not an ironclad statement of future requirements because I know that is difficult. And as part of my language also, a description of the progress of bringing other troops in, I think that is all part of trying to get quarterly reports to the Congress so we can better understand what is happening. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation and his leadership.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. TAUSCHER

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. TAUSCHER:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $300,000,000)''.

Page 19, after line 20, insert the following new section:

SEC. . ____. The total amount appropriated by this chapter is hereby reduced by $300,000,000.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

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

I am offering an amendment with my friend and colleague from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) to transfer $300 million from the weapons inspectors in Iraq to pay for lifesaving equipment for the Army National Guard and Reserve troops currently serving there. Our amendment would leave the remaining $300 million to focus on finding weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, if there are any. Some 300,000 of our Guard and Reserve personnel have been called to active duty to fight terrorists in Africa and Asia and secure the peace in Afghanistan, the Balkans and Iraq. They are being called on to serve multiple tours and will continue to serve until we either stabilize Iraq or get international troops in there to share the burden. Yet our Guard and Reserve forces are working in Iraq without bulletproof jackets, armored vehicles and other basic lifesaving equipment. I am deeply concerned that if the demands of the Guard and Reserve do not ease up in the coming months, we will severely undermine our ability to attract new Reservists and keep ones that we have, which will prevent those who are currently serving in Iraq from returning to civilian life. If we are to depend on our brave citizen-soldiers to secure the peace in Iraq and prosecute the war on terrorism elsewhere, it is critical that they have the same equipment as everyone else.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to increase funds to protect the lives of our troops currently serving in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California for introducing this amendment and making sure that it was in order. It raises a very important question. It is a matter of life and death for the members of our National Guard.

Currently we have a policy in place which makes a lot of sense in ordinary circumstances for the taxpayer and for the use of our equipment and, that is, that the Guard gets essentially hand-me-down equipment as we buy new equipment for the active forces to engage in combat. But now what we find out is because of our manpower problems and the longer deployments of the Guard and a deeper reaching into the Guard structure in this country to deploy people in Iraq, in Afghanistan, we are in the situation where we now have the Guard entering the field of combat with old and, in some cases, obsolete equipment, equipment that is not compatible, communications equipment that is not compatible, Humvees that are from the first generation that do not provide the kind of protection to the occupants of that vehicle that the newer Humvees do. Yet, now we find, as I have been told by Guard members on the phone from Baghdad, in letters from Baghdad, they are seeing modern equipment being rotated back to the United States as those units are rotated out and the Guard is still left with old, obsolete, unsafe equipment.

The National Guard must not be put into the theater of combat with less than the same equipment that the active Army is put into the field of combat with. We cannot treat them as second-class citizens. This is a policy that

makes sense in peacetime, but this is a policy that is now lethal to our Guard members. I would hope that the committee, in its deliberations, would be able to address this problem.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from California for this amendment which would provide additional equipment to our troops and still leave our U.S. inspections team with adequate resources for the search. But there is a simple way for the United States to supplement our search efforts by bringing back the highly trained U.N. troops to help in the effort. We have all said the international community should share in the burden and share in the cost. We have an opportunity right now. The U.N. has a team of over 354 inspectors on the ground, trained, ready to go on short notice. What would it cost the United States? Nothing. They are paid for through the U.N. dues. They can also supplement our effort in another way. They can bring us something that money cannot buy, which is credibility. The fact of the matter is that this administration has lost much of its credibility with respect to claims it made of weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1030

If we want the international community and the American people to have faith in the findings, it is important that we bring in an independent inspection team to join our efforts. Only then can we convince the international community that any findings they make are legitimate and unbiased.

So I thank the gentlewoman for offering this important amendment. It is a win-win.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I do not intend at this moment to use the 5 minutes, but I must say I absolutely understand the gentlewoman's presenting this amendment for, indeed, we spent time together in Iraq, I have been saying a whole month in one weekend in Iraq together. That is not because of our wonderful charm, but because of what we experienced there together, the reality that Saddam Hussein is the worst tyrant, clearly competing with Hitler and Stalin. We learned that he was capable of almost anything. I will never forget the gentlewoman, as we were together at the killing fields, urging me and others to join together in a moment of silence, thinking about the potential of mass destruction as a part of this guy's everyday existence as long as he was ruling that country.

Indeed, I do not know exactly what we might find. I am hesitant about reducing this amount of money. I am going to be willing to talk about it as we go forward, but, indeed, the things that David Kay is about in his work are very important for us as we look at the challenges of dealing with people like this. So it is with great reluctance that I resist and ask for a ''no'' vote on the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

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

I want to thank the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for not only including me on the trip but for his eloquence and his leadership. I appreciate the fact that he recognizes the urgent needs of our Guard and Reserve. I know that he intends to work diligently to provide them with the money to get this new equipment. I do think that it would be wiser for us to have U.N. inspectors in there not only to have more credibility but also to share the burden. And I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on this amendment.

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

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

I just might mention that the gentlewoman's expression of international involvement is a very appropriate one, and I would highlight her remarks by mentioning that the U.N. voted unanimously yesterday, getting the U.N. really on board for the first time in helping us with this effort. In the meantime, moving this money around in this fashion when we have done so much as we have in O & M and the bill in general, I hesitate about it, and therefore I ask for a ''no'' vote. And I want to tell the gentlewoman I very much appreciate the work she has done with me.

I might mention, just to take the time, when we were together following our weekend, we actually sat down together for hours, our team of 17, and in the midst of it, one of our colleagues said, I am one, a liberal Democrat, who voted ''no'' to going to war, but after seeing what I see here about Saddam Hussein, I must say I have got to be ahead of my people. It is going to be unpopular at home.

It is time for us to lead, and therefore I am going to support this request of the President to carry forward this war on terrorism.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to immediately obtain the help of the international community in sharing the burden and cost of some of our efforts in Iraq.

As part of his $87 billion request, President Bush has asked for an additional $600 million to pay for our team of weapons inspectors in Iraq—known as the Iraq Survey Group—so that they may continue their search for weapons of mass destruction. This team of 1,200 inspectors, led by David Kay, has searched for WMD in Iraq for many months now. The President's request would increase that team to 1,400 inspectors.

I had an amendment prepared would allow us to greatly reduce the costs to the American taxpayer of conducting that search and dramatically increase the credibility of any findings made by the inspectors. The Republican majority refused to allow that amendment to come to a vote. I am pleased that Rep. Tauscher has offered this amendment. It provides for better equipment for our troops and leaves $300 million for our inspection team. We can supplement our team by bring back the U.N. inspectors. The President should immediately invite the existing team of United Nations' inspectors—known as UNMOVIC—to participate in the search for WMD in Iraq. The U.N. has a pool of inspectors who have 12 years of experience investigating Iraq's programs and many of whom speak Arabic. According to its most recent report, UNMOVIC has a roster of 354 trained experts available to serve in Iraq at short notice. This important resource should be put to use, allowing us to reduce the size and costs of our team of inspectors.

What would it cost us to engage these trained experts? Nothing. The costs of UNMOVIC are borne by the United Nations and paid for through the dues of the member nations.

Engaging the U.N. weapons inspectors in the search for WMD would also get us something that money can't buy—credibility. With respect to the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the Bush Administration has lost its credibility with the American people and has undermined American credibility in the international community. Before the war, our Secretary of State told the United Nations that the Iraqis were attempting to import nuclear weapons material from Africa. The U.N. inspectors reviewed the evidence and determined the claims were based on forged documents. The U.S. conceded the point and, worse, it turns out that agencies within the U.S. government had already questioned the veracity of the documents. Our Secretary of Defense told the world that we knew the location of the weapons of mass destruction. We now know that was untrue. In the aftermath of the war, the President claimed that two mobile trailers found in Iraq were evidence of a biological weapons program. Our inspection team has recently had to retreat from that claim. Again and again, Administration officials from the President on down have made false claims about Iraqi WMD. Even the Economist magazine, which had been a booster of the war, has stated that the Bush Administration is seen around the world as having its own arsenal of WMD—Wielders of Mass Deception.

The only way to restore confidence in the search for WMD is to bring in an impartial team of international inspectors. David Kay, the leader of our team, is stuck in a fundamental contradiction. He wears two hats, serving as both fact finder and salesman for the Administration. No matter how high his personal integrity, this dual role undermines the credibility of any findings his team may make.

It is critical to the integrity of the process that independent U.N. weapons inspectors be invited to participate in the search and given

the opportunity to independently evaluate any claims made by David Kay and the Iraq Survey Group. The American people should not be asked to spend an additional $600 million to fund a search that is widely perceived to be an effort to provide cover for an Administration that has lost its credibility on this issue at home and abroad.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for the purposes of colloquy.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and the opportunity to address this critical issue on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, as we are poised to invest billions of dollars in the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, I believe that it is imperative that we address the infrastructure needs of people with disabilities in the rebuilding process. Conflicts in other countries result in higher-than-average rates of disabilities for people, and the need for their consideration in the planning and design stages of new construction simply cannot be understated. Furthermore, given the history of discrimination and abuse of people with disabilities in Iraq, targeted programs through multi-inclusion of Iraqis with disabilities in public life and education will be necessary and, in fact, imperative. Including these matters, I believe, as a forethought will result in little up-front cost and save significant time and expense down the road. It is always more difficult and more costly to retrofit than it is to plan it in the earlier stages when construction is just being planned.

Finally, I believe that it is time to align our foreign policies with our national priorities, and currently foreign assistance funding is not required to be used in a manner that ensures access to people with disabilities. And this is inconsistent with our own civil rights laws, most notably the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Mr. Chairman, I was hoping and wanted to ask as this bill moves forward and goes to conference that the gentleman would be willing to work with me to perhaps ensure that those things are considered.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for bringing this issue to our attention, but most importantly for his strong leadership on this issue.

I agree with him that our foreign assistance dollars ought to be spent in a manner that is not only efficient but that is inclusive of all peoples including those with disabilities. I agree that the needs of people with disabilities ought to be a priority as we proceed with the reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan; and as we negotiate the terms of this spending bill, I certainly intend to keep the gentleman's comments today here in mind as we look at the report language and bill language. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERMAN:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), add the following:

SEC. . None of the amounts made available and allocated for oil infrastructure under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' may be used to enter into any contract using procedures other than competitive procedures.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of October 16, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes of time on the amendment.

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

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

The supplemental proposal before us today provides $2.1 billion for oil infrastructure improvements and reconstruction in Iraq. The public and the world are a bit skeptical as to how that money will be spent. The answer to that skepticism is in government contract law which provides for procedures for competitive bidding. However, there are on many occasions exceptions to the competitive bidding rules that have been employed by this administration.

The purpose of this amendment is to say that, with regard to the oil work, there will be no further exceptions at least for the money being spent under this bill.

This amendment does not affect our military procurement or our troops. It does not affect any emergency acquisitions of food or medicine or other humanitarian assistance. It deals only with the lucrative construction projects for the Iraqi oil system. And as to those projects, we should say no sole-source contracts.

Last night we debated a part of this issue. Congress demanded notification whenever there was sole-source contracting, and that is important as far as it goes. But with regard to these highly sensitive oil contracts, we need to go further and say no sole-sourcing at all. It is not just a matter of notification. There is no exigency, no national security justification for secrecy and sole-source contracting when we are talking about building oil wells in Iraq.

I am particularly concerned with the one company, Halliburton. This administration seems unable to contain its affection for this one corporation. Before the war, Halliburton won $1.4 billion for Iraq on a no-bid basis—before the hostilities even began and at a time when the administration was saying that hostilities were our last resort. The Halliburton Company greatly overcharged the American Government for its work in Kosovo. Recently, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) brought to the attention of this House the fact that Halliburton was charging a $1.70 a gallon for gasoline in Iraq at a time and a place where others were selling it for only 70 cents. American taxpayers are being ripped off for over half the price. This amendment will make sure that the building of the Iraqi oil infrastructure is done legitimately, that American taxpayers and the entire world know that fair processes are being pursued.

Given the incredible justification for skepticism as to how oil contracts have been let by this administration, it is appropriate for us to impose ''regular order'' in dealing with these oil contracts.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me use this 1 minute to address another issue, and that is to commend the United States Senate for adopting an amendment yesterday similar to one debated here on this floor. That amendment says that half the money being used to rebuild Iraq will be in the form of loans. That is an important decision by the United States Senate. The Senate version of that amendment was, I think, crafted in a more sophisticated manner than we were able to offer here on this floor given the House rules. I think that amendment might have passed this House, and in any case I urge our conferees to recede to the Senate on the issue of a $9 billion loan, $9 billion gift to rebuild Iraq.

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

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

I do rise in opposition to this amendment. We already had a full debate on this issue last night, as a matter of fact. The bill that we have before us has provisions, rather extensive provisions, dealing with competition and providing for full and open competition. These were provisions that were worked out with the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and the staff and, I believe, ranking members as well. Those provisions were amended last night here on this floor in the House. A perfecting amendment was added to it, which struck a particular exception on the notification. If it was a sole-source contract, it struck the exceptions for that. So notification

has to be given before those contracts are awarded.

This sets up a separate procedure that has no exception at all for it, even for an urgent situation. I am not sure if the gentleman has thought about what happens if there is a break in an oil line, what happens if there is a fire. They cannot go through a long bidding process for that. They have to take the money that is available and do an immediate contract. But even under those circumstances, there are procedures for competitive bidding and for open bidding, for making sure it is done in an open manner; and that is basically what the law that the Committee on Government Reform has the responsibility for is all about. That legislation, which is quite extensive, provides for open competition, provides for the bidding process, and it provides for the exceptions which are in there. And as I said last night on this floor, this body decided to eliminate at least one of those particular exceptions.

So I think we have thoroughly debated this issue, and I might say that the language as it is drafted here is not really, it seems to me, in legislative or legal form where it says ''enter into any contract using procedures other than competitive procedures.'' That ''other than competitive procedures'' is not a term which appears in the law anyplace, so we do not know exactly what ''competitive'' means there. ''Fully competitive'' is something that does appear in the law, but ''competitive'' does not.

□ 1045

So it is not at all clear what really the impact of this would be. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge its rejection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of California) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have with me a bulletproof vest. My colleagues can see that it is extremely heavy. It weighs about 16 pounds. I was horrified to learn that tens of thousands of our troops were sent out to battle without the proper armor and, to this day, they still lack necessary items, life-saving items like this bullet-proof vest.

Mr. Chairman, 44,000 troops do not have this bullet-proof vest that costs $1,500. The family members are writing the checks and sending these vests to their family members. So the taxpayers are paying twice. They are paying their dollars. We are not getting assistance from any foreign sources. The family members are writing checks, sending these vests to their family members to make sure that they have the necessary items to protect their lives. This is unacceptable.

This is an important issue. I want every American citizen to know that the President did not request one penny for these vests. He did not request one penny for these vests. Mr. Chairman, 44,000 soldiers in Iraq without body armor, and the President did not ask for a cent to protect these soldiers. I guess our brave men and women will have to wait until Halliburton, Halliburton, Halliburton starts making body armor before they can get the protection they need and deserve.

Congress approved $310 million in April to buy 300,000 bullet-proof vests for our troops; but, sadly, only 75 million of these dollars have gone to the officers, Army officers that are responsible for purchasing these vests.

Where is the accountability that this administration promised this Nation?

The Republicans keep telling us that this bill is all about the soldiers, and everyone in this Congress supports our soldiers. But how can a bill for our soldiers not include money for basic protection like body armor, boots, armored vehicles, Humvee tires, signal jammers, and chemical suits? We cannot even provide those brave men and women with simple, necessary items like drinking water, showers, tennis shoes, and even toothpaste. And women, they do not have personal items that they need. This is unacceptable.

Just 6 months ago, we appropriated $79 billion for the war effort; and yet relatives have to resort to sending body armor to protect their family members.

The American people who are writing the checks for Iraq do not want a grants program. Like anyone who lends money in the real world, they want their money back.

I would encourage every citizen, if it were me, to call their Senator or their Congressperson and let them know that they do not support a blank check slush fund for this administration.

Vote ''no'' on the bill and ''no'' for another blank check for the President and his campaign contributors. Mr. President, this account is overdrawn.

I was horrified to learn that tens of thousands of our troops were sent out to battle without proper armor. And to this day, they still lack many necessary items. I spoke with several soldiers who suffered injuries to their legs, and many who totally lost their legs when bullets crashed through their vehicles because the cars were not fortified with armored plates. I met with soldiers who suffered chest injuries because they did not have bulletproof vests.

This is a very important issue, and I want the American public to clearly understand this point. Even though we have 44,000 soldiers in Iraq today without proper bulletproof vests, the President asked for absolutely nothing to protect these troops. Let me repeat that. We have 44,000 soldiers in Iraq without body armor, and the President didn't ask for a single cent to protect these soldiers. I guess these brave men and women will have to wait until Hailburton starts making body armor before they can get the protection they need and deserve.

Congress approved $310 million in April to buy 300,000 bulletproof vests for our troops. But sadly, only $75 million of that money has gone to the Army office that is responsible for purchasing these vests. Where is the accountability that this Administration promised this Nation.

The Republicans keep telling us this bill is all about the soldiers, and everyone in this Congress supports our soldiers. But how can a bill for our soldiers not include money for basic protections like Body Armor, Boots, Camouflage, Rucksacks, Armored Vehicles, Tank Tracks, Humvee Tires, Signal Jammers, and Chemical Suits. We can't even provide these brave men and women with simple necessities like drinking water, showers, tennis shoes, and even toothpaste.

Just 6 months ago, we appropriated $79 billion dollars for the war effort, and yet relatives have resorted to buying body armor in the U.S. and shipping it to troops in Iraq. What happened to this money Mr. President. These families and this Congress want and deserve to know.

The American people who are writing the check for Iraq do not want a grant program. Like anyone who lends money in the real world, they want their money back. I would encourage every citizen to call their Senators and Congressperson to let them know that you do not support another Blank Check slush fund for this administration.

Vote no on this bill, and no on another blank check for the President and his campaign contributors. Mr. President, this account is already overdrawn.

I was shocked to find out that the Services did not fully meet immunization and other predeployment requirements. Based on GAO review of deployments from four installations, between 14 and 46 percent of servicemembers were missing at least one of their required immunizations prior to deployment. As many as 36 percent of the servicemembers were missing two or more of

their required immunizations, such as influenza and hepatitis. We cannot send our servicemembers to war without first making certain that they are protected from in theater disease threats.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I was amazed to hear a Member of the other body on radio yesterday say despite all of the discussion about this problem, that he had not yet heard about the shortage of body armor. I think that when the American public understands what has not been provided, they are going to be very, very angry.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind all Members to direct their comments to the Chair and not to the President of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEINER:

Page 51, after line 11, insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 3007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations to Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Iran, Saudi Arabia, or Syria: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, the prohibition on obligations or expenditures shall include direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of October 16, 2003, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

I am offering an amendment that I doubt will provide much controversy for this House. It is something that mirrors language that was inserted in the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill this year. It essentially says that no funds allocated in this bill should go to the countries Libya, North Korea, Iran, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. The only change from section 507 of past bills that we have done is that we add Saudi Arabia to that list. It should be no mystery to anyone in this House why we would be taking this action.

First of all, let me make it very clear that there is no direct funding allocated to Saudi Arabia, just many, many pots of money that could conceivably fund that kingdom. I could go through the list; it is quite substantial. We have a Saudi Arabian Government that supports terrorism, supports it overseas, funds homicide bombers in Israel. We have a Saudi Government that exports the type of hatred that leads to terror with Wahabbism throughout the world. We have a Saudi Arabian Government that was directly connected to September 11. Simply put, there is no reason there should be a single dime of U.S. taxpayer dollars going to that kingdom.

Putting it on a purely economic level, one that I think will appeal to just about everyone in this House, why would we offer even a hint of a suggestion that we would provide funding to the richest nation on Earth at the time when we are struggling to pay our bills as well?

The legislation is excruciatingly simple. It simply says no funds, no authority can go to these rogue nations and adds Saudi Arabia to that list, where they rightfully deserve to be.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Weiner amendment.

This week this Congress sent a strong message to Syria bypassing the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act. We must ensure the United States does not provide funding to the nations that finance terrorism around this world. I am specifically speaking today about Saudi Arabia.

The Saudis claim to be our allies; but at the same time, they offer assistance in our war on terrorism, they are funding the terrorists who desire to attack us. Saudi blood money does not only threaten the United States, but also our good friend and ally, the State of Israel.

Saudi Arabia provides money for Palestinian organizations that kill innocent Israelis on what feels like almost a daily basis. In fact, if I were told tomorrow that the Saudis were helping support the terrorists that killed three Americans recently in the Gaza Strip, I would not be surprised.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot decide that one country funding terrorism is any different from another. I urge all of my colleagues to pass this amendment and send Saudi Arabia the message that this Congress will not stand for their support of hate and terrorism anymore. We must hold the Saudi family accountable for their actions.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition. I do oppose this amendment, and I will have some comments at the end.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to my friend's amendment, and I will be precise in why.

I sit on several committees that deal with foreign nations. I would tell my friend, he knows I am a very strong supporter of Israel. I flew there, flew Mirage there. But I would tell my friend also that Saudi Arabia, since May, has done a total turnaround. There are 15,000 members in the royal family. Some of those are helping some of our enemies, possibly so; but there are no direct links that have been caught yet. And I believe that there are more people in Saudi Arabia who want to be the friend of the United States than those who oppose us. I believe that.

I think the wrong message to send them is to slap them right smack upside the face when we are trying to get them to help us. So I know the gentleman's amendment is well-intentioned, and I understand why, and I supported the Syrian one; but I think this is wrong.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding me this time. I would simply rise to say that this is a very delicate foreign affairs matter. An amendment like this was presented when the Foreign Operations bill was before us and was defeated on the House floor. We have had this debate before; and, frankly, this supplemental is hardly a time and place for us to readjust very sensitive, very important foreign affairs questions.

So I would urge that the House in this case just reserve itself, vote ''no'' on the amendment, and have the gentleman know that we intend to discuss this matter in a very serious way in the months and years ahead. I appreciate the gentleman's effort.

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

Let me just address some of the brief comments that have been made so far. First of all, if I had a dime or a dinar for every time I have heard that the Saudis were thinking about changing, I would be a very wealthy man.

The fact of the matter is, the Saudis talk a very good game. Whenever there is a flash point of terrorism that comes back to them, they say, oh, we have changed. They have become professionals at dividing up the royal family and having a handful go talk about peace while a handful talk about terror. Let me just say they are not just talking and this is not just a thing of the past. As recently as 6 months ago, it was revealed that the Saudi royal family was paying bounties to terrorists, bounties to terrorists.

I would also point out to my distinguished friend from California who said that the timing is not right, well, to be honest with my colleagues, that is exactly the same argument that was made on this floor during the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. The timing is now.

I would point out that we cast the vote on that amendment which was narrowly defeated early in the morning of the day that the report came out on

who was behind the terrorist attack on September 11. And while the 28 pages were not released, and I have not seen them, let me say this: the Saudi Arabians had a role in the attack on our country on September 11. Every arrow points that way. Frankly, now that we have that information, we should act upon it.

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise to urge support for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today we are going to vote to provide $87 billion to Iraq to fight terrorism and protect against weapons of mass destruction; but if we ask the Government of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Chairman, what weapons of mass destruction are, they will tell us that this is a weapon of mass destruction, that this breeds terrorism, a Barbie doll. The Saudi Government recently said that the Barbie doll is a Jewish-influenced toy.

□ 1100

Mr. Chairman, dolls do not kill innocent civilians. Plastic toys are not terrorists.

We should pass this amendment and stop subsidizing terror and violence, intolerance and anti-Semitism.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying this: This is an opportunity for all of us in this Chamber to express in the strongest possible terms, and, frankly, it is not that strong, it may wind up costing a net zero dollars to the Saudis, but in strong terms we can show how fundamentally upset we are at the way that Saudi Arabia has acted with two faces. One is the side that they show us in the TV commercials and the meetings and the negotiations and in the well-orchestrated press conferences. On the other side are the facts.

We all too often in this part of the world judge people based on what they say rather than what they do. And the Saudis should see what we do in this House. No more aid to the Saudi Arabians.

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

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from New York that we should be upset with many of the actions of the Saudi Arabian government, but I do not think this is the right approach.

As the gentleman pointed out, this was tried in the foreign assistance bill earlier this year, the foreign operations bill earlier this year, and it was defeated. But there is a major change, a major difference between that time and this time. That was the foreign assistance bill for the entire world; this deals with Iraq reconstruction and our military.

And this refers to assistance, not just foreign assistance which that bill dealt with, but assistance. So it also would deal with anything in the Defense Department. And if anything in this bill could in any way be characterized as cooperation or coordination between the Defense Department and Saudi Arabia over a radar, over aircraft, anything that would be cooperation, that would be funded out of this, that would be prohibited.

Mr. Chairman, I think the impact of this amendment is broader than, perhaps, what the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) intended it to be, but that is the affect of it. It does mean that no assistance of any sort, including defense assistance, can be used.

Now, the reason that we have that provision in the regular Foreign Operations bill is to set up a list of terrorist states that are not eligible for any kind of foreign assistance. Again, this bill is not about that. This bill is strictly about Iraq and Afghanistan. It is a clever way, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for his amendment as a clever way of getting a backdoor way into the list of terrorist states, but I think it is a wrong approach.

The administration has written a letter which says that they strongly oppose the efforts to add the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the list of state sponsors of terrorism and urges the House to reject this amendment that is offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER). ''It would severely,'' they go on to say, ''undermine our counterterrorism cooperation with Saudi Arabia at precisely the moment when it is moving to a new level of effectiveness.''

Mr. Chairman, similarly, the Defense Department has sent a memorandum saying that they are strongly opposed to this because it would prohibit any kind of cooperation under the terms of this bill with the Saudi Arabian Defense Department.

I would urge this body to reject this amendment. I think it is not the right time, nor the right place, to be doing this. I hope that we will vote no.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. WEINER for his leadership and persistence on this critical issue, and rise in strong support of his amendment.

I do not say this lightly—Saudi Arabia is an ally of the United States; they have come to our aid in Gulf military actions several times. The U.S. has worked hard to get Saudi cooperation to apprehend terrorist suspects, share intelligence, and professionalize their counterterrorism efforts, and I support those efforts.

However, there can be no doubt now that Saudi Arabia has two faces. On the one hand, Saudi Arabia stood—they said—in shock and solidarity with the U.S. when our citizens were murdered by an Al Qaeda gang comprised primarily of Saudi citizens. They have allowed the U.S. military to again use Saudi air fields as staging grounds for the emission in Iraq.

But on the other, the Council of Foreign Relations reports that Saudis and Saudi charities are a major source—the ''most important'' source, according to CFR—for Al Qaeda, and states plainly that Saudi officials have turned a ''blind eye'' to this reality. Senior U.S. officials criticize Saudi Arabia for being uncooperative in terrorism investigations, Saudi citizens shower the families of Al Qaeda terrorists with money, and the ruling family in Saudi Arabia seems to have come no closer to acknowledging its own complicity in terrorist financing.

Further evidence of Saudi Arabia's support for terrorism came from Congress itself. Our investigative report on the September 11th attacks contained a great deal of information on Saudi Arabia in both its classified and unclassified sections. 28 pages remain classified, but according to the New York Times, the section states that ''senior officials of Saudi Arabia have funneled hundreds of millions of dollars to charitable groups and other organizations that may have helped finance the September 11 2001 attacks.''

In the past, and this Congress, have been hesitant to call the Saudis on their actions in support of terrorism. But I have come to the conclusion that the U.S. government must stop shielding the Saudis from the criticism and the penalties their actions warrant.

Saudi Arabia and its citizens have proven to be major supporters of terrorism against the United States and its citizens around the world. That is clear. Fighting terrorism must be our first priority, and our actions must match our priorities.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund any contract in contravention of section 8(d)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(6)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, today we are voting on an $87 billion spending bill that is solely funded by American taxpayers and with nothing in this legislation to ensure that U.S. small businesses have an opportunity to compete for the rebuild contracts. This funding will once again be funneled to large corporations.

The amendment I am offering today on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) will give small businesses a chance. It will require that all large companies submit a subcontracting plan prior to being awarded an Iraq reconstruction contract.

We have already spent $79 billion on war efforts in Iraq. And with this $87 billion funding request, President Bush is once again abandoning the Federal Government's longstanding commitment to ensure small businesses can compete in the Federal marketplace.

The administration has awarded billions of dollars in mega contracts to a handful of well-connected U.S. corporations. These contracts were not open to fair competition. They were doled out in secret backroom negotiations. Bechtel alone received a $680 million construction contract. Halliburton received a $1 billion logistical support contract, and recently received a noncompetitive contract to rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure worth up to $7 billion. These companies have very close ties to the White House. And these secret closed-door deals further damage our international credibility and endanger our rebuilding efforts.

If we are going to spend this money we need to ensure that some of these funds are also available to small businesses. And that is exactly what my amendment will do.

Mr. Chairman, there are 23 million small businesses in the United States. They represent 99 percent of all employers, create three out of four new jobs, employ more than half of all private sector workers, and make up half of our gross domestic product.

The financial commitments the administration makes in Iraq directly impact the viability of our economy here at home. This $87 billion spending measure will put this Nation even deeper in debt.

We have heard a lot today about the costs of this bill. And I feel that we do have a responsibility. But if we are going to spend the money, we should make every effort possible to ensure it assists our struggling economy here at home. We can do that by ensuring small businesses get a fair chance to participate in these contracts.

My amendment will require large businesses to make every effort possible to subcontract with small companies in this reconstruction effort while ensuring that taxpayers are getting their money's worth.

Under current law, large contractors in the United States are required to submit subcontracting plans prior to receiving contract awards. And that is what I am proposing for corporations seeking contracts in Iraq.

This is a simple amendment. It does not prevent the government from entering into contracts with large corporations or limit the size of these awards. It ensures that large corporations are subject to the same self-contracting requirements for Iraq contracts as they are for contracts here at home.

If we are going to spend this money, we need to recognize that funding it only to large corporations will not only hurt small businesses and likely squander taxpayer dollars. It will also hinder our ability to get our economy back on track.

This amendment is a vote for a fair and open Federal marketplace. It is a vote to protect taxpayer dollars from waste and abuse, and it is a vote to give America's small businesses a chance to compete and succeed.

I urge passage of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I intend to accept this amendment. We just saw it for the first time this morning, and it is problematic. It raises some concerns in that it requires everybody that is a contractor in Iraq to comply with all sections of the Small Business Act. That would mean that a subcontractor in Iraq has to have a small business plan. I think there are some real problems with this, but we have not had a chance to really examine it that closely.

And, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of expediting the business of the House, my intention would be to accept this and review it in conference and review it with the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) in conference. So I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for accepting this amendment. And I will work with him and look forward to working with him in addressing some of the concerns.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEUTSCH:

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

SEC. 3007. None of the funds made available under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' may be provided until September 30, 2004.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 16, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

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

Mr. Chairman, yesterday eight of the Republican Members in the United States Senate voted not to have the $20 billion grant that is in our bill as a grant. And I have had the opportunity to listen to part of that debate. That debate was similar to some of the things that I mentioned on this floor in the substance of our debate but was not able to convince enough of our colleagues.

This amendment is an attempt to do that and give people a second chance. The question is why should we give a grant to construction in Iraq? And I think we need to focus on this very specifically, why we should not, and why eight Republican colleagues in the Senate, after intense lobbying by the President, refused to do that. I think there is a very simple reason for it, and I think we need to focus on that reason.

Iraq has the second largest oil reserves in the world. Trillions, not billions anymore, nor hundreds of billions, but trillions of dollars. It is not a relatively large country. Less than 30 million people. They have a natural resource to build themselves. But even more significantly than their natural resources, during the years of Saddam Hussein, even today with American troops in Iraq, and, clearly, once we leave, by all indications Iraq would be part of OPEC.

Now, what has OPEC done to America and the citizens of America, our constituents? OPEC has put, effectively, the largest tax on the citizens of both the United States and the rest of the world, but of the United States, the largest tax in the history of the world. That is who Iraq is. They are those people that have taxed American citizens again in the hundreds of billions, if not trillions of dollars, by OPEC monopoly power.

And if we think about that for a second, as illogical as it sounds that we as Americans and the American taxpayers and the citizens of this country who, all of us know, are struggling every week, every month to make their ends meet, whether it is a senior citizen that literally cannot afford prescription drugs, or the parent who unfortunately cannot send their kid to college, or the person who has lost their house because of a foreclosure that they cannot meet their payments or someone who has canceled their vacations, OPEC has directly, adversely affected every person in the United States and continues to do that.

And by our actions, we are strengthening OPEC if we pass this legislation as part of a proposal that does not include not only a loan part of the proposal, but a loan part of the proposal that would, in fact, increase the production capacity of Iraq to 6 billion barrels of oil a day.

□ 1115

That is probably the best thing that this Congress can do for Iraq is to help them increase the capacity of their oil fields to 6 million barrels a day, to give them the ability, as opposed to what this legislation does, which is literally the country with the second largest oil reserves in the world, we have importation of oil at these exorbitant prices through sole-source contracting that is going on now. We have the opportunity. We have a moment in time on this House floor right now to pass an amendment that would lead to the effort of requiring the World Bank as part of a loan effort to increase the production capacity of oil fields in Iraq, which they have the ability to do, to 6 million barrels a day. If we do that, if we do that, OPEC will end. OPEC will end. We have the opportunity.

We talk about tax cuts in this Congress, and we debate them, and we talk about what good they can do and what problems they create. Well, let me state there is one tax cut that everyone in this Chamber should agree with and that is the tax cut to stop the hundreds of billions of dollars, trillions of dollars of taxes that OPEC is taxing our constituents, and we have the opportunity to stop that today with this amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, if we were to take the Deutsch amendment, we could just finish today and come back a year from now or 10 months from now and we could have this debate again because that is exactly what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) would have us do. The gentleman would say that none of the funds in here for the reconstruction are available until September 30 of next year, which is more than 11 months away.

Now, we have already had confirmation from Ambassador Bremer in the hearings that the funds that are existing now for reconstruction in Iraq will expire in January, roughly January, December to January, that is, all the contracts that are under way now will run out of money in January. That means there will be nothing for clean water. There will be nothing for the sewers, sewage systems. There will be nothing for the food programs. None of this will be there.

The gentleman is suggesting that we should have this gap from roughly just January to next September of 9 months where no reconstruction is done.

Now, if you really want to make sure that people start throwing rocks and shooting bullets at our troops, I guess that is the surest way to make sure that happens is by cutting off all the reconstruction for the next year. I cannot imagine what the thought or the idea behind it is, but I cannot imagine anything that would be worse for us.

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

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

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

As the gentleman knows, I have taken the position that we should not be providing all grants. I have taken the position we should not be providing all loans. We ought to have an intelligent and balanced mix. I certainly would like to see changes in the reconstruction program; but clearly to eliminate all funding for reconstruction, especially recognizing the fact that we did attack Iraq and did cause certain damage, I think is clearly unacceptable.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his comments.

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

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, my comments were directly related to the issue of oil production capacity in Iraq and, in fact, Iraq's participation in OPEC. And this was the only way that I could get at that issue in terms of the mandatory process.

I would be happy to withdraw this amendment; and I would hope that in the conference process that we are about to enter that there is an acknowledgment that OPEC membership and limitation on production capacity is problematic for the United States of America, and we need to focus on that.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, if that indeed is what the gentleman is after, which is certainly not apparent at all in reading this amendment here, we have already dealt with that in an amendment that was accepted. The DeFazio amendment prohibits any of U.S. funds being used to support OPEC membership by Iraq.

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

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, the DeFazio amendment only deals with our money, not their money. There is every indication that Iraq will remain part of OPEC, will remain part of a monopoly that taxes Americans to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, I understand what the gentleman is after. As I said, there is not a clue in reading this amendment that that is his intent, other than what the gentleman has just told us here, because that is not, of course, what the impact of this amendment will be. We ought to pay attention to the impact, not just the words. The impact is to stop all reconstruction. Let me repeat that. All reconstruction would cease from now until next September. That is the only thing it says. It does not say anything unless they do not participate in OPEC. It does not say anything about that, so it would not have any effect actually on Iraqi membership or participation or expenditure of funds in OPEC.

Mr. Chairman, nothing could be worse for us than to do that. Whether or not Iraq decides to participate in OPEC with their own dollars is going to be something the Governing Council is going to have to do. And that will be done out of their oil revenues that they generate and goes into an account which is controlled by the Iraqi Governing Council. So that is not something that we are going to make that decision.

I do agree that our dollars certainly should not go to support Iraq's participation in that oil cartel. But again, Mr. Chairman, to close, let me say this amendment has nothing to do with that. It does not have anything to do with Iraqi participation in OPEC. The effect of this amendment is to stop all reconstruction, to cease all reconstruction, all money spent on reconstruction in Iraq. Everything that would be spent on humanitarian needs, everything spent to rebuild the water systems, the sewage systems, the education, to start the constitution, to develop those groups that will be writing the constitution, all of that would cease from now, when the current amounts of money run out, until September 30 of next year. It would be catastrophic to our forces and national security policy. It would be absolutely disastrous for our national security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

The amendment was rejected.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND); amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK); amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES); amendment by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE); amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN); amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WIENER).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KIND

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the remainder of the series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 267, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—156

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—267

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra
Capps
Clay
Culberson
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1145

Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. GINGREY, HAYWORTH and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. OLVER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 213, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

AYES—213

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—213

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Capps
Clay
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1157

Messrs. HOYER, DICKS and LIPINSKI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Messrs. TOOMEY, PORTER and RENZI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REYES

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 221, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

AYES—206

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—221

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Capps
Clay
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1205

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote

on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 271, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—156

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Doggett
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—271

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Stearns
Stenholm
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Capps
Clay
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1212

Mr. SIMMONS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 179, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

AYES—248

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bartlett (MD)
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buyer
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chabot
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland

Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—179

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner (OH)
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Capps
Clay
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1225

Mr. OSE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, JONES of North Carolina, FERGUSON, FORBES, JOHNSON of Illinois, PICKERING, NEUGEBAUER, SHUSTER, FOSSELLA, and Mrs. CAPITO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, in light of all the vote switching that just occurred on the last amendment, has everybody who needed to gotten to the well on that vote yet?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen has failed to state a parliamentary inquiry.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 233, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

AYES—193

Andrews
Baca
Baird
Ballance
Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Case
Chabot
Clyburn
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frost
Garrett (NJ)
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Solis
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
English
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stark
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Watt
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Capps
Clay
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder
Spratt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1233

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, with the knowledge that there are over some 120 amendments, my understanding is that there will be an announcement that the committee now rise and a proposed rule.

My inquiry is, is this the end of the Committee of the Whole, and does this mean that the amendments of Democrats who wanted to impact on the $87 billion, over 100 amendments will now be denied and issues dealing with our troops in Iraq, will not be able to be responded to by these amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is about to entertain a simple motion to rise. The Chair is not able to respond to the gentlewoman's inquiry with respect to future events that may take place in the House.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction for Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that we have called for the committee to rise and we are now in the full House under H.R. 3289.

My inquiry is, are we about to enter into a discussion on a rule that will supersede the submitting, if you will, of amendments by Members of this body? My understanding is that we passed an open rule, and we had at least 100 or more amendments offered by Members from both sides of the aisle, many of them dealing with the quality-of-life issues of our troops, many of them dealing with the mental health issues with respect to the huge numbers of suicides, many of them dealing with bulletproof vests, but focusing on the intent of H.R. 3289, which is a supplemental that funds the actions in Iraq with respect to our troops, but also deals with the Iraqi reconstruction.

My concern is whether or not debate is now going to cease because of this newly presented rule and the basis upon which the House now moves to implement a rule that supersedes the original rule that allowed us to have the opportunity to present our amendments.

I believe the American people deserve an answer, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot give an advisory opinion on a hypothetical situation which may arise. The gentlewoman raises a proper question for debate during the debate on the rule.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. May I inquire as to the next step of the proceedings of this House with respect to H.R. 3289? Are we about to enter into a discussion on a rule eliminating debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to recognize a member of the Committee on Rules to call up a rule.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would appreciate very much if we would be able to get a answer. Is the Chair yielding to the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to recognize a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will we get an answer at that point whether debate will cease?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a proper question for debate on the rule.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. And we will get a proper answer as to whether debate will cease and desist? But the intent of the rule is to cease and desist our debate and to cut off debate on these amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a proper question for the debate on the rule.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 401 ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 401

Resolved, That, during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes in the Committee of the Whole, the bill shall be considered as read and no further motion or amendment shall be in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 401 provides that H.R. 3289, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, shall be considered as read, and that no further motion or amendment shall be in order.

Mr. Speaker, the House began debate 3 days ago on this emergency appropriations bill that provides for the needs and protection of our troops in Iraq. The unanimous consent agreement provided for 5 hours of general debate that began on Wednesday. The House resumed debate yesterday morning with discussion and consideration of amendments lasting well into last night. The House began a third day of debate this morning with consideration of 13 amendments.

After hours and days of debate, delay of a final vote on the emergency supplemental bill means a delay in getting the men and women in our military the resources and the equipment that they need. This rule, H. Res. 401, would end the delay and give our troops the funding they require and the support that they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, this rule is a travesty, but certainly no surprise. In the years since the Republican Party took control of this body, their leadership has made a concerted effort to strip away the rights of Members of the House of Representatives, bit by bit by bit. This rule is just more of the same, and every Member of this House who believes in the small ''d'' democratic process should vote to defeat it.

The Republican Party's leadership has been nothing short of disingenuous about the debate on this supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, this has been anything but an open process. There have been some very important discussions on the floor, but those discussions have been truncated. Over 120 amendments were noticed to this bill, yet, despite the fact that there is obviously so much interest on the part of Members of the House in this $87 billion bill, the Republican leadership is now cutting off the last opportunity to bring over half of those amendments to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of the resolution authorizing the President's action in Iraq. I still believe my vote was the right vote to take. But, if I recall correctly, one of the many reasons the President and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State gave the American people about why we should take military action against the regime of Saddam Hussein was to bring democracy to the Iraqi people.

Quite frankly, I think it is time we bring democracy back to the United States House of Representatives. The way the Republican Party runs this House makes a mockery of the President's laudable goal of bringing democracy to Iraq and its people.

Mr. Speaker, in September the President requested $87.5 billion in emergency funding for the continuing military operations in Iraq as well as to fund reconstruction projects in that country. He made the request and expected the Congress to rush it back to him ready to be signed into law.

We have no authorization for legislation for these funds. In fact, the committees with jurisdiction over the programs funded here have not even been given the chance to add their views to the bill.

On Wednesday, the Committee on Rules reported a so-called open rule, but I have to point out that the Republican Party's version of an open rule is one that does not allow Members the right to amend this bill in a way that affects the policies it moves forward. In fact, the chairman of the Committee on Rules told the committee that an open rule could and should waive all points of order against the committee bill, but not against Member amendments. And why? Why can legislative language offered by other Members be made in order? Because, Mr. Speaker, as the chairman said, ''We are considering this in the same manner which the Democrats did before 1995.''

Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. In fact, if we just take the emergency supplemental for fiscal year 1994, the Committee on Rules, controlled by the Democrats, reported a rule for that supplemental that waived all points of order against two Republican amendments. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) expressed his opposition to the rule at that time because two other Republican amendments were not allowed to be considered under the rule. We may have cut off those two amendments during the consideration of that supplemental, but we did waive points of order against other Republican amendments because, as my chairman so ably pointed out on Wednesday evening, ''We are the Committee on Rules. We do have the authority to do that.'' So I have to ask, why did the Republican Party's leadership not grant waivers to at least some of the thoughtful and constructive policy amendments brought to the Committee on Rules on Wednesday?

As reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the funds for reconstruction in Iraq are $1.4 billion more than were contained in the entire foreign operations appropriation passed by the House and $500 million more than the Senate's foreign operations bill. That represents every single foreign assistance program this country participates in for the entire fiscal year. Yet the Committee on International Relations was not given an opportunity to consider the President's request in a legislative forum and amendments that sought to impose policy in this bill were denied the opportunity to be voted on during this debate.

The Committee on Appropriations has reported funds for the military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan that amount to 56 percent of the funds for all operations and maintenance in the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004.

□ 1245

I strongly support this funding, but certainly the Committee on Armed Services should have been given an opportunity to fully examine the request and report legislation that would set some policy about how this money is to be spent. Perhaps amendments offered by the members of that committee who have great expertise in these matters might have added substantive policy limits to ensure that these funds are going to be used in the best interests of the men and women in uniform who are on the front lines in Iraq and Afghanistan right now.

Yesterday I heard far too many Members on the other side of the aisle come to the floor and impugn the motives and perhaps the patriotism of Members who sought to reprioritize the funds in this bill. Mr. Speaker, those kinds of remarks are a shameful blemish on this institution. Every Member of this body is entitled to hold his own opinions. We are not elected to march in lockstep with the dictates of the Republican Party's leadership.

No, indeed, Mr. Speaker. We are all here to do what we think is best for the United States of America and its citizens. I hold a different view on going to war in Iraq than do many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I cannot and I do not hold them in any less regard for holding views that differ from mine. I believe that a vibrant and vital democracy requires that all of these views be heard, not hidden or muffled to escape the withering attacks of ideologues. I also believe that these views should be brought to this floor and discussed in a civil atmosphere, not subjected to the partisan pot shots that have been lobbed by the other side of the Chamber during this debate.

This rule shuts off debate, pure and simple. This rule cuts Members out of the discussion. By denying Members waivers to bring up amendments that address policy in addition to money, Members were shut out of the process in the first rule. But at least there was a chance for Members to bring up those issues before a point of order would be lodged against them. Now, the autocratic Republican Party leadership, for whatever reason, be it to go home for the weekend or to leave on a CODEL, or perhaps even to cut off debate so that the American people could not find out what the Congress is up to, has brought to the floor a rule that says, That's all, folks. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just wrong.

In one last attempt to try to give the House an opportunity to set policy, it is my intention to oppose the previous question in order to give the House one last chance to discuss a matter that is of grave concern to millions of Americans who are deeply alarmed about using so many American tax dollars to rebuild Iraq. If the previous question is defeated, I would amend this rule to allow the House to vote on an amendment adopted by the Senate, by the other body, yesterday. That amendment, which is similar to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) yesterday in his substitute, is identical to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas, a Republican, and would require half of the reconstruction funds of this bill to be funded through the World Bank. That passed in the United States Senate yesterday on a vote of 51 to 47. Under this rule, we will not even be permitted to vote on that measure on the floor today.

The House should go on record on this language; and if the previous question is defeated, it will have the opportunity to do so. Otherwise, it is, That's all, folks. What a mockery we will make of ourselves.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the majority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule. We have had hours of debate on this legislation. It started 3 days ago. There have been plenty of opportunities to discuss what needs to happen and what this House needs to do. Our appropriators have done a great job. They have asked the hard questions. The gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) in the subcommittee and in the full committee have asked questions. We have not given the President everything he asked for, because part of our job is to put the difficult questions to the administration and try our best to do the right thing.

We all know the right thing here is to continue to work for peace and freedom in Iraq. The international community is beginning to respond. This is exactly the moment when this House should step forward, when our country should step forward and show we have a commitment that will not stop. The

message we send to others in the international community who can help needs to be sent today. The message we send to the donor conference to meet later this month is important that we send and we send it strongly and clearly.

Iraq is not a nation that needs to be saddled down with debt that they cannot deal with. The President has asked us to make a commitment not just to bullets and ammunition, but to the basic services that keep our troops alive. I had someone from St. Louis in my office the other day; and as he was leaving, talking about a totally different topic, he pulled out a picture of his son in his pilot's outfit who is in Iraq and said, all of the money the President asked for will keep my kid alive.

So this is a country where people have not had basic services for 25 or 30 years. But for the last 25 or 30 years when they came up and they were mad in the morning and they got out on the streets, the tyrants that worked for Saddam Hussein just killed them or put them in jail. We do not do that any longer. We can make a commitment to the fundamental infrastructure of this society. We can make a commitment to our troops. We need to do that here today.

Afghanistan and Iraq are now central to the war on terrorism. This is a war that we all knew months ago would not be over in a short period of time. We have to engage the terrorists where they are. We have to show the kind of resolve that the world respects and people in all parts of the world respect.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just the American soldier and sailor, Marine and airman who is a target in Iraq; it is anyone who wants to bring stability to that country. It is policemen in their headquarters. It is Iraqi policemen lined up to get their paychecks. It is a Muslim cleric who sends signals he wants to work with us for peace and stability. We need to do what we can to win this war on terror, and an important part of that is to show our commitment to those who live in the center of this most dangerous part of the world.

The committee has brought a product that allows us to do that. We do not need to continue to debate this for more than 3 days. This debate has gone on for hours. I urge not only support of this rule, but quick and speedy action that sends a message to the world; and that action needs to happen today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

My friend who just spoke and I are going to vote together on final passage of this bill, but my friend and I disagree on the process that we are pursuing to accomplish the objectives of which he speaks. He speaks of the objectives and not the process because he feels comfortable defending the end result, but obviously not comfortable discussing the process. Why?

This bill that we are considering is larger than 10 of the 13 appropriation bills. As a matter of fact, it is almost 100 times larger than the District of Columbia appropriation bill which we spent in debate in committee and in hearings 10 times longer to consider. Hear me. The District of Columbia bill is 1/100ths of the dollars that we are appropriating in this bill, yet we spent 10 times the time of Congress and Members and allowing the public to have input as we have on this bill.

Now, we passed a bill, I tell the gentleman from Missouri, just a few months ago, almost $70 billion. It tragically has not made our men and women safe, as the gentleman says this bill will. I hope the gentleman is right. But we have over 100 amendments and a number particularly that are very substantive in nature that ought to be considered on their merits, because it may make the bill better. It may make the men and women in our armed services safer. It may more cheaply accomplish the objective of reconstruction in Iraq that will pursue our progress and make our success more probable.

So I say to my colleagues that we ought to reject this rule, this gag rule that shuts down the consideration on one of the largest bills we will pass this year for just a few more hours to give Members, elected by 600,000 Americans, the opportunity to offer their alternatives.

Now, in committee, we considered some of those alternatives; but that committee is but a portion of the House of Representatives. In particular, I say to my colleagues, the ranking member who would be the chairman of this committee if his party, my party, were in control, so he is not just a back-bencher, has a very substantive alternative that got a lot of votes in committee. And what it says is, yes, we need to take responsibility. And, yes, we need to sacrifice. But guess what? We who are here at home, safe in our sanctuary, ought to make a little sacrifice too, and we ought to pay for this bill and not pass it along to our children and to our grandchildren. That is responsible. That is fair. That is the moral position, in my opinion, we ought to be taking.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin who has that amendment is being precluded from offering that amendment, along with 30 or 40 other Members who have substantive, important proposals to bring before this House, the people's House, the people's representatives, to consider the alternatives available. Is that not sad? Does it not undermine our democracy and our product?

Let us reject this rule. Let us vote against the previous question. Let us consider in full the proposals made by the Members elected to this House by the American public.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. We are talking a lot about a reconstruction of Iraq, our commitment to bring democracy in this area; and all I can see is war, war, war and read about the numbers of Americans that are in harm's way that are losing their lives. All we are saying is that we have the responsibility to share with our constituents why we are making this second down payment on a war which we have no idea as to when, if ever, it is going to conclude, how many lives are going to be lost, where is it going to be spread. Most of us accept the fact that the decision to unilaterally attack Iraq was made before 9–11, but how many other countries are on the list? Where do we go from here?

It just seems to me that somewhere along the line we were looking for Osama bin Laden and then we were looking for Saddam Hussein. God knows how long the President's list is. We should be able to ask these questions. We should not leave here until every Member of this House feels satisfied that they have explored the direction in which our country is going.

It bothers me that what we are talking about today is rebuilding a country that we started bombing. I do not remember coming here to rebuild Iraq, Baghdad, or any other place in the Middle East, and yet we are supposed to feel guilty if we do not fulfill this obligation, as though our mail is coming in from the GIs and the Marines that are overseas saying, for God's sakes, send some money to rebuild Iraq if you love me, because the quicker you rebuild Iraq, the quicker I will be able to get home. That is not my mail. My mail is, I want to come home because, guess what? They started the draft. No, not the draft that I advocated. But if you volunteer to serve this country, either in the active service or in the Reserves or in the National Guard, you are being drafted. Your time is being extended. They are taking you away from your home and your family. And these families are not talking about rebuilding Iraq; they want their lives rebuilt.

So give us some time to better understand the President's position, and we might find out where he is going to take us from Baghdad.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the 17 years I have been in Congress, most of that time on the Committee on Rules, that things have changed in such an incredible way, I can hardly recognize it. I remember the times when just the defense budget alone, we

would take testimony from the beginning of the morning until late at night for days at a time, hundreds of amendments. We thought that was just fine. It was wonderful. We wanted everybody to get a chance to talk about what was one of the most important things we do in the country, and certainly one of the most expensive.

But it seems to me lately that because we can only work 2 days a week in Washington, next week I think we are going to be here a day and a half, that we have to condense everything. It is sort of the Reader's Digest version of the House of Representatives.

□ 1300

And so we cut out everybody's rights to speak. We make sure that nobody has a chance to be in any way distasteful by saying something that another person may not like.

We are elected by the people of the country to come down here and speak for them, nobody here, nobody in the gallery, nobody else can get up on this floor and speak except those of us they sent here to do it for them. And yet we are being stifled at every turn. And, believe me, I have never seen anything so egregious to us as what happened last night at about 1 a.m. in the morning when they said that this, the largest bill, the money we pass and what many of us believe is a debacle, and for reconstruction and so much malfeasance going on that it almost rivals Teapot Dome, that we will not be able to discuss it, and we will not be able to do much about it.

I want to close with a quote that is one of my very favorites here. Quote, ''I rise in strong opposition to this rule. It is unfair, undemocratic and elitist, disenfranchising nearly every Member of Congress and the voters whom they were elected to represent.'' This description was from the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) the chairman, of a rule from 1994, and, boy, is it applicable today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. Once again, the Republican leadership that runs this House is attempting to stifle debate. Once again, they are trying to rush important legislation through without adequate deliberation. And, once again, they are wrong. And I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject their tactics.

It saddens me to say this, but the United States House of Representatives has become a place where trivial issues are debated passionately and important ones barely at all. And this is an important issue. We are talking about the war in Iraq. We are talking about an enormous, complicated $87 billion supplemental appropriations bill. We are talking about providing the resources our soldiers need to do their jobs in Iraq and Afghanistan. And we are talking about the financial health of our Nation and about the priorities of this Congress.

Now, at least we were talking about those things until the Republican leadership decided just after midnight last night that they did not want to listen anymore. The Committee on Rules is intended to be a place where debate is structured. It can, and it should be, a tool to manage the House. But under this leadership, the Committee on Rules has become a weapon, a weapon that does not manage debate but smothers it.

Now, here is the situation: Yesterday, we passed what the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), and other Republican leaders described as an open rule. In reality, the rule was not all that open since it did not allow us to offer very thoughtful and important amendments. Amendments to pay for the $87 billion without passing the debt on to our kids, amendments to require the administration to actually come up with a plan for winning the peace in Iraq. Those amendments and so many others, Republican and Democrat, were not made in order. But they said even though we could not vote on our amendments, we could at least talk about them. They called it an open rule. So let us go with that.

Now, we are told by the Republican leadership that the Republican leadership is tired. They do not want to debate. They do not want to vote past 2 or 3 today. They are tired or they have trips to take or planes to catch or somewhere else to be.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, too bad. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider this year, and we need to get it right. Is this the new standard for appropriations bills? You use an open rule that really is not open until you get sleepy, and then you shut off debate and go home? You muzzle Members of Congress and the people they represent?

There has been a lot of rhetoric in this Chamber this week about establishing democracy in Iraq. I want to say to the Republican leadership that you are setting a lousy example for the Iraqi people to follow. We spent one day authorizing this war, one day as legislatures of parliaments from London to Berlin, to Ankara to Santiago spent significant and meaningful time discussing the issue of war and peace. The United States House of Representatives rushed to a war resolution in a single day.

We did not ask the tough questions, we did not get the straight answers. I do not think there is a Member in this House who really believes that we met our responsibilities, and here we go again.

Now, the leadership tells us you have had 3 days. Well, I do not care if it takes 3 weeks. Let us stay here all weekend for the soldiers in Iraq, for their families, for the people we represent, we cannot afford to get this wrong.

Let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of you had important amendments and thoughtful things to say. If this rule passes, you will be silenced. You know this is wrong. Please take a stand. Do not be a cheap date. Vote no. Because if you do not, this is going to happen again and again and again. Reject this rule and let us get back to work.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the other side. Is the other side going to just play rope-a-dope here and not have any speakers? I guess the answer to that is yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. Not only does this second rule prohibit further amendments to the supplemental, but it also shortchanges the substance of debate on a bill that costs $87 billion: $200 million per congressional district that will not be used to build schools, provide health care or improve the Nation's infrastructure.

My objection to this rule is as much about substance as it is about process. It is as much about the needs of the American people as it is about the needs of the Iraqi people. It is as much about democracy as it is about tyranny. As we deliberate an $87 billion supplemental appropriations request from the President, House Republicans are saying that we cannot ask questions. We cannot ask what the money is going to be used for and how we are going to pay for it. We cannot ask because the Republicans do not know. They do not know because the President will not tell them.

Mr. Speaker, if we allow the dictatorial Republican majority to decide what is worthy to debate, then the House will quickly become an insignificant Constitutional trophy sitting on the President's mantle.

Do my colleagues realize that the other body has been debating this bill for 15 days? Some Senators have spoken more, each one, more than all of the Members of the House, while the House has not spent 15 hours, and we have more than four times as many Members.

So I echo what Mr. RUSH said last night: It ain't Christmas, it ain't New Years, and it ain't Easter. Why not work through the weekend and all the Members be heard? American troops will be working this weekend. Why cannot Congress? Our soldiers are fighting and dying, three last night, while Republicans are cutting and running.

When Democrats ask questions about cost, strategy, and accountability, Republicans label us as unpatriotic. As I see it, the only unpatriotic thing about

this debate is the majority's abandonment of the House's Constitutional responsibility to, as Mr. Madison put it, have a will of its own.

As written, H.R. 3289 gives the President carte blanche to spend nearly $87 billion before he has explained how he spent $79 billion we appropriated a few months ago. As I said yesterday, we have seen what happens when we relinquish our oversight authority and fail to hold this administration accountable ahead of time for its actions.

Last night, when America was sleeping, Republicans on the Committee on Rules dredged out the familiar formula of pushing their self-serving agenda by oppressing debate, deliberation and dialogue. There is an acronym in the United States Armed Forces that best describes what Republicans are saying to the American people today: The soldiers say BOHICA, B-O-H-I-C-A. Bend over, here it comes again.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I gather in this time of the World Series that my friend on the other side is the designated ''sitter.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation before us provides $87 billion to pay for the consequences of our war against Iraq, and the $20 billion reconstruction section provides $872 per capita aid to every single person in Iraq; 872 bucks. That is the size of this package. That ought to merit a lot more debate than we have had.

The bill before us got to the floor only because the majority went to the Committee on Rules and made a number of exceptions to the House rules so that this bill could come to the floor. And then the leadership guarantees that they are not going to lose any votes, the Republican leadership, by denying to the alternative to their proposal, those same exceptions to the rule.

That is what you did yesterday. Then yesterday you said any Member who had a germane amendment was given the grand total of 5 minutes to discuss it before the hammer came down. And now today, you are saying that the rest of the Members, who have not yet been able to even offer an amendment for consideration, are going to be denied the opportunity to do so.

Now, this happens in this Chamber, in Washington D.C., the capital of the greatest democracy in the world, supposedly, at the same time we are all supposed to swoon at the thought of how quickly Iraq is going to become a beacon of democracy and the second imitation of New Hampshire on the Presidential primary circuit.

Well, I am sorry, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), what a lousy example you are setting for the Iraqis. You got a rigged game in this House. And any time you see an amendment you cannot beat, you solve it the easy way. You say we cannot even vote on it. Incredible. Where is your fairness? Where is your guts? If you cannot beat us fair and square, you should not be in this Chamber at all.

Now, last night eight of your Republican colleagues in the Senate voted for a proposal that provided a good portion of this aid in the form of loans. It does not matter whether you agree with that or not, we ought to be able to vote on that same proposition. But you do not think you can beat it, and so you are denying us the opportunity to even vote on it. Where is your guts?

So, Mr. Speaker, the only way we have a chance of a snowball in you know where of getting a vote on an amendment to protect the interest of the taxpayers is for us to vote down this antidemocratic rule so that we have an opportunity to change it. And that is why you need to vote against the previous question on this rule so that while we are prattling on about how much democracy we are going to bring to Iraq, we occasionally provide a little in this Chamber.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker I would inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I gather the other side is not intending to use any time at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because it blocks amendments such as the one I would like to introduce which would increase the pay by $1,000 a month for anybody who is serving in excess of 6 months in Iraq.

Extended deployment strains all families, especially Reservists and those in the National Guard who have seen their deployments extended to 12 months. USA Today recently reported that one-third of Reservists and National Guard members suffered a cut in pay when called to active duty, especially those called up on short notice, those who have made personal business arrangements for a 6-month leave only to be told later that it is going to be a full year.

The cost of this amendment would be a drop in the bucket. If you figure that a third of those over there will be on extended deployment, that would cost about $50 million a month, $600 million a year, less than 1 percent of the cost of this bill.

□ 1315

Moreover, the amendment will not cost anything if the deployments are limited to 6 months, and at the same time it discourages the 12-month deployment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the rule be defeated so that amendments like this can be considered. Defeat the rule and allow other amendments.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules for yielding me time and the fight he and the other members of the Committee on Rules are making in that venue for openness on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn and serious matter that we have before the House today. And the question is what is the best way for us to provide for our troops, help with the reconstruction in Iraq, and accomplish our mission so that we can bring our troops home safely and soon. We know that it is not about cutting and running. We take our responsibilities seriously that we have inherited in Iraq, and it is not about cutting and running. It is about accomplishing our mission. But cutting and running is what is happening here in this House of Representatives.

The debate on these issues relating to the $87 billion supplemental is just too painful for the Republicans to hear. The fact that there was no plan for postwar Iraq is just too painful for them to listen to.

The amendments that have been thoughtfully considered and presented here by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle point out the shortcomings of this supplemental to begin with. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) had an excellent amendment earlier talking about paying for transportation for our men and women in uniform, that we would pay for that. Why would that not have been in the President's proposal to begin with? Why is it not the law now? The list goes on and on.

We said it over and over again that, without the intervention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the cooperation of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), our troops would still not have funding for Kevlar in their jackets, jammers to stop the detonation of explosive devices, spare parts for their equipment, and armor for their Humvees. They still do not have it. It will hopefully be in this package. But it was not there in the summer after we gave the administration $63 billion, and it was not in the President's proposal. And that is why these amendments are important, but they again show the concern for the troops was much less than it should be on the part of the administration.

So we come to the floor with this very important matter, a matter relating to war, how we support our troops, how we reconstruct and bring stability to Iraq so that we can accomplish our mission. And we are told that we have an open rule, that the discussion will consider what people propose. And immediately the rule becomes restrictive in terms of what it will allow to be brought to the floor for a vote.

It is beneath the dignity of this House for us to have a debate on the war and not allow the proposal of the Democrats, the Democratic substitute,

to come to this floor. And the main reason it could not come to this floor is because it paid for, it paid for what we would do for the troops and the reconstruction of Iraq. So it is against the rules here to be fiscally responsible to pay for the proposals that we are putting forth.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) put forth some saying that he heard in the Army. I cannot repeat it and I would not repeat it if I could, but I want to go to the Marines. The Marines have an expression, ''Proper Preparation Prevents Poor Performance.''

Our men and women were properly prepared and they performed their duties excellently, but there was no planning for after the military action, which still continues but which the President declared over May 1. There is no plan. There has been no plan. And to quote General Zinni, ''The level of sacrifice has not been met by the level of planning.''

How can we ask our troops to make those sacrifices when we are not really willing to have a plan? And if there was a plan, it is a failure. And if there is a plan, nobody knows what it is. And if there is a plan, it did not take into consideration the risks in postwar Iraq and, therefore, properly protect our troops. It misunderstood the conditions in Iraq and the challenges that we would face, again, endangering our troops. And it misrepresented what the cost would be to the American people.

Again, we have heard Secretary Wolfowitz's statement about how quickly Iraq would be able to provide for its own reconstruction. So that is why there is some level of disapproval of what is happening here. It is an open rule except we will restrict what we can hear and besides, we are sick and tired of hearing what is wrong with this policy.

That is cutting and running. We are opposed to it in anything we undertake.

We are professional people. We have the privilege of representing the American people. They have serious questions about this, and we are cutting and running and stifling debate.

So I hope that the opportunity that is presented under this rule, under the consideration of the previous question, will enable this House to vote on what happened in the Senate in a bipartisan way last night, which basically said that the American people should not be taking all the risks as far as their troops are concerned and paying all the bills. And this amendment specifically addresses the bills. It says if those oil fields get gushing, this is what it means, if these oil fields get gushing and Iraq amasses resources, then and only then would they pay back the loan. If they cannot, there is consideration for that. It could not be more fair. It could not be more reasonable. It should be voted upon by this body. But it is really unfortunate because time is what we were sent here to use for the American people; and if we cut and run, if we cut and run on a matter of this solemnity and this seriousness to the American people, shame on us.

I urge our colleagues to support the motion that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) will be making in regard to the previous question.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have only one concluding speaker, and I would ask if the other side intends to close. If they have any other speakers, do they intend to close after our concluding speech.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman to use his speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I would offer an amendment to the rule. This will give Members an opportunity to vote on an amendment by the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), which is identical to the bipartisan amendment passed in the other body last night by a vote of 51 to 47. That amendment will require that a portion of the money for reconstruction efforts will be in the form of a loan.

The amendment provides $5 billion as a grant to rebuild Iraqi security services, and it provides $5.2 billion as a grant for water, power and other critical infrastructure facilities. Congressional notification would be required for any projects in excess of $250 million; $10 million would be considered as a loan but would convert to a grant upon 90 percent forgiveness of prewar debt by other countries.

I want to stress that a ''no'' vote will not prevent us from voting on this supplemental. But a ''no'' vote will allow Members to vote on the identical language that will be included in the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can have an opportunity to vote on the Senate loan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned in different forms earlier in this debate, this is serious business. It is serious business. And I believe knowing that we are engaged in this war on terrorism, which we have been now for over 2 years, we have to respond in a timely manner to those Americans that we put at risk. And I would remind my colleagues that three-fourths of this bill, or slightly more, goes to support our troops. And we have focused on other parts. Probably that is good for the debate, but we should not lose sight of the fact that three-fourths of this goes directly to our troops.

Now, we have some difference of opinion between the other House with their supplemental budget. The quicker we can get this into conference, the quicker we can get a bill passed; and the quicker we can get the President to sign it to support our troops, frankly, the better off we are.

I would just make one observation that I found rather interesting, because we spent a great deal of time debating before I was here on the Gulf War resolution. I was not here. But I understand that was a debate that was inspiring for the Congress. That really, when we look at that from a historical standpoint, is why we are here today, because of whatever reasons and agreements were made following the Gulf War, Saddam remained in power.

Now we are in a situation where we have to complete that. We had a long debate when we decided to go to war in Iraq this year, properly the right thing to do. And now we have debated this supplemental to support our troops for into the third day.

From a historical standpoint, I would just like to remind Members that sometimes this body moves extremely fast on important issues. Right after December 7, 1941, when we declared war on Japan and Germany, the U.S. House of Representatives allocated 40 minutes for each of those resolutions. I think it is important for us to get this done as quickly as we possibly can. So I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this new rule to recklessly cease debate and eliminate all opportunity for amendments on behalf of the American people. I now will speak to H.R. 3289 before us. The task of stabilizing and reconstructing Iraq may end up being one of the greatest challenges of our generation. Although we are getting rosy reports of progress in Iraq from the administration, the fact that we have 130,000 troops in the area and are now being handed an $87 billion tab paints a fully different picture. It is now obvious that the administration grossly underestimated the cost and difficulty of stabilizing Iraq, almost to the same extent that they overestimated the threat posed to the American people by Saddam Hussein. Even the so-called ''soft costs'' of the war and its aftermath are enough to cripple some nations.

This is not revisionist history; at least a hundred of us in Congress, millions of citizens who took to the streets, and even a handful of brave souls in the administration itself, tried to warn the administration of what it was getting into with its pre-emptive strike on Iraq. We were ignored, and those in the administration—the Shinseki's and the Lindsey's have been encouraged to move on. But the problems in Iraq have not gone away so gracefully. We are now at an important crossroads. We can continue to beat this dead horse with the same policies of isolation from our allies around the world and partisanship here in the

United States or, we can start working together—employing the collective wisdom of all of us here and around the Nation with the experience and expertise to be of service in this endeavor—and who are committed to our troops, and to fulfilling the promise the President made to the people of Iraq and Afghanistan and to the world.

As this debate comes to the Halls of Congress, the people who marched us into this war will try to paint this vote as a vote for or against our troops. This is absolutely a false picture. For one thing, our military is extremely well funded. As I just described, including the Iraq supplementals, the Defense budget will be approaching $500 billion. Furthermore, Iraq is not an indigent nation.

If they wanted to, they could take better care of our troops. Secretary Rumsfeld wants to spend billions of dollars on a Star Wars defense system, while we are getting reports that our soldiers risking their lives in Iraq don't have adequate body armor, or clean water supplies, or basic human necessities like feminine hygiene products for our women soldiers. Six months after this battle started, we still have soldiers without kevlar body armor and water purifiers. What did they do with the first $79 billion war supplemental? We now have a new request for money, but we still have not heard details of how they spent the first money, what progress has been made, and what challenges remain.

I visited the As-Sayliyah Central Command Base in Doha, Qatar last weekend and heard the concerns of the troops from their own mouths. I heard testimony about how a ground soldier, watched his partner and the operator of a military vehicle get tossed out as the vehicle was thrown airborne by a land mine. ''Why did you hit this mine,'' I asked. ''It was just one of those mines that was missed in the sweep . . .,'' said the soldier. Because there isn't enough personnel or specialists to assign to technical tasks, unskilled or untrained technicians frequently get asked to do jobs that they have not mastered enough to guarantee the lives of those who must traverse the sands of Baghdad. The soldier misses his wife and newborn baby dearly. Because there hasn't been a change in the personnel on the front lines in several months, many reservists and active duty servicemen and women have spent a longer time in Iraq than was promised by the Administration. May 1, 2003 was supposed to have been a day of hope and homecoming; instead, it was a sham. Some of these troops feel like ''sitting ducks'' out in the foreign terrain. They don't speak Arabic. They don't know Tikrit like they know their hometowns. When I asked them if they have seen any troops of other coalition nations, they responded, ''what coalition troops?'' They need support and they need continuous relief.

The President and his friends in Leadership in Congress did not listen to the warnings of the Congressional Black Caucus, or our international allies, or hundreds of thousands of like-minded citizens who took to the streets. Some of my Democratic colleagues voted for this war, because they believed in the institution of the Presidency, and thought they had to give this administration the benefit of the doubt. I did not. Regardless, now the President has cut open this patient, and the patient is laying on the surgical table. The President has made a promise to the people of Iraq and to the world that we will leave the patient better than we found it—and it is up to our American soldiers and the American taxpayers to fulfill that promise.

Much of the toughest burden will fall on the shoulders of the families of our troops overseas. Therefore, I have submitted amendments that speak to alleviation of this burden. (1) I firmly believe that before any further funds are sent to Iraq to rebuild that country, we need to ensure that our men and women in the armed forces—reservists as well as active servicemen and women are receiving the money and services that they deserve and in a timely fashion. Dr. Jones, who works under Lt. Col. Corbett shared this concern with me during my visit. (2) I also believe that the Pentagon needs to develop a plan to ensure that none of our troops or government employees must remain stationed in Iraq for more than 6 months at a time. (3) Furthermore, the administration must announce a definite and clear exit plan for the troops to give them real hope and a notion that an end to the fighting is truly near. (4) There should also be more trained military policemen and women stationed in Iraq to mitigate the vulnerabilities experienced by these men and women. (5) Similarly, they need proper job allocation so that lives are not lost due to erroneous assignment of duties. (6) Moreover, as to the national guard servicepersons, the scheduled end of deployment should be honored rather than making them continue fighting until their respective units are released. Despite their frustrations, I encouraged them with the following phrase, ''you are as much defenders as you are peace-keepers'' to let them know that their work truly matters the most for the people of Iraq as well as the people at home in the United States.

I sincerely wish the President had not put us in this situation, but he and his administration did. And now we have to deal with it. If we are going to deal with it, I feel at this point it is critical to take some of the control away from the people who have made horrible misjudgments at every step of the way, who misled the American people and the Congress about the need for war, and who ignored warnings from inside and outside the administration. Either they knew the truth, chose to mislead us, or they did not take the time to adequately assess and plan for the true situation. Either way, senior members of this administration were not doing their jobs.

That is why before any appropriations are sent to rebuild Iraq, the Congress and the American people need to see an independent investigation in progress, looking deeply into several questions: whether U.S. intelligence reports were manipulated in order to misrepresent the threat Saddam Hussein posed to American interests; whether the costs and dangers of invading and occupying Iraq were deliberately understated; whether American officials who offered differing views of Iraq became the victims of inappropriate or illegal retaliation; and whether one or more individuals within the administration is or are responsible for the leak of classified information regarding intelligence reports and the veracity of accounts as to the purchase of ''yellowcake'' for nuclear weapons production.

If any of these allegations are proved true, those responsible must be held accountable. I am concerned that there has been a methodical and undemocratic effort to mislead and intimidate the American people and the world in order to march us into this war. And now we are being given an $87 billion bill to pay for that effort.

As we move forward in Iraq, unfortunately, we have severely limited options. Because people like Secretary Rumsfeld have used reckless speech that has angered and exasperated our allies, many of our most staunch allies are now reluctant to get involved in stabilizing and reconstructing Iraq. While our State Department has been reaching out around the world with a hand of cooperation and partnership, Mr. Rumsfeld has proudly displayed his arrogance and disdain for anyone not walking lockstep with him.

Too much is at stake to distance ourselves from those whose help we need. People from democracies around the world are now being asked to trust this administration with the lives of their sons and daughters in the military, by sending them to fight under a U.S. command whose leaders show them blatant disrespect. They are being encouraged to send their hard-earned money to reconstruct Iraq under the authority of this administration that gives the largest contracts to its political supporters, that seems to have no credible plan for the future, and that ignores the advice of even the most trusted experts on the world stage. It is not surprising that they are not stepping up with money and troops.

I think the problem is basically a lack of trust. I can't blame them. I do not trust this administration to do the right thing in Iraq either. I do not intend to vote to send another dime to Iraq until the President takes some dramatic steps to restore credibility to his Administration:

First, I want to see new faces in top positions, starting with Donald Rumsfeld. We need people who choose integrity over politics and respect over arrogance. Second, I want to see a full accounting of how they spent the first $79 billion, and exactly how they came up with this $87 billion figure. Our sources say that the armed services were barely consulted on those numbers—that some critical needs were totally left out, and others grossly exaggerated. We need honest accounting. And third, once we have a true picture of what funds are necessary to support our troops, Congress should be able to vote on that funding alone—separate from the money needed for reconstruction of Iraq. That ''bifurcated vote'' will allow us to quickly get money to protect our brave soldiers, but will also give us the time we need to thoughtfully craft a plan for reconstruction—a plan that will include our allies, and the World Bank, nongovernment organizations (NGOs), and oil and natural resources from Iraq itself.

Those are the three things I want to see before I can consider giving any more money to this administration for the United States effort in Iraq. This does not mean that I do not want to support our troops. And this does not mean that I want to break the president's promise to the Iraqi people and to the world that he would make things better in Iraq.

Instead, it is a call for action. I want to get the appropriate amount of money to the people who deserve it—but right now I am not confident that $87 billion is the right amount or that it would be spent in a way that would help our troops, help the Iraqi people, stabilize the region, or prevent terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, there are just too many questions and not enough answers. Why do we need $950 million for recruiting and training of

police forces in Iraq, when we need more money for police and firefighters in Houston, New York, Washington, DC, and Philadelphia? Why do we need $209 million for prison and detention facilities, and $100 million for construction of a new prison in Iraq, when our Federal prisons are overcrowded and severely underfunded. Too many questions, and not enough answers, Mr. Speaker. Do we really need $100 million for a witness protection program, and $5.65 billion to repair and rehabilitate the infrastructure in Iraq, when a few months ago the whole Eastern seaboard was without power? Are we really serious?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, are we really serious about supplying Iraq with $793 million for health care programs, when we still have children without health insurance, elderly without health insurance, and our poor citizens without health insurance. There are just too many questions, and not enough answers.

There will be many thoughtful amendments offered that could ensure that the funds that we do not bankrupt our Treasury, while failing our troops and the people who need our help. I urge all of my colleagues to put politics and pride aside and consider them, so that together we can get our efforts in the Middle East back on track.

I have several amendments that I think will help get our policies back on track.

My first amendment states that none of the funds made available in this act may be obligated or expended until Government personnel policies have been implemented to ensure that no members of the Armed Forces or Government employees are being required to be stationed in Iraq continuously for a period greater than 6 months. The President has stated that the war on terror will be a long and involved one. Therefore we must pace ourselves, and we must ensure that our armed services can continue to recruit good people in the future. This amendment will help ensure that our troops and their families remain mentally fit and rested, and that military tours will remain a reasonable commitment in service to this Nation.

The second states that of the funds made available in this act may be obligated or expended until all Reserve and National Guard personnel are paid in full.

The third amendment requires that none of the funds made available in this act may be obligated or expended until the President has submitted to Congress a report setting forth in detail the strategy and projected timetable for withdrawing U.S. forces in Iraq. Without goals, I am concerned that our efforts in Iraq could drift indefinitely. Congress and the American people must know what lies ahead, so that we can plan appropriately.

The fourth is a sense of the House of Representatives that, before any appropriation under this act is obligated, a special counsel should be appointed to investigate the propriety and legality of actions by the administration in connection with the unauthorized release of classified information. We have a complex mission ahead of us in the Middle East. To succeed we will need to take advantage of every single national security asset at our disposal. Recently, one of our top CIA operatives was ''outed'' by White House employees, thus compromising her work and even the lives of her sources and acquaintances overseas. If we do not show the appropriate immediate vigorous response, we could undermine our efforts in the Middle East, by discouraging people to come to American officials with assistance or information.

Finally, I have two amendments that will help refocus some of our energy and resources on Afghanistan. The supplemental continues to shortchange Afghanistan's reconstruction and security, and it does this at the peril of jeopardizing the rights of Afghan women and girls and hopes for a peaceful, democratic Afghanistan. The proposed funding levels neither adequately make up for the small amounts of reconstruction funding thus far nor do they meet the country's needs.

In the last 2 years only 1 percent of Afghanistan's reconstruction needs have been met. The country remains in shambles from two decades of war and lack of development. Most people in the country do not have access to electricity, health care, schools, and sanitation. Not only is the lack of reconstruction depriving people of very basic services, but it is contributing to instability in the country and a lack of confidence in the central government.

The transitional government in Afghanistan estimates that between $20 to 30 billion is needed over the next five years. In other post-conflict settings, an average of $250 per person was spent per year in aid. But in Afghanistan, donors spent only $64 per person in 2002.

The proposed $800 million Afghanistan reconstruction supplemental spending request represents less than 1 percent of the total $87 billion Iraq and Afghanistan package. The $20 billion request for Iraq reconstruction funding is 25 times as large as the Afghanistan request. Yet Afghanistan has approximately the same population size as Iraq and suffered more destruction over 23 years of war.

House Chairman YOUNG's mark to increase reconstruction funding for Afghanistan by $400 million is a step in the right direction. But still more must be done. My first Afghanistan amendment will shift $20 million from the Iraq budget toward Afghanistan to be used for developing electricity-generation and transmission infrastructure. If Afghanistan is ever going to thrive and progress, it will need consistent sources of energy, to power its factories, hospitals and homes. These funds will help.

The other amendment will improve the plight of Afghan women and girls. Women and girls continue to face severe hardship and violations of their rights in Afghanistan. Yet the Afghanistan request does not specify funds for programs to improve the status of women and to remedy the tremendous injustices they faced under the Taliban regime. My amendment proposes designating $300 million for women's programs in the area of political rights and human rights, health care, education and training, and security, protection and shelters. I also propose earmarks of $10 million of the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission and $24 million for the Ministry of Women's Affairs. We must provide direct support to help strengthen those women-led, permanent Afghan institutions whose mission it is to promote women's rights and human rights. These are funds already authorized in the Afghan Freedom Support Act of 2002, but which still for the most part have not been appropriated.

Some girls have gone back to school in Afghanistan, but the majority have not because there are not enough schools and those that do exist are in very bad shape. The Asian Development Bank estimates that an additional 13,851 primary schools need to be constructed, but the administration request is only for 275 schools. Some 40 percent of schools in Afghanistan were completely destroyed during the war, another 15 percent were heavily damaged, and in many areas of the country there were no schools for girls.

What's more, the advances in girls' education that have been made are under attack. In the past year, fundamentalist extremists have burned down, bombed, and otherwise violently attacked more than 30 girls schools. At most of the sites of these attacks, leaflets have been distributed threatening the families of girls who attend school or the teachers who teach them. Flyers distributed at the site of one of the first attacks read ''Stop sending your women to offices and daughters to schools. It spreads indecency and vulgarity. Stand ready for the consequences if you do not heed the advice.'' Some families are now afraid to send their daughters to school. Our Nation promised to help free Afghan women; we cannot allow the extremists to take back these newly won freedoms.

I hope my colleagues will support these amendments. We must look toward a brighter future in Iraq, and work together to make that vision happen.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, and thank you to my colleague on the Rules Committee for your leadership and for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule to gag the strong, growing, and justified opposition to this $87 billion blank check bill and to prohibit its amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republican majority had not issued this draconian, unfair rule to prohibit amendments to this wrong, blank check to President Bush, I would have offered a very important amendment that deserves this body's consideration.

My amendment was simple. It would have added $1 billion to our global AIDS initiative this year, in order to reach the original $3 billion authorization that this Congress and the President approved in May.

If the President can ask for a blank check of $87 billion, for the life of me I don't understand why he won't ask for this $1 billion.

He promised it, he traveled to African and touted his commitment, but in what has become his MO (modis operandi) he has mislead us again.

And in failing to live up to his commitment on AIDS, he is also neglecting a vital matter of national security.

Make no mistake about it, in Sub-Saharan Africa, the region worst hit by AIDS, the disease has contributed to the destabilization of whole communities, tearing at the very fabric of society by killing mothers, fathers, teachers, farmers, health professionals, business-people, and soldiers, and undermining the governing authority and political stability of entire nations. In short, AIDS is creating chaos.

Secretary of State Colin Powell has already described the global AIDS pandemic as something far worse than terrorism. And even our own national intelligence council has already concluded that a wholesale political, social, and economic collapse is very likely to occur in those countries that are already severely affected by AIDS.

Millions of lives are hanging in the balance, and we have the power to save them. We

cannot allow further delay, and AIDS will not wait for us to act. I urge the Republican leadership and the administration to wake up to this reality.

And I urge all members to join me in voting ''no'' on this rule which denies us the opportunity for continued debate on this and denies members the opportunity to offer important amendments, like the one I would have offered today.

The material previously referred to by Mr. FROST is as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, in the Committee of the Whole, it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

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

SEC. . (a) Of the amounts appropriated under the subheading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND''—

(1) the $5,136,000,000 allocated for security, including public safety requirements, national security, and justice shall be used to rebuild Iraq's security services;

(2) $5,168,000,000 shall be available for the purposes, other than security, set out under such subheading; and

(3) $10,000,000,000 shall be available to the President to use as loans to Iraq for the purposes, other than security, set out under such subheading until the date on which the President submits the certification described in subsection (c).

(b) The President shall submit a notification to Congress if, of the amounts referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), an amount in excess of $250,000,000 is used for any single purpose in Iraq.

(c)(1) The certification referred to in subsection (a)(3) is a certification submitted to Congress by the President stating that not less than 90 percent of the total amount of the bilateral debt incurred by the regime of Saddam Hussein has been forgiven by the countries owed such debt.

(2) On the date that the President submits the certification described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the unobligated balance of the $10,000,000,000 referred to in subsection (a)(3) may be obligated and expended with no requirement that such amount be provided as loans to Iraq; and

(B) the President may waive repayment of any amount made as a loan under subsection (a)(3) prior to such date.

(d) The head of the Coalition Provisional Authority shall ensure that the amounts appropriated under the subheading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'', are expended, whether by the United States or by the Governing Counsel in Iraq, for the purposes set out under such subheading and in a manner that the head of the Coalition Provisional Authority does not find objectionable.

(e) It is the sense of Congress that each country that is owed bilateral debt by Iraq that was incurred by the regime of Saddam Hussein should—

(1) forgive such debt; and

(2) provide robust amounts of reconstruction aid to Iraq during the conference of donors scheduled to begin on October 23, 2003, in Madrid, Spain and during other conferences of donors of foreign aid.

(f) In this section:

(1) The term ''amounts appropriated under the subheading 'IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND' '' means the amounts appropriated by chapter 2 of this title under the subheading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT''.

(2) The term ''Coalition Provisional Authority'' means the entity charged by the President with directing reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 199, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

YEAS—221

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clyburn
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns

Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Blunt
Boehlert
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Capps
Clay
Conyers
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1346

Messrs. HILL, CARDOZA, RODRIGUEZ, FORD, NEAL of Massachusetts and WEINER and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall No. 559, because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''Nay.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 201, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

AYES—221

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—12

Boehlert
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Capps
Clay
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Souder
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1354

Mr. DICKS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. OXLEY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 396 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3289.

□ 1355

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 2, line 2.

Pursuant to House Resolution 401, the bill is considered read for amendment and no further motion or amendment is in order.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

TITLE I—NATIONAL SECURITY

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $12,188,870,000: *Provided*,

That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $816,100,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $753,190,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $3,384,700,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $24,355,664,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $1,934,058,000, of which up to $80,000,000 may be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security for Coast Guard Operations: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $1,198,981,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $5,598,368,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $4,485,452,000, of which—

(1) not to exceed $15,000,000 may be used for the CINC Initiative Fund account, to be used primarily in Iraq and Afghanistan; and

(2) not to exceed $1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended, 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 may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations on the use of these funds: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $16,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $53,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $214,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For an additional amount for ''Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid'', $35,500,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

IRAQ FREEDOM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For ''Iraq Freedom Fund'', $1,988,600,000, to remain available for transfer until September 30, 2005, for the purposes authorized under this heading in Public Law 108–11: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid; procurement; military construction; the Defense Health Program; and working capital funds: *Provided further,* That funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further,* That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further,* That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees of any such transfer: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees summarizing the details of the transfer of funds from this appropriation: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $101,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $1,250,287,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $158,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $76,357,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $123,397,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $53,972,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $20,450,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $3,418,006,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $418,635,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $34,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $39,070,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $195,817,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $600,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For an additional amount for ''National Defense Sealift Fund'', $24,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $658,380,000 for Operation and maintenance: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $73,000,000: *Provided,* That these funds may be used for such activities related to Afghanistan: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided herein only to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; and research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided further,* That the funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further,* That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

RELATED AGENCIES

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Intelligence Community Management Account'', $21,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005; of which $3,000,000 may be transferred to and merged with the Department of Energy, ''Other Defense Activities'', and $15,500,000 may be transferred to and merged with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, ''Salaries and Expenses'': *Provided,* That all such amounts are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1101. Upon his determination that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary of Defense may transfer between appropriations up to $3,000,000,000 of the funds made available to the Department of Defense in this chapter: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to this authority: *Provided further,* That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further,* That the authority in this section is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004, except for the fourth proviso: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 1102. Funds appropriated in this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in or pursuant to this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

SEC. 1103. Sections 1318 and 1319 of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11; 117 Stat. 571), shall remain in effect during fiscal year 2004.–

SEC. 1104. From October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004, (a) the rates of pay authorized by section 310(a) of title 37, United States Code, shall be $225; and (b) the rates of pay authorized by section 427(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, shall be $250.

SEC. 1105. DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND CLOSE-OUT AUTHORITY.—(a) Section 1313 of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11; 117 Stat. 569), is amended by inserting ''unobligated'' before ''balances''.

(b) Effective November 1, 2003, adjustments to obligations that before such date would have been properly chargeable to the Defense Emergency Response Fund shall be charged to any current appropriations account of the Department of Defense available for the same purpose.

SEC. 1106. During the current year, funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Iraq: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 1107. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, from funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense under ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', not to exceed $100,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide assistance only to the New Iraqi Army and the Afghan National Army to enhance their capability to combat terrorism and to support U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: *Provided,* That such assistance may include the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training and funding: *Provided further,* That the authority to provide assistance under this section is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees not less than 15 days before providing assistance under the authority of this section.

SEC. 1108. None of the funds provided in this chapter may be used to finance programs or activities denied by Congress in fiscal year 2004 appropriations to the Department of Defense or to initiate a procurement or research, development, test and evaluation new start program without prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 1109. In addition to amounts made available elsewhere in this Act, there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense $413,300,000, to be used only for recovery and repair of damage due to natural disasters including Hurricane Isabel, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $73,600,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $126,400,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $9,200,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $201,900,000; and

''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $2,200,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 1110. During the current fiscal year, from funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, not to exceed $180,000,000 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander's Emergency Response Program, established by the Administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority for the purpose of enabling military

commanders in Iraq to respond to urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility by carrying out programs that will immediately assist the Iraqi people, and to establish and fund a similar program to assist the people of Afghanistan: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports, beginning on January 15, 2004, to the congressional defense committees regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 1111. Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing an Analysis of Alternatives for replacing the capabilities of the existing Air Force fleet of KC–135 tanker aircraft.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Operating Expenses'', $23,183,000, for costs related to Hurricane Isabel damage: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Army'', $185,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated or expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Navy'', $45,530,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated or expended to carry out military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Air Force'', $292,550,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated or expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $8,151,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps'', $6,280,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $6,981,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1301. (a) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO USE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—During fiscal year 2004, the Secretary of Defense may use this section as authority to obligate appropriated funds available for operation and maintenance to carry out a construction project outside the United States that the Secretary determines meets each of the following conditions:

(1) The construction is necessary to meet urgent military operational requirements of a temporary nature involving the use of the Armed Forces in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom or the Global War on Terrorism.

(2) The construction is not carried out at a military installation where the United States is reasonably expected to have a long-term presence.

(3) The United States has no intention of using the construction after the operational requirements have been satisfied.

(4) The level of construction is the minimum necessary to meet the temporary operational requirements.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF AUTHORITY.—The total cost of the construction projects carried out under the authority of this section using, in whole or in part, appropriated funds available for operation and maintenance shall not exceed $500,000,000 in fiscal year 2004.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—(1) Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal-year quarter of fiscal year 2004, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional committees specified in subsection (e) a report on the worldwide obligation and expenditure during that quarter of appropriated funds available for operation and maintenance for construction projects.

(2) The report shall include with regard to each project the following:

(A) Certification that the conditions specified in subsection (a) are satisfied with regard to the construction project.

(B) A description of the purpose for which appropriated funds available for operation and maintenance are being obligated.

(C) Relevant documentation detailing the construction project.

(D) An estimate of the total cost of the construction project.

(E) The total amount obligated for the construction project as of the date of the submission of the report.

(d) RELATION TO OTHER AUTHORITIES.—The temporary authority provided by this section, and the limited authority provided by section 2805(c) of title 10, United States Code, to use appropriated funds available for operation and maintenance to carry out a construction project are the only authorities available to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to use appropriated funds available for operation and maintenance to carry out construction projects.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The congressional committees referred to in this section are the following:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittees on Defense and Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittees on Defense and Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

TITLE II—IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION AND INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses for ''Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'', $15,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For necessary expenses for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', $156,300,000, of which $35,800,000 shall remain available until expended. Of the funds appropriated under this heading in the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003, $35,800,000 are rescinded. All such amounts are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance'', $43,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for ''Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service'', $50,000,000, to remain available until expended, which may be transferred to, and merged with, the appropriations for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'': *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses for ''Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities'', $245,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

RELATED AGENCY

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for ''International Broadcasting Operations'', for activities related to the Middle East Television Network broadcasting to Iraq, $40,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2101. 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 2

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development'', $40,000,000, for direct support of operations in Afghanistan, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for security, relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction in Iraq, $18,649,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, to be allocated as follows: $3,243,000,000 for security and law enforcement; $1,318,000,000 for justice, public safety infrastructure, and civil society; $5,560,000,000 for the electric sector; $2,100,000,000 for oil infrastructure; $4,332,000,000 for water resources and sanitation; $500,000,000 for transportation and telecommunications; $370,000,000 for roads, bridges, and construction; $793,000,000 for health care; $153,000,000 for private sector development; and $280,000,000 for education, refugees, human rights, democracy, and governance: *Provided,* That the President may reallocate up to 10 percent of any of the preceding allocations, except that the total for the allocation receiving such funds may not be increased by more than 20 percent: *Provided further,* That such reallocations shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and notifications shall be transmitted at least 15 days in advance of the obligation of funds: *Provided further,* That an annual spending plan for reconstruction programs under the preceding allocations, including project-by-project detail, shall be submitted by the President to the Committees on Appropriations not later than January 1, 2004, and shall be updated and submitted every 180 days thereafter: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall be apportioned only to the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq, the Department of State, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Treasury, the Department of Defense, and the United States Agency for International Development: *Provided further,* That upon a determination that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated in this paragraph, not less than $35,000,000 shall be made available for administrative expenses of the Department of State Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs and the United States Agency for International Development for support of the reconstruction activities in Iraq: *Provided further,* That up to 1 percent of the amount appropriated in this paragraph may be transferred to ''Operating Expenses of the Coalition Provisional Authority'', and that any such transfer shall be in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further,* That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization, may be credited to this Fund and used for such purposes: *Provided further,* That the Committees on Appropriations shall be notified quarterly of any collections pursuant to the previous proviso: *Provided further,* That the Coalition Provisional Authority shall work, in conjunction with relevant Iraqi officials, to ensure that a new Iraqi constitution preserves full rights to religious freedom: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, 10 percent of the total amount of funds apportioned to the United States Agency for International Development under this heading that are made available on a subcontract basis shall be reserved for contracts with small business concerns, including small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women (as such terms are defined for purposes of the Small Business Act): *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY

For necessary expenses of the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq, established pursuant to United Nations Security Council resolutions including Resolution 1483, for personnel costs, transportation, supply, equipment, facilities, communications, logistics requirements, studies, physical security, media support, promulgation and enforcement of regulations, and other activities needed to oversee and manage the relief and reconstruction of Iraq and the transition to democracy, $858,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For necessary expenses for ''Economic Support Fund'', $872,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2004: *Provided,* That not less than $672,000,000 is available only for accelerated assistance for Afghanistan: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $30,000,000 may be used for activities related to disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of militia combatants, including registration of such combatants, notwithstanding section 531(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used to provide additional policy experts in Afghan ministries and that not more than five senior advisors to the United States Ambassador may be deployed in Afghanistan: *Provided further,* That not less than $17,250,000 is available only for security requirements that directly support United States and Coalition personnel who are implementing assistance programs in Afghanistan, including the provision of adequate dedicated air transport and support for civilian personnel at provincial reconstruction team sites: *Provided further,* That upon the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a determination by the President that the Government of Pakistan is fully cooperating with the United States in the global war on terrorism, not to exceed $200,000,000 appropriated under this heading may be used for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct loans and guarantees for Pakistan: *Provided further,* That amounts that are made available under the previous proviso for the cost of modifying direct loans and guarantees shall not be considered ''assistance'' for the purposes of provisions of law limiting assistance to a country: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER AND FAMINE ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for International Disaster and Famine Assistance utilizing the general authorities of section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to respond to or prevent unforeseen complex foreign crises, especially in Sudan and Liberia, $100,000,000, and by transfer not to exceed 1 percent of the funds appropriated under any other heading in this chapter, to remain available to the Secretary of State until September 30, 2005: *Provided,* That funds appropriated under this heading may be made available only pursuant to a determination by the President, after consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, that it is in the national interest and essential to efforts to reduce international terrorism to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine for such purposes, including support for peace and humanitarian intervention operations: *Provided further,* That none of these funds shall be available to respond to natural disasters: *Provided further,* That funds made available under this heading to respond to or prevent unforeseen complex foreign crises shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', $170,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2004, for accelerated assistance for Afghanistan: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for ''Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', $35,000,000, for accelerated assistance for Afghanistan: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for the ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', $297,000,000, for accelerated assistance for Afghanistan: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for ''Peacekeeping Operations'', $50,000,000, to support the global war on terrorism: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 2201. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any unexpended funds provided in Public Law 108–11 may be used to repay, in whole or in part, principal or interest on any loan or guarantee agreement entered into by the Government of Iraq with any private or public sector entity including with the government of any country (including any agency of such government or any entity owned in whole or in part by the government of such country) or with any international financial institution, prior to May 1, 2003: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, the term ''international financial institution'' shall mean those institutions contained in section 530(b) of division E of Public Law 108–7.

SEC. 2202. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' and made available under the same heading in Public Law 108–11 may be used to enter into any Federal contract (including any follow-on contract) unless—

(1) the contract is entered into in accordance with title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.); and

(2) in any case in which procedures other than competitive procedures are to be used to enter into such a contract—

(A) if such procedures are to be used by reason of the application of a paragraph (other than paragraph (2)) under section 303(c) of such Act (41 U.S.C. 253(c)), the head of the executive agency entering into the contract shall submit to the committees described in subsection (b), not later than 7 calendar days before award of the contract—

(i) notification of the use of such other procedures; and

(ii) the justification for such use; and

(B) if such procedures are to be used by reason of the application of paragraph (2) of section 303(c) of such Act (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(2)), the head of the executive agency entering into the contract shall submit to the committees described in subsection (b), not later than 7 calendar days after approval of the justification for the use of such other procedures under section 303(f)(1)(B) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(f)(1)(B))—

(i) notification of the use of such other procedures; and

(ii) the justification for such use.

(b) COMMITTEES.—The committees referred to in subsection (a)(2) are—

(1) the Committees on Government Reform, on International Relations, and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committees on Governmental Affairs, on Foreign Relations, and on Appropriations of the Senate.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall not apply to contracts entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act or after September 30, 2010.

SEC. 2203. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF NON-COMPETITIVE CONTRACTING FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN IRAQ.

(a) DISCLOSURE REQUIRED.—

(1) PUBLICATION AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The head of an executive agency of the United States that enters into a contract for assistance for Iraq, using funds described in paragraph (3), through the use of procedures other than competitive procedures shall publish in the Federal Register or Commerce Business Daily and otherwise make available to the public, not later than 7 days before the date on which the contract is entered into, except in the case of urgent and compelling contracts issued pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 303(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(2)), the following information:

(A) The amount of the contract.

(B) A brief description of the scope of the contract.

(C) A discussion of how the executive agency identified, and solicited offers from, potential contractors to perform the contract, together with a list of the potential contractors that were issued solicitations for the offers.

(D) The justification and approval documents (as required under section 303(f)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(f)(1)) on which was based the determination to use procedures other than competitive procedures.

(2) FUNDS.—The funds referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) any funds available to carry out sections 103 through 106 and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b–2151d; 2346 et seq.); and

(B) any funds appropriated by Public Law 108–11 under the heading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' (in chapter 5 of title I; 117 Stat. 573).

(3) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to contracts entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act or after September 30, 2010.

(b) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD.—The head of an executive agency may—

(A) withhold from publication and disclosure under subsection (a) any document that is classified for restricted access in accordance with a Executive order in the interest of national defense or foreign policy; and

(B) redact any part so classified that is in a document not so classified before publication and disclosure of the document under subsection (a).

(2) AVAILABILITY TO CONGRESS.—In any case in which the head of an executive agency withholds information under paragraph (1), the head of such executive agency shall make available an unredacted version of the document containing that information to the chairman and ranking member of each of the following committees of Congress:

(A) The Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(C) Each committee that the head of the executive agency determines has legislative jurisdiction for the operations of such department or agency to which the information related.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER DISCLOSURE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting obligations to disclose United States Government information under any other provision of law.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''competitive procedures'' and ''executive agency'' have the meanings given such terms in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403).

SEC. 2204. Section 1503 of Public Law 108–11 is amended—

(1) by striking ''equipment'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''equipment, including equipment''; and

(2) by striking ''2004'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''2005''.

SEC. 2205. Section 1504 of Public Law 108–11 is amended by striking ''controlled'' and inserting ''or small arms controlled''.

SEC. 2206. Section 202(b) of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–327) is amended by striking ''$300,000,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$450,000,000''.

SEC. 2207. (a) Until January 2005, the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) shall, on a monthly basis, submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations and International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate that details, for the preceding month, Iraqi oil production and oil revenues, and uses of such revenues.

(b) The first report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act.

(c) The reports required by this section shall also be made publicly available, including through the CPA's Internet website.

SEC. 2208. Any reference in this chapter to the ''Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq'' shall be deemed to include any successor United States Government entity with the same or substantially the same authorities and responsibilities as the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq.

SEC. 2209. Assistance or other financing under chapter 2 of this title may be provided for Iraq and Afghanistan notwithstanding any other provision of law not contained in this Act that restricts assistance to foreign countries and section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That funds made available for Iraq pursuant to this section shall be subject to the regular reprogramming notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, except that notification shall be transmitted at least 5 days in advance of obligation.

SEC. 2210. Funds made available in chapter 2 of this title are made available notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended.

SEC. 2211. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to undertake any program authorized by title IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in Iraq: *Provided*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of this section shall be subject to the regular reprogramming notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

REPORT ON MILITARY OPERATIONS AND RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 2212. (a) REPORT.—The President shall prepare and transmit to Congress on a quarterly basis a report on United States military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report shall, at a minimum, contain the following information:

(1) A full accounting of amounts appropriated under this Act or any other Act that were expended during the preceding quarter for military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(2) A description of progress made in reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, particularly efforts relating to public safety, defense and law enforcement, energy infrastructure, water, sewer, roads, and other public works, transportation and telecommunications infrastructure, medical and hospital services, and private sector development.

(3) A description of progress made to reduce attacks against members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(4) An analysis of the impact that military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have had on overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(5) An analysis of the impact that the extended deployment of members of the Armed Forces in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom is having on recruiting and retention efforts in the active and reserve components.

(6) An estimate of the cost of repairing or replacing the combat vehicles, aircraft, and other equipment damaged or destroyed by combat, by prolonged use in Iraq and Afghanistan, or by exposure to the extreme climatic and terrain conditions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(7) A description of progress made toward holding of free and fair elections in Iraq.

(8) A description of the extent of international participation in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq and the amount of financial assistance that the United States has secured from the international community during the preceding quarter.

(9) The number of members of the Armed Forces deployed in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

SEC. 2213. (a) REVIEW OF CONTRACTING PROCEDURES.—The Comptroller General shall review each covered contract and task or delivery order entered into during a review period to determine whether the procedures used to enter into the contracts and orders were in compliance with the requirements of this Act and other applicable laws and regulations.

(b) REPORT.—At the end of each review period, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the review.

(c) REVIEW PERIOD.—A review under subsection (a) shall be carried each quarter of a fiscal year, beginning with the first quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) COVERED CONTRACTS AND ORDERS.—This section applies to any contract or task or delivery order entered into using funds appropriated by this Act for foreign assistance if—

(1) in the case of a contract, the contract is in an amount in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold (as defined in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403), and

(2) in the case of a task or delivery order, the order is in an amount in excess of $1,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 3001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 3002. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act for fiscal year 2004 may be used for any defense or reconstruction activities in Iraq or Afghanistan coordinated by any officer of the United States Government whose office is not subject to appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 3003. For purposes of computing the amount of a payment for an eligible local educational agency under section 8003(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7703(a)), children enrolled in a school of such agency that would otherwise be eligible for payment under section 8003(a)(1)(B) of such Act, but due to the deployment of both parents or legal guardians, or due to the death of a military parent or legal guardian while on active duty, are no longer eligible under such section, shall be considered as eligible students under such section, provided such students remain in average daily attendance at the same school that they attended prior to their change in eligibility status.

SEC. 3004. None of the funds made available by this Act may be provided to any unit of the security forces of a foreign country participating with coalition forces in Afghanistan or Iraq if the Secretary of State or the Secretary Defense has credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights, unless the appropriate Secretary determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the government of such country is taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces unit to justice: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to withhold funds made available by this Act from any unit of the security forces of a foreign country not credibly alleged to be involved in gross violations of human rights: *Provided further,* That in the event that funds are withheld from any unit pursuant to this section, the appropriate Secretary shall promptly inform the foreign government of the basis for such action and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, assist the foreign government in taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces to justice.

SEC. 3005. None of the funds in this Act, or any other appropriations Act, may be used to execute the Lateral Repatriation Program, or any other program under which citizens or nationals of Mexico are removed by land from the United States by returning them to a location other than the United States port of entry closest to the location where they were apprehended or last imprisoned, or, in the case of an alien who is removed upon being acquitted of a criminal charge, the port of entry closest to the courthouse where the acquittal occurs. If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that compliance with the preceding sentence is not feasible, the Secretary shall notify the Committees on the Judiciary and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

SEC. 3006. None of the funds in this Act, or any other appropriations Act, may be used for the issuance of Form I–20A by the San Antonio Office of Detention and Removal of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Border Patrol sectors served by said office.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that section 3005 fails to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. By addressing funds in all appropriations acts, it implicates funds other than those in the pending bill and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of the rule.

I ask for a ruling by the Chair on the point of order.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The section is stricken from the bill.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that section 3006 fails to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. By addressing funds in all appropriations acts, it implicates funds other than those in the pending bill and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of the rule.

I ask the Chair for a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The section is stricken from the bill.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, as I did a year ago this month, I rise to address this chamber with a heavy heart. Over the past several days, we have engaged in a debate worthy of this institution's history. These deliberations have focused on providing additional funding for the Administration's Iraqi policy. Specifically, the resolution we are considering today would provide approximately $86.9 billion in emergency funding for U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, $18.6 billion of which would be used for ongoing reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

The debate over the President's policy in Iraq runs deeper than the discussions over the monetary size of this bill. At this moment, before us is the question of how we, as Members of Congress charged with the responsibility to represent our diverse constituencies, should fulfill our constitutional responsibilities. This is an obligation that I take very seriously.

After careful consideration of all sides of today's debate, I have decided to vote against the House's initial supplementary appropriations bill. I do so for three primary reasons. First, this proposal would continue to support a foreign policy that lacks a clear objective and fails to identify a well-reasoned plan for removing our troops from the region. Second, it would unfairly burden American taxpayers and future generations. Third, I look forward to a second opportunity to address this issue and vote on an improved bill based on negotiations with the Senate. I further believe that the Congress can, and should, take this time to reevaluate the Administration's approach to Iraq and recommit itself to our constitutional duties.

During these debates, many have stressed the importance of supporting our troops who find themselves in harm's way. I share these concerns. The fact of the matter is that Members of Congress on both sides of this debate recognize our responsibility to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. These brave American men and women are serving their country with great distinction and this Congress must ensure that they have the equipment, training, resources and amenities necessary to carry out their duties. I therefore very strongly support the more than $60 billion contained in this bill designated for supporting our troops.

Moreover, a vote on this bill is not about whether one political party or one individual Member of Congress supports our armed services. Instead, this debate is a question about how we can most effectively support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, encourage regional stability over the long term, and ensure the appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. In a larger context, we must also seek whether this Congress will continue to unquestionable accept the Bush Administration's foreign policy approach to Iraq.

Given the chain of events of the past year, I believe that during this debate we should carefully review and studiously scrutinize the Administration's policy on Iraq. Last fall, President Bush and officials within his Administration made the argument to the Congress, to the American people, and to the world community that the threat to the United States posed by Iraq was imminent. They went to great lengths to present information to Members of this House, including personal presentations to me, about Iraq's imminent capabilities to use weapons of mass destruction against our citizens. Based on the evidence presented at that time, particularly pertaining to Iraq's use of mobile facilities to hide its biological weapons research and especially relating to Iraq's ability to use unmanned aerial vehicles to deliver these weapons to specific targets within the United States, I voted to grant the President the specific powers laid out in the congressional resolution authorizing the use of military force in Iraq.

Following the failure of the Administration to reach consensus on a unified course of action in the United Nations, the onset of hostilities authorized under that resolution, and the President's subsequent declaration of the end of the major combat operations, the Administration has thus far failed to locate any specified weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and the means to deliver them. Moreover, it has uncovered no conclusive evidence of mobile facilities to the best of my knowledge. At this point, the evidence to support the Administration's fundamental premise for going to war—that Iraq posed an imminent threat to our country's national security—has not emerged.

Given these facts and circumstances, my vote today signals my unwillingness at this time to blindly accept the Administration's policy position on proceeding in Iraq. Until this point, I have given the President the benefit of the doubt. I supported the resolution passed by this House authorizing the use of force. When the President came before this Congress last spring requesting $63 billion in emergency funding for operations in Iraq, I joined an overwhelming number of my colleagues in supporting his request. At this time, I must demand accountability from this President in his management of the Iraqi effort and the use of U.S. taxpayer dollars that underwrite it.

One potential approach for promoting fiscal accountability and ensuring that the Iraqis and Americans support our rebuilding effort over the long term is to demand that American taxpayers have the opportunity to recover their investments in Iraq's reconstruction. Iraq is a country with considerable financial and natural resources. It could harness this capital to pay for the rebuilding of its infrastructure and the completion of new projects. In light of this reality, I presently believe that we should provide the reconstruction funds contained in this emergency spending measure in the form of a loan, not an outright grant.

Additionally, before proposing this emergency spending legislation Bush Administration officials had repeatedly heretofore stated that Iraq possessed the financial capability to self-finance its reconstruction efforts. For instance, in February then-White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer said, ''Iraq has tremendous resources that belong to the Iraqi people. And so there are a variety of means that Iraq has to be able to shoulder much of the burden for their own reconstruction.'' Additionally, when speaking about Iraq's reconstruction before the Senate Appropriations Committee in March Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld stated, ''I don't believe that the United States has the responsibility for reconstruction, in a sense. [Reconstruction] funds can come from those various sources I mentioned: frozen assets, oil revenues and a variety of other things, including the Oil for Food, which has a very substantial number of billions of dollars in it.''

In contrast to these statements, Administration officials in recent weeks have now argued that Iraq cannot incur additional debt and that the only way to promote stability in Iraq is through the issuance of an outright grant. For example, during his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee just last month, Secretary Rumsfeld averred, ''Iraq is in no position to pay its current debt service, let alone take on more additional debt. If we want to encourage Iraqi self reliance, so that Iraqis can fund their own reconstruction and so that American troops can go home, it would not be helpful to saddle Iraq with more debt it could not be reasonably expected to pay.'' The rhetorical about-face regarding this element of the Bush Administration's policy toward Iraq has been unmistakable and undisputed.

Yet these same Administration officials have been remiss in explaining why reality in postwar Iraq has not conformed to their original rhetoric. Is this a question of miscalculation, insufficient planning, or arrogance? Is this perhaps a question of a fundamental misunderstanding of the level of sacrifice required to implement a policy? The Congress has a responsibility to ask these questions and to probe the assumptions underlying the Administration's approach to Iraq in light of this significant, and as yet unexplained, foreign policy turnaround.

While I fully recognize the potential logistical difficulties in accessing Iraq's resources to pay for reconstruction efforts, I remain confident that Iraq ultimately will overcome these problems and have the financial capacity to repay these loans to the American people. In the unlikely event that Iraq's financial potential does not emerge, this Congress also can revisit this issue and forgive the loans at a later moment in time. It is, moreover, my understanding that our counterparts in the Senate are actively considering this issue as well, and they have already included a provision in their bill converting at least a portion of the funds appropriated from a grant to a forgivable loan, an approach which I consider fitting.

A vote in favor of this emergency spending legislation at this time would essentially send a message that I am satisfied with its content and the policies it supports. Simply stated: I am not. I, therefore, must fulfill my constitutional obligations to discharge the duties of my office, which include oversight of the executive branch, to the best of my abilities. As a result, I will vote against this bill.

Just one example of the need to scrutinize this Administration's implementation of reconstruction efforts is the repairs made to an Iraqi cement factory. Rather than spending the $15 million U.S. engineers estimated it would cost to transform the factory into a state-of-the-art facility, our troops worked with Iraqis to make the factory operational at a cost of just $80,000.

Moreover, voting against the initial House proposal at this time will, in my view, strengthen the Senate's position as we move into negotiations between the House and Senate on this important legislation and, hopefully, develop a realistic consensus for future action in Iraq. Furthermore, our vote today constitutes just the first step in the legislative process, and it is my strong hope that the coming deliberations on this bill will incorporate a forgivable loan provision or some similar stipulation. Observers should consequently construe my vote following the initial debate in the House over this matter as both evidence of my deep skepticism of the President's current Iraqi policy as well as my position that reconstruction funding should be allocated in the form of a loan to the Iraqi people.

The completion of today's proceedings brings to a close the initial debate over this legislation. It, however, should not end congressional evaluation of the President's Iraqi policy. Moving forward, this Congress must demand accountability from the President and officials in his Administration on these matters. Specifically, we should require the President to outline his objectives in Iraq, detail a logical plan and timetable for achieving those goals, and present long-term estimates of the costs of his proposed policies. We must accomplish these tasks while supporting the needs of our troops and their families.

The American commitment in Iraq has been thus far an open-ended affair, characterized by daily reports of troops under siege. Now my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has brought to the attention of this House evidence that our troops are, in some cases, lacking the equipment they need and the amenities they deserve while selected favored corporations receive contract awards without participating in a competitive bidding process. In the face of all of these inconsistencies, the Administration additionally has to date failed to locate the imminent threats that served as the basis for war. The Congress consequently should take this opportunity to question these developments and ensure that this legislation and any subsequent allocation of federal funds include appropriate accountability measures.

The Constitution vests all legislative powers in us. As Members of this great institution, we

should take that responsibility seriously. While the President can, and does, submit legislative proposals for consideration, we have an obligation to our nation's founders, ourselves, and, most importantly, our constituents to deliberate on these matters, make necessary adjustments to them, and enact laws. I have worked with the President in an effort to remove the perceived threat in Iraq and bring greater stability to the region and the world. The developments of the past few months, however, should serve as evidence of the Administration's ineffective planning effort and misunderstanding of the challenges facing our troops. As this Congress works to support our troops, we must now hold the Bush Administration to account and demand that it provide a justification for its further use of taxpayer dollars to support these endeavors. Anything less would represent a failure of this Congress to meet its constitutional responsibilities and its leaders to provide clear direction for the future.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, in October 2002, I voted against the war in Iraq because there were other viable options the Bush Administration should have pursued before sending our troops into harm's way. The Administration then moved too hastily in invading Iraq without a clear vision for how to bring our troops home. We were prepared to win the war, but we were not prepared to keep the peace.

In April of this year, we approved $60 billion the Administration requested for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Now, just five months later, the President is asking for an additional $87 billion without accounting for how the original funds were spent.

I cannot in good conscience vote for this request. The Bush Administration has not presented a coherent, credible plan to the American people to address any of the challenges facing our soldiers in Iraq.

I supported an alternative plan offered by Representative DAVID OBEY (D–WI), which was voted on yesterday. His proposal gives our troops the equipment they need to conduct their mission in Iraq, requires the Administration to account for how they are spending the supplemental funds, and ensures international funding and cooperation.

The Obey proposal requires the Administration to account for the funds from the previous war supplemental and for how additional funding will be used to support both the military and reconstruction efforts. Congress should not agree to provide the Administration additional funds without knowing how they will be spent.

In addition, by internationalizing reconstruction efforts in Iraq, the Obey proposal ensures American taxpayers do not shoulder this burden alone.

We have all heard about the deplorable conditions our soldiers are operating in as they carry out their important mission in Iraq. Our troops lack even the most basic equipment, such as bullet-proof Kevlar vests, to keep themselves safe. The drinking water is impure at nine out of the ten American bases in Iraq, because the Bush Administration did not provide needed water purification equipment. When they are given much-needed leave for a visit back to the United States, they have to buy their own tickets from their point of entry to their homes, creating a significant financial burden on the troops and their families.

This is how the Bush Administration treats our soldiers in combat and their $87 billion proposal does nothing to fix this. Our troops deserve better.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my full ongoing support for the brave men and women engaged in the war on terrorism. In this great nation, we made a solemn commitment to strike from the face of this earth those fanatics who threaten our freedom and our civilization with acts of unrestrained barbarity. It is our firm resolve to achieve a stable and lasting peace, and, accordingly, we must devote the necessary resources to achieve that noble aim.

Since the tragic events of September 11, 2001, we as a nation along with our allies have been engaged in a broad and violent battle against terror—against radicals who target and kill innocent men, women and children in a misguided struggle with the West, with freedom, with equality, with democracy. This battle continues today on many fronts, including, most prominently, Iraq and Afghanistan.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, we are called upon today to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to appropriate monies for our national defense. In reviewing the President's $87 billion request, I believe our first priority must be to provide our forces in Iraq the resources they need in order to complete their security mission throughout the country, prevent militias from taking hold, and enhance troop safety and security while they are performing their vitally important mission.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear at the outset that, while I have grave concerns about the lack of accountability provided for in this legislation, I plan to support the legislation, because it is critically important that we do not leave the war on terror unfinished and our troops on the ground in Iraq less than safe and secure.

On that point, I want to commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for making two critically important improvements to the President's request. The parents and families of the brave men and women who are now in harm's way in defense of our freedom will doubtless be relieved that this bill requires the Department of Defense to provide Kevlar flak jacket inserts—basic body armor—to our troops. In addition, I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee included specific direction requiring the provision of portable jammers to block the radio signals used to detonate the remote-controlled bombs that have been repeatedly used to kill and wound our troops.

For reasons that defy comprehension, the current civilian leaders at the Pentagon failed to provide adequate supplies of these two types of equipment even after it became terribly apparent this summer that shortages were costing American lives. I was recently appalled to read multiple press reports describing how parents and spouses of our troops found it necessary to purchase body armor to protect their loved ones whom we placed in peril. How is it that we can spend tens of billions of dollars to fight a war on terror while not providing for the basic safety and security of the brave men and women that we have placed in harm's way? I just don't understand. I doubt those families do either.

In addition to perpetuating an unaccounted for and unexplained policy, this bill is also inadequate to meet the needs of our nation's armed services. The Administration failed to consult with the uniformed leadership of the Pentagon in preparing its request. As a consequence, this bill only provides a tenth—10 percent—of the Army's stated needs for spare parts, reconditioning and depot maintenance for critically important heavy machinery. As a result, thousands of pieces of equipment, such as Bradley fighting vehicles and M1 tanks, equipment that the uniformed leadership of our armed services designate as vital to our military success, will sit idle in unusable condition throughout this year and well into the next. In my district, despite the ongoing war effort and the Army's need, my constituents—men and women who have devoted most of their working lives to maintaining our military's equipment needs—at Red River Army Depot are still not working at full capacity.

To allow some of our military's most effective equipment to lay fallow is foolish and short-sighted. The men and women working for our national security at the Red River Army Depot and other depot facilities across the country stand ready—as they have for decades—to ensure that our military has all its heavy equipment needs met, and we should do no less. Let us resolve to give our military all that its uniformed leadership says it needs, not less.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican leadership of this House frequently comes to the floor of this great body to denounce waste, fraud and abuse. Yet it has acted with a single-minded passion to thwart every effort by members of this House to seek an accounting of our nation's ongoing operations in Iraq.

I understand as well as any members of this House the dangers that we confront in the war on terror. There is no question that the United States faces daunting and unprecedented challenges in combating an enemy unlike any other we have ever confronted before. Nevertheless, the Congress of the United States has a sacred and constitutional obligation to ensure that the American taxpayers' money is spend wisely and well. The United States Congress is not the President's personal ATM and should not be treated that way.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not provide the necessary accountability. The taxpayers of this nation sent us here to deliberate and debate, to discuss and dissect so that we can arrive at policies and practices that produce the best return on our nation's investment—at home or abroad. However, Mr. Chairman, the Republican leadership of this House is determined to quell any debate or discussion.

The Republican leadership of this House insists that to question the wisdom of this legislation or of this Administration's policy is to commit acts bordering on traitorous. Such accusations are mean-spirited and disingenuous. We have no less than a constitutional obligation to carefully consider each and every component part of this legislation and of this Administration's policy in Iraq. It is our responsibility. The founding fathers of this great nation gave us an important power, the power of the purse. To fail to exercise that power, including the necessary oversight, is to fail the people who elected us. There is nothing unpatriotic about questioning his legislation or the Administration's policy. As a matter of fact, it would be unpatriotic not to do so.

As members of this House, we are obliged to ensure that the legislation that we pass,

that becomes law, does what it purports to do and does it effectively and efficiently. Unfortunately, the leadership of this House seems to have a different view of our obligations as members of Congress than the Constitution contemplates.

Accordingly, one has to ask, Why? Why does the leadership of this House refuse to permit a full-throated debate of both the monies being spent on our ongoing operations in Iraq and the policy underlying the provision of those resources? Why are we in Congress not entitled to have the Administration's plans and proposals explained to us in detail—not the broad brush explanations that this Administration insists we must accept?

The legislation we debate today allocates $87 billion to our operations in Iraq. Yet the Administration has not offered—and the Republican leadership of this House has not allowed—a full and complete explanation of how these dollars will be spent. That is not acceptable. I have every confidence that if we called upon each taxpaying family in this country to write a check directly to the government to pay for our efforts in Iraq, they would demand to know exactly where their money was going. Our constituents would not sign a blank check, and neither should we.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the supplemental appropriations provided in this bill are borrowed money. This legislation, however, noble its purpose, piles another $87 billion on to our already crippling national debt—a debt that will be paid by our children and grandchildren, by the brave men and women now serving in Iraq and their children and grandchildren. Personally, I am certain that the taxpaying families in my district will demand to know exactly how their money and that of their children and grandchildren is used, and I demand to know the details for them.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why there is an $18.6 billion gift in this bill devoted to building Iraq's infrastructure, when the Administration cannot even find the monies to fully and appropriately equip our own military personnel. I cannot understand why the taxpayers of the United States need to provide $18.6 billion in grants to Iraq, a country with the world's second largest oil reserves. Nevertheless, the President insists that loans are out of the question.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I ask, Why? The Administration says that loans to Iraq are not workable, because Iraq has an unbearable debt load already. The Administration believes we should borrow $18.6 billion from the American taxpayer to build highways, hospitals, schools, houses, and community centers in Iraq, because Iraq has too much debt. Is this the same Iraq that the Administration said could pay for its own reconstruction six months ago? It certainly makes you wonder.

I object to borrowing $18.6 billion from the American taxpayer to build infrastructure in Iraq, when we neglect our own citizens here at home.

The Administration expresses considerable concern about the debt burden of the Iraqis but ignores the continuing fiscal crisis that confronts our own government. It is reported that Iraq has $100 billion in outstanding debts from the Saddam era, which is less than one quarter of the amount the Administration has piled onto our national debt in this year alone. The vast majority—at least 75 percent—of Iraq's debts are owed to its oil-rich neighbors—poor struggling nations such as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Mr. Chairman, it is farcical for this House to accept the proposition that Iraq is unable to bear any additional debt—despite being the world's second most oil-rich nation—because it owes approximately $75 billion to its oil-rich neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I am firmly committed to fighting through to victory over terror. The American people are resolved to secure themselves against the threat to our freedom and democracy represented by a few violent fanatics. I support and share that resolve. Nevertheless, I continue to question the wisdom of this Administration's plan to conduct the war on terror. Our troops are in the field. They are in harm's way. This Congress must not do anything to compromise the safety and security of these brave men and women.

Mr. Chairman, I will support the bill before the House today, but not without serious concerns. As we continue the war on terror, I would hope that the members of this House from both sides of the aisle will insist on true and complete accountability from this Administration for the expenditure of these funds. It is our right and obligation to do so. Failure to do that is failing the American people.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, last year, during debate on the resolution granting the President the authorization he sought to commence a war against Iraq, I was concerned that the Administration was ignoring the fact that actions and words have consequences. The consequences of our actions then are exactly what we are trying to address through H.R. 3289 today. We took the burden of a notoriously ill-advised, preemptive war and placed it on the shoulders of our young men and women in the military to carry virtually alone. Now we are asking the American taxpayers to take on the burden almost exclusively of rebuilding an entire nation, while our own nation finds its schools in disrepair, forty-four million Americans without health care, and our homeland security needs under-funded.

If this were a spending package focused on supporting and protecting our troops, this would be an easy vote for me. Nearly 5 months after the Commander-in-Chief declared, ''mission accomplished,'' too many of our troops are dying daily. I do not think these young men and women in the armed forces, National Guard, and Reserves expected to still be there so long after our President's proud and premature declaration of success in Iraq. Our soldiers are sacrificing too much: some their lives, and others their valued role as a parent, breadwinner, or caregiver to their families and their communities.

I would support whatever it takes to bring these young men and women home as quickly as possible, and to ensure their success and safety in their mission while they are away.

But even the portion of the bill that would support our military's ''post-war'' efforts in Iraq is deficient. We know from reports that weapons caches are poorly secured and that our troops are lacking absolutely vital equipment such as body armor. The bill also would leave 80 percent of our troops in Iraq without the ability to ensure a clean water supply for themselves. We should also be paying for our soldiers' rare calls home and for the full cost of traveling home while on leave. Equally disturbing are reports that our troops in Iraq are fatigued and suffering from low morale, the direct consequence of the Administration's failure to secure extensive international cooperation and compose a comprehensive exist strategy.

A significant portion of this bill's $87 billion is for rebuilding Iraq, and like it or not we now have a moral responsibility to carry much of this burden. When scrutinized in the light of day, however, many of the items for which the Administration is asking us to sign away precious tax dollars simply do not make sense. I was appalled by findings reported in the New York times that Halliburton has been exploiting the American taxpayer with a 140 percent mark-up for a gallon of gas in Iraq. Despite our best efforts today to include some Congressional oversight to the contracting process, I am afraid that the Administration and its representatives in Iraq will continue to oppose sensible oversight even while they have compiled a very poor track record of ensuring that the largesse of the American taxpayer will not further be abused. As an example of what is already occurring on the ground, I would reiterate what the Democratic members of the Appropriations Committee reported about the reconstruction of a cement factory in Northern Iraq. In that instance, after the American contractor estimated that it would take $15 million to upgrade the factory, local Iraqis got the job done for $80,000. Something is wrong here, and I do not believe we have done enough to make sure the Administration does not continue to make these mistakes.

I understand the overwhelming pressure to rebuild as quickly as possible, but we cannot afford to do this at any cost and without greater discipline.

The American people know that this will not be the only request on their tax dollars—some have characterized the President's $87 billion request as a mere down-payment in a rebuilding effort that I expect to be long and very expensive. I am heartened that our international allies are starting to offer help, but these agreements should have been taken care of long ago through a collaborative international partnership. Again, the consequence of acting alone and without credible evidence has come back to haunt not just the President, but America's soldiers and taxpayers.

Having said all of this, the most troubling aspect of this bill before us today is that it is not paid for at all; the full amount is added to this year's already alarming $500 billion deficit. Why? We have been told that the funds are simply not available. Why not? In large part it is because of the cost of the excessive tax cuts benefiting the wealthiest among us that this Administration decided were its first priority. The 2001 repeal of the estate tax alone—which benefits 30,000 of America's wealthiest individuals and only them, at the expense of more than 140,000,000 other taxpayers—costs more in two years than this entire appropriations package.

Mr. Chairman, this is a policy with no fiscal discipline that stands in stark contrast to the discipline and sacrifices our young men and women are demonstrating every day in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I sincerely wish I could have voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that would have met the burden that we have assumed in Iraq in a responsible way. I do not understand why the leadership denied us the ability to vote on that

amendment, which would have reset our priorities in a very sensible manner, asking Americans to heed the call of shared sacrifice and asking the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans to give up just a little bit of their tax cut to help bring our troops home and rebuild Iraq.

What the Administration has asked us to do here today—approve deficit spending in the amount of $87 billion—will place the cost of rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan squarely on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren and those of our soldiers, too many of whom have already made the ultimate sacrifice. We should be more responsible than that. I will vote against H.R. 3289.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the FY '04 Supplemental bill.

In April 2003, President Bush asked the American people to provide $77.9 billion for military and reconstruction spending in Iraq. At the time, his administration repeatedly assured Congress that they would not need additional money for Iraq. We now see that this was either poor planning or a calculated and gross underestimation of the cost. Today, congress is being asked to vote on $87 billion in additional spending for our military actions in Iraq and the reconstruction of both Iraq and Afghanistan for 2004.

Congress needs to start acting in a fiscally responsible manner. In this bill's current form there are no corresponding spending cuts or revenue generators to pay for the nearly $87 billion cost. President Bush is asking for $20.3 billion in reconstruction funds with no strings attached. This proposal has no accountability and, equally as disturbing, there has been no effort made to provide an offset to cover the cost. As a result, the proposal would add significantly to the already massive $500 billion federal budget deficit.

I have attempted to inject some fiscal responsibility into this process by offering an amendment that would eliminate the Bush tax giveaway for taxpayers in the top federal income bracket. My proposal would only impact the top 0.7 percent of all taxpayers with annual incomes of more than $312,000 and would restore approximately $90 billion to the federal budget. Unfortunately my amendment was not allowed and we are left with a bill that we are utterly unable to afford.

We have an obligation to protect our troops in Iraq and to help rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan so that they are no longer havens for the tyranny and misery that spawn violence. This must be done responsibly and within the context of a clear plan for the U.S. to accomplish its goals and turn over both the governance and security of Iraq to the Iraqi people.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today encapsulates all of the problems with the Administration's Iraq policy. President Bush has not explained how the $87 billion in spending helps us meet our goals of protecting our troops and restoring order in Iraq. The President has failed to make clear how many more American tax dollars will be spent on Iraq or the duration of our occupation. The President has no plan for how to pay for the $87 billion without adding dramatically to an already record federal deficit.

The spending for our troops is vital. However, the President's plan needs to include guarantees that the $67 billion in military spending will go to getting critical supplies to our troops in a timely fashion. This is particularly important in the wake of a report this week that more than 40,000 G.I.s in Iraq still do not have the protective body armor for their Kevlar vests that stops rounds from AK–47s, the assault weapon favored by Iraqi guerrillas.

The most troubling portion of this proposal is the $20 billion allocated for the rebuilding of Iraq. To this point, many of the reconstruction contracts have been awarded without competition to companies with close ties to the White House. These no-bid contracts preclude the accountability that is critical to ensuring that our tax dollars are not wasted and that every contract is implemented to meet the goal of a quick restoration of order and self-governance in Iraq.

The question of cost points to the other major concern I have with this request. The President did not provide any way for us to pay for it. Instead of cutting spending or finding another revenue source, he is borrowing on our children's future by adding to the federal deficit. This is the continuation of a reckless economic policy that has already turned a budget surplus in 2000 into a projected $500 billion deficit for 2004.

There is also the question of whether this plan makes our nation more secure. Last year, I voted against the Iraqi war resolution because I believed that there was no clear evidence showing Iraq was an imminent threat or that there were ties between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. I was extremely concerned that the Bush Administration's unilateralist approach would seriously harm our international standing, our ability to wage the War on Terror and our ability to rebuild Iraq after the fall of Saddam Hussein.

These concerns have been borne out. Weapons of mass destruction have yet to be found and the Bush Administration has recently admitted that there is very little evidence to tie Iraq to al Qaeda. There is a growing consensus that the Bush Administration did not have the solid evidence they once claimed to have in order to justify invading Iraq.

Congress has an obligation to pass a bill that contains a clear and coherent plan for our troops and the reconstruction of Iraq and does not balloon the deficit. This proposal does not meet these standards.

I urge a no vote on the Supplemental.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today Congress again considers the important issue of providing additional funding for military and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan. As a member of the House Armed Service Committee, I appreciate the valiant service of our men and women in uniform, and we must not hesitate to provide them with the appropriate resources to continue their success in the global war on terrorism. However, I have serious concerns with this measure—not because I believe the U.S. should not contribute to rebuilding Afghanistan and Iraq, but because so much of the burden is falling upon American taxpayers. I am frustrated that we are paying for this request through increased deficit spending—thereby shifting the cost to future generations—without considering the options of international loans through the World Bank, as Congressman OBEY has recommended, or other revenue sources that would spread the burden to those who can most afford it. Nonetheless, I believe that the United States ultimately has a responsibility to follow through on our international commitments.

While much discussion about the supplemental will focus on the reconstruction request, we must not forget that the majority of its funding goes toward ensuring the safety and success of our troops. For example, the bill will increase the number of protective body suits, flak jackets and armored vehicles available to our military's men and women serving in hostile areas. Just last week, I visited Walter Reed Army Medical Center and spoke with soldiers whose injuries might have been prevented if they had been driving the armored vehicles included in this bill. Additionally, the measure recognizes that the difficult terrain and often inhospitable climate of Iraq have necessitated frequent maintenance of military equipment, and therefore provides funding for parts replacement and much-needed upgrades.

A far more controversial aspect of the bill is the $18.6 billion for reconstruction activities in Iraq and $1.2 billion for Afghanistan. I was concerned with some of the items in the President's original request—including the establishment of postal codes and the purchase of a fleet of pricey garbage trucks—and am pleased that the Appropriations Committee deemed them unworthy of emergency funding. The remaining items, such as utility infrastructure projects, health care improvement and security upgrades, are important building blocks that will help improve the safety of the Iraqi people while allowing them to develop self-sufficiency and independence. While some regions in Iraq are still hostile to U.S. presence, we must build on the progress that we have made in other areas of the nation. Insufficient investment now in Iraq could lead to the spread of religious extremism, an increase in illegal arms trading, and an explosion in anti-American sentiment. To fall short in our reconstruction efforts could have a devastating effect on the stability of the region, causing it to descend into chaos and become a breeding ground for terrorists.

However, I am disappointed that the reconstruction portion of the request was not considered separately from the military component so that Congress could have provided immediate assistance to our troops while having greater opportunity for deliberation and consideration of the longer-term reconstruction proposals and the larger issues of U.S. involvement in Iraq.

Unfortunately, the military improvement and reconstruction efforts come at a high cost, and no one in this chamber should have any question about the impact of this measure on our nation's financial situation. To an already historic deficit projected at $480 billion in fiscal year 2004, we are adding $87 billion. This combination translates into larger interest payments on the national debt and less funding for important domestic priorities such as health care, education, and homeland security. My constituents are fully aware of the impact on our budget; I recently met with a man who has been unemployed for two years who questioned why we are not focusing our spending efforts on job training and other programs to address the nation's unemployment problem. I believe that the costs of this package fall unfairly on American taxpayers, and we must rectify this problem. Consequently, I sent a letter to President Bush asking that he aggressively pursue international cooperation to help defray the costs of reconstruction. Absent a major influx of foreign aid, I requested that he

consider options that would require small sacrifices from those Americans who can most afford them. One possibility would be to reduce a portion of the recent tax cut for the top income tax bracket to generate enough revenue to cover the $87 billion request. This reduction would slightly impact fewer than one million taxpayers, while maintaining the tax cuts for the middle class. Our men and women in uniform have served heroically to safeguard our nation's security, and we must now endure other sacrifices to keep from endangering the economic security of future generations.

What frustrates me most about the current situation is that it was not unforeseen. Many of my colleagues and I cautioned the Bush Administration about the consequences of pursuing military intervention in Iraq without a broad coalition of support. Almost exactly a year ago, I cam to the floor to speak on the resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq. At that time, I said that I could not vote for it because it lacked a clear mandate that the President seek U.N. Security Council support for military operations in Iraq. I specifically noted that an international coalition would broaden regional support for military intervention and would be essential in promoting a new government in Iraq and undertaking reconstruction efforts. Unfortunately, those words were not heeded, and the onus of reconstruction now falls heavily on our Nation.

The bill before us is a flawed bill, not because of the provisions it contains or the programs that it funds, but because the circumstances that brought us to its consideration could have been different. However, we must not judge this bill based on its history, but on what it can do to shape the future. As Shakespeare wrote, ''What's past is prologue,'' and we cannot allow finger-pointing to obscure the task at hand. Our Nation successfully toppled two oppressive regimes and freed the Afghan and Iraqi people from cruelty, abuse and torture. We bear responsibility in assisting their nations as they transform themselves into successful democratic entities. In so doing, we can also prevent the dire conditions of poverty and political and religious extremism that have led to terrorism and tyrannical regimes throughout the region and the world.

While I will support this measure because our nation must complete what we have started, my vote is by no means an endorsement of the Administration's policies in Iraq, which are severely deficient in accountability, clarity and vision. I know that many of my colleagues share my reservations, and I look forward to the upcoming amendment process as an opportunity to address some of these concerns. I urge the Administration to pay close attention to our debate and recognize that a serious shift in strategy and attitude is needed immediately if we are to avoid having this same discussion again in the near future.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, when President Bush's $87 billion supplemental request was presented to the Appropriations Committee, Chairman YOUNG, Chairman LEWIS and Chairman KOLBE had corrected a number of serious deficiencies in the President's budget request. For that reason, I reluctantly voted to support the committee bill with the hope that the serious weaknesses that still remained would be strengthened as the bill moved through the process.

Unfortunately, that has not happened. Therefore, I will not support the supplemental bill before us today, because the majority has chosen to prevent the House from addressing the concerns many of my colleagues and I still have on the critical questions American taxpayers are asking. Questions such as: Are we doing all we can for our troops? How are we going to engage the international community for financial support? How are we going to pay for the $87 billion price tag and where is the accountability for this enormous and unprecedented request?

The Obey amendment is the very amendment that best addresses these critical questions. Yet the House will not be allowed to vote on it. And for good reason, because if given the opportunity, the majority knows it would pass. The Obey amendment strengthens the quality of life provisions of our troops, provides accountability to the taxpayers and to Congress, and pays for the $87 billion request instead of adding it to the already enormous debt created by the misguided policies of this Administration—a debt that will be passed on to our children and our children's children.

Let me briefly highlight some of the key provisions of the Obey amendment. First, the Obey amendment addresses quality of life issues for our troops by helping to correct some of the alarming conditions our troops have found themselves. For example, as reported by our colleagues who have visited Iraq, not all our fighting men and women in Iraq have purified drinking water, and many of our troops are getting sick and suffering from dysentery as a result. The Obey amendment, had we been allowed to vote on it, would have provided enough funding for purified drinking water plants so that all our troops have clean water, not just one of nine U.S. bases in Iraq as proposed by the Administration, which would leave 80 percent of the troops unprotected.

The Obey amendment also shows respect and appreciation for the sacrifices made by our troops by providing reservists with pre-deployment medical and dental screening, which they now pay for themselves. The amendment also extends their health care coverage from 60 days to six months following deployments and provides for an adequate supply of prepaid phone cards so all U.S. soldiers can call home. Finally, because troops are currently required to pay their own transportation home once they have reached the U.S., the Obey amendment pays for the R&R transportation costs for troops on a 12-month deployment. Unfortunately, these important quality of life issues for our troops will not be permitted to be a part of the bill before us.

Second, the Obey amendment engages the international community financially by devoting $7 billion to a trust fund at the World Bank. The advantage of the World Bank is that these funds would be conditioned on contributions of at least $3.5 billion from other nations. The accumulated $10.5 billion could then be used as security for an additional $42 billion in World Bank bonds for the reconstruction in Iraq. This would help to eliminate the drain on our own U.S. Treasury by generating the vast majority of the estimated $54 billion needed for Iraq reconstruction. Equally as important is the fact that using the World Bank would eliminate the cronyism and no-bid contracts that have been awarded to Haliburton and Bechtel with funds from the first supplemental bill. As we all know, there is still little disclosure about these no-bid contracts and their resultant long-term costs. Again, the majority has denied us a vote on this important issue.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Obey amendment would fully pay for the $87 billion supplemental appropriation by returning the tax rate for individuals with incomes in excess of $350,000 to the level that existed in January 2001. That means that although they will not get the bonus tax cut, the richest one percent will still get the largest tax cut provided to any American. Given the sacrifices that are being made by our servicemen and women and their families, having the richest Americans do their fair share to pay for this appropriation with a smaller tax cut honors the American spirit of ''shared sacrifice.'' Yet again, the majority will prevent this House from voting on the Obey proposal that would pay for this costly appropriation.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, is the issue of accountability, another key issue the House will be unable to adequately address on behalf of the American people, who have a right to know how their tax money is being spent. What makes the lack of transparency and accountability for this $87 billion even more incredible is the fact that the Administration has failed to account for the $63 billion Congress already allocated for the safety of our troops. This is critical especially when we know that the full $63 billion that should have gone for Kevlar flak jacket ''body armor'' and jammers to block the radio signals used to detonate the remote controlled bombs never reached all our troops. Why the current civilian leaders in the Pentagon failed to provide these life-saving supplies to our troops prior to the U.S. invasion of Iraq and even after it became apparent that these shortages were costing American lives must be answered. And it must be answered before we give Secretary Rumsfeld discretion to spend over an estimated $9 billion of taxpayer dollars without being accountable to Congress and the American people for how the money will be spent.

For those who say we cannot afford to wait—that this is an emergency and our troops need these funds right away—I would direct them to the report by the Congressional Research Service on this very question. CRS states that based on the available sums provided through the regular FY '04 Defense Appropriations Bill that military operations can be sustained until early May of next year, and that the billions of dollars of unobligated funds remaining in the last supplemental appropriations also can be used to address the immediate needs of our troops. That means that we can protect our troops and Congress can take the time to get this right and have our questions answered. We do not have to hastily pass $87 billion of taxpayers' dollars in order to meet the Administration's arbitrary deadline.

Since the bill before the House today leaves too many unanswered questions and because the majority has prevented this House from voting on the key policy issues that responsibly should be considered before giving away $87 billion of taxpayers' money, I believe my vote against this appropriation is a responsible vote. Hopefully, it will send a clear message to the Bush Administration that we must pass a bill giving real protection to our troops and improving their quality of life while at the same time requiring a clearly defined plan with transparency and accountability that does not saddle future generations with a huge debt that prevents us from addressing the needs of Americans in our own country.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has a responsibility to work with the President to protect the national security of our nation. When our soldiers are sent in to war, it is the Congress' responsibility to make sure that all resources necessary are provided to carry out their missions. Although I disagreed with President Bush's request for unrestricted use of force against Iraq, such a resolution was approved by Congress. It was clear to me from the outset that although we would win the war, the Administration did not have an adequate plan to win the peace; that is, to rebuild Iraq, and to establish democratic institutions in that abused country. To succeed after the war it was critical to engage the international community. Yet the Administration refused to seek international support early or to share responsibility with the international community for the governing of Iraq.

Because of these failures, Americans have paid a heavy price. It is primarily American troops stationed in Iraq that face continuing attacks. It is our taxpayers that are being asked to almost exclusively pay the cost to rebuild Iraq.

I stand behind our brave men and women who have performed admirably in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have made tremendous sacrifices on behalf of their country and have served longer deployments than expected. We should provide our troops with all the resources necessary to carry out their mission. Therefore it is necessary to support the supplemental appropriations bill. Most of the funds in this bill will go directly to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. The funding of the reconstruction efforts are also fundamental to the successful completion of our missions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

However, I believe that the Administration's request of $18 billion for reconstruction requires a higher level of scrutiny. There were a series of amendments considered by Congress during the consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill that I supported. These amendments included:

(1) An amendment to transfer some of the Iraqi reconstruction funds to repair and replace military equipment used in current operations, as well as improve the quality of life for the families of active and reserve forces. The amendment failed by a vote of 209 to 216.

(2) An amendment which would have converted half of the Iraqi reconstruction grants into loans. This amendment was similar to an amendment that was adopted by the Senate yesterday. Although the amendment failed in the House by a vote of 200 to 226, I hope in conference the House will agree with the Senate action.

(3) An amendment which I authored with Congressman KIND of Wisconsin, which would have reduced the reconstruction funds to Iraq by 50 percent. I sponsored that amendment because I thought it was important for the administration to obtain more help from the international community, use loans rather than grants, provide more details to Congress and the American people on the use of these funds, have a plan to transfer authority to Iraqis, and have a plan to bring home our troops stationed in Iraq within a reasonable period of time. The Administration could then seek Congressional approval of additional resources if needed once these conditions have been met. Unfortunately, the amendment failed by a vote of 156 to 267.

The Administration has relied almost exclusively on U.S. troops to take most of the risks in Iraq. The Administration's ''go-it-alone'' strategy must end. I am pleased that on Thursday the United Nations unanimously adopted a resolution, initiated by the Secretary of State Colin Powell, which will strengthen the role of the United Nations and the international community in the reconstruction of Iraq. Iraq must make a transition to a nation that adopts a constitution, holds elections, and creates a democratic government that respects minority rights and operates under the rule of law. The U.S. must show enough flexibility in working with our allies to effectively implement this U.N. resolution, so that other countries will pledge both troops and funds to alleviate the burden on our American soldiers and taxpayers. Ultimately, the quickest way to bring our troops back home is to reach out more aggressively to the international community, establish order and security in Iraq, and transfer authority to the Iraqis.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, from the outset I have opposed the Bush administration's approach to Iraq. It embraced the notion of preemptive strike where the U.S. could act alone when it determined that there was a threat, even if that threat did not pose imminent danger to the United States. Within this misguided doctrine of the Administration, other nations and the United Nations would merely be notified of an American decision with little emphasis on the United States using our unique leadership position in the world community to obtain support for collective action; strengthening the international role rather than the U.S. going it alone.

As the administration was moving to implement their doctrine, I joined others in actively opposing it. When the President asked for the authority to undertake unilateral military action against Iraq, I worked with others to draft an alternative that required the President to come back to the Congress for its approval before taking unilateral military action in the absence of authorization by the U.N. Security Council.

Unfortunately, our resolution did not pass. The rest is history—the use of false arguments to justify unilateral action, the failure to find weapons of mass destruction that were reasons given for taking unilateral military action, the inadequate planning for the aftermath in Iraq, the lack of accountability by the administration on spending to date, and the irresponsibility of not providing our troops the ceramic body armor strong enough to stop bullets fired from assault rifles.

Once again, domestic public and international pressures have forced the administration to consult in recent days with the international community through the U.N. We need to be clear that ensuring the U.N. and the international community a meaningful role in rebuilding Iraq isn't just a matter of approving a new U.N. resolution. The Administration's words must be backed by action and a change in its approach in Iraq.

So today the question for Congress remains—now that the U.S. is where it is, what should happen next?

I totally reject the propagandistic framing of the issue yesterday by Majority Leader TOM DELAY. The issue is not whether or not one supports the battle against terrorism. Mr. DELAY mistakenly describes that if you are for the battle, you are for the supplemental appropriation, and if against that battle, against the supplemental. During this debate we have heard a strong bi-partisan commitment to supporting our troops and to the reconstruction of Iraq. Whether one voted for or—as I did—against the resolution authorizing the President to unilaterally undertake a war with Iraq, we all take seriously the responsibility to protect our troops and stabilize Iraq now.

The Administration and the Republican majority have resisted dividing the issue before us into two parts: the $65 billion for military equipment and services to support of our armed forces, and $20 billion for reconstruction efforts in Iraq. I think it is useful to consider each of the two components on their own as well as their connections.

As to the $65 billion, there seem only two realistic alternatives. One is to pull out American armed forces quickly and thus oppose the $65 billion. The other is to conclude that such a withdrawal would only add to the chaos and take a chance on what would result. No one has seriously suggested a third alternative—to say but to reduce significantly the $65 billion in military assistance.

Going beyond the rhetoric that the U.S. should not ''cut and run,'' I believe that an abrupt withdrawal of American troops, once the Administration positioned them in Iraq, would lead to chaos that could result in turmoil and potentially dangerous results in Iraq as well as the entire region.

Then, how about the $20 billion for reconstruction? No matter how strongly one opposed the unilateral, pre-emptive military action by the Bush Administration, it is hard to conclude that the U.S. should not bear any responsibility for reconstruction efforts. No matter how vehemently one rejected the Administration's misguided notion that everything would easily fall in place after the military captured Iraq, and how frightful was the lack of effective planning by the administration for its aftermath, it seems inescapable that our Nation must now assist substantially in reconstruction efforts.

But this does not mean that we should bear all the costs and basically control the decisions in this period of reconstruction. As usual, the Administration has dug in its heels, and said it is their way and nothing else. I regret that the Majority Leadership in the House would not even allow a vote on the Obey amendment, which would have offset the entire $87 billion cost of the Iraq package by rolling back a small portion of the 2001 tax cuts for the top 1 percent of income earners in this country. Instead, every dollar of this package will be added to the already huge Federal deficit.

We tried in the House to build into American assistance a mixture of grants and loans. I voted for this approach and was disappointed that it lost by a narrow margin because there were more Republicans who supported the idea than voted for it as a result of pressure from their leadership and the White House. One reason to support this approach is that it is likely to further the Iraqi engagement and investment in the decision making process and results of reconstruction.

The Senate last night passed an amendment that provides for a mixture of grants and loans. The way it is worded, it might well lead to a greater financial responsibility on the part of other nations.

The action of the Senate provides a real hope that the final package will have a mixture

of financing and spread the cost of reconstruction with other nations and Iraq, which possesses the second largest reserves of oil in the world. I believe, therefore, there is now more, not less, reason to support the $20 billion for reconstruction.

Therefore, if one does not oppose the $65 billion for the Armed Forces and one does not believe that we can avoid substantial involvement in the reconstruction of Iraq, my conclusion is that a yes vote is warranted today. I will withhold a decision on the conference bill that is now necessitated by the Senate action last night because an effort to strip out the Senate provision on a loan would again call into question this administration's commitment to internationalizing the reconstruction of Iraq. A major reason to vote no on this bill would be to protest further the mistaken path followed by the Administration from the very start. I respect that approach, through I have chosen otherwise on this bill and I will continue to urge that the mind set and the perspectives of this administration that led them to their go-it-alone actions in Iraq are more than adequate cause for their defeat at the ballot box in 2004.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I was horrified to learn that tens of thousands of our troops were sent out to battle without proper armor. And to this day, they still lack many necessary items. I spoke with several soldiers who suffered injuries to their legs, and many who totally lost their legs when bullets crashed through their vehicles because the cars were not fortified with armored plates. I met with soldiers who suffered chest injuries because they did not have bulletproof vests.

This is a very important issue, and I want the American public to clearly understand this point. Even though we have 44,000 soldiers in Iraq today without proper bulletproof vests, the President asked for absolutely nothing to protect these troops. Let me repeat that. We have 44,000 soldiers in Iraq without body armor, and the President didn't ask for a single cent to protect these soldiers. I guess these brave men and women will have to wait until Halliburton starts making body armor before they can get the protection they need and deserve.

Congress approved $310 million in April to buy 300,000 bulletproof vests for our troops. But sadly, only $75 million of that money has gone to the Army office that is responsible for purchasing these vests. Where is the accountability that this Administration promised this nation?

The Republicans keep telling us this bill is all about the soldiers, and everyone in this Congress supports our soldiers. but how can a bill for our soldiers not include money for basic protections like Body Armor, Boots, Camouflage, Rucksacks, Armored Vehicles, Tank Tracks, Humvee Tires, Signal Jammers, and Chemical Suits. We can't even provide these brave men and women with simple necessities like drinking water, showers, tennis shoes, and even toothpaste.

Just six months ago, we appropriated $79 billion dollars for the war effort, and yet relatives have resorted to buying body armor in the U.S. and shipping it to troops in Iraq. What happened to this money, Mr. President? These families and this Congress want and deserve to know.

Yesterday I was shocked to find out that the Services did not fully meet immunization and other predeployment requirements. Based on GAO review of deployments from four installations, between 14 and 46 percent of servicemembers were missing at least one of their required immunizations prior to deployment. As many as 36 percent of the servicemembers were missing two or more of their required immunizations, such as influenza and hepatitis. We cannot send our servicemembers to war without first making certain that they are protected from in-theater disease threats. We need to take care of the basics for our troops!

The American people who are writing the check for Iraq do not want a grant program. Like anyone who lends money in the real world, they want their money back. I would encourage every citizen to call their Senators and Congressperson to let them know that you do not support another Blank Check slush fund for this Administration.

Vote no on this bill, and no on another blank check for the President and his campaign contributors. Mr. President, this account is already overdrawn.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I come before you today to urge your continued support for the War on Terror. While there has been spirited debate in this Chamber during the past two days, the stakes are too high for us not to meet the obligations and responsibilities at hand. Make no mistake about it: by passing this War on Terror Bill, we are investing in the future safety and security of the American people.

None of us will ever forget September 11th, 2001, when terrorists attacked our freedom, our peacefulness, our American way of life. I still remember looking out my office window and seeing the smoke from the Pentagon attack rolling across the Washington Mall, at that moment, I knew this Congress—Republicans and Democrats—would stand shoulder-to-shoulder with our President to say ''Never Again.'' The very next day, this House moved swiftly.

We approved emergency funding to rebuild what the terrorists destroyed, and to buttress our homeland security and our intelligence efforts. We enacted new, stringent laws giving our judicial system and law enforcement the tools necessary to fight this new war on terrorism. We embarked on the most ambitious reorganization of our federal government in more than 50 years, establishing a Department of Homeland Security, whose core mission is to prevent terrorist attacks against America.

Now, we must approach the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan with the same vigor with which we undertook the defense of our homeland. The pending legislation does just that. It is estimated that the Terrorists of 9/11 spent less than $500,000 to undertake an operation whose economic toll far exceeds $150 Billion. There is no question as to the significant economic consequences that terrorism holds for the global economy. Yet, there are those who question the need for this War on Terror Bill. Worse yet, they also question our overall mission—

Why are we in Iraq?

Why are we in Afghanistan?

Why spend this money in this way?

Let me be clear; to protect America: Terrorism cannot stand; Terrorism must be rooted out and destroyed.

My colleagues, we have taken the battle to the enemy. Iraq and Afghanistan are now the central fronts in the War on Terror. Our brave men and women in uniform are stamping out terrorists in Baghdad, Iraq and Kandahar, Afghanistan before these methodical killers strike Brooklyn, New York, or Batavia, Illinois.

And while much remains to be achieved, the Commander in Chief and is National Security Team are having remarkable success. We liberated the people of Afghanistan from the Taliban's cruel grip; We rid Iraq of the evil of Saddam Hussein; We have taken into custody hundreds of al-Qaida operatives and benefactors, reducing the likelihood of future attacks on all countries. And, we have begun to sever the financial ties that bank roll these evil acts. Terrorist training camps in Iraq and Afghanistan have been uncovered and destroyed; Forty-three of the fifty-five most wanted former Iraqi leaders are dead or in custody; and, thousands of other Baath Party loyalists and terrorists have met their ultimate fate.

This is an investment in our future. The President is calling on us to provide our courageous troops the tools they need to fight terrorism abroad, finish the job, and return home safely. Our President needs our continued support to help the emerging, democratic government take hold in Baghdad and Kabul. This cause is worthy of our assistance. While I have heard some say we should use this money to rebuild our roads, bridges, and schools here at home, I must remind my colleagues that peace and stability in Iraq and Afghanistan is very much an investment in America's safety and security—both now and in the future.

We all know that until democracy firmly takes root in these two nations, Americans, joined by troops from Poland, Australia, Britain, and thirty allied countries will remain on the ground, risking their lives on our behalf. To date, some sixty nations from around the globe have already pledged their support. Why? Because they understand keenly that what happens in Iraq and Afghanistan affects the Persian Gulf and beyond.

Running water, functioning electricity, an impartial judicial system, and properly trained law enforcement are basic, and essential elements of a government infrastructure that must be in place before we should leave. When it comes to our commitment of resources, let's do it right from the outset so our American military can finish these missions and return home as soon as possible—safe and sound.

Let me be clear: this is much more than a vote on dollars and cents; this is a vote to protect Americans from future attacks both at home and abroad.

We pledged on September 11th, 2001, we would ''Never Again'' fail to do what's necessary. Let us not fail today.

Vote ''yes'' on this War on Terror Spending Bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to talk about the brave men and women who are fighting in Iraq at this very moment; the hundreds who lost their lives; and the thousands who have been wounded.

Despite the fact that Congress appropriated $310,000 in April for bulletproof vests, nearly one-third of the 130,000 U.S. troops in Iraq still have not been issued these vests, which are strong enough to stop bullets from assault rifles. Nor have most of our troops been issued CamelBak hydration systems to protect them from the scorching desert heat. In fact,

many families have resorted to sending protective bulletproof vests and CamelBak hydration systems to their sons and daughters stationed in Iraq. No family should be paying extra to help keep their loved ones safe; the federal government has this responsibility. After all, who sent these young people to war in the first place? Certainly not their families.

In August of this year, I stayed in Bethesda Naval Hospital where I visited with wounded men and women and their families who will never again experience the world in the same way as a result of this war. We don't talk about the impact of this war. In fact, we don't talk about the impact of any war on the wounded and their loved ones. I met with individuals who had lost limbs, their sight, their hearing, parts of their beautiful faces, and we are still not providing our troops with the best equipment available!

Mr. Chairman, we must do the right thing for our troops and give them the support they deserve, in the way they deserve it. Now is the time to make permanent the increases to the Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance, which Congress approved for our soldiers only through next year. We must make the commitment to our troops, right now, that we will take care of them after this war is over. That means ensuring the permanent end to the Disabled Veterans Tax by providing full concurrent receipt for all veterans. And it means not denying, but treating, the illnesses they will face ten, twenty, and thirty years down the road.

It is pretty simple, really. If we are willing to spend another $65 billion to keep our troops in danger, then we must care enough to bring them home, bring them home safely, bring them home soon, and support them after the war. Since I see no real commitment to doing this from the Administration, and I see no real reason for being in Iraq in the first place, I will be voting no on the supplemental.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support a bailout for poor preparation and bad foreign policy. The President squandered the $79 billion that Congress appropriated in April. He is now requesting an $87 billion blank check, and I will not vote to sign it.

This year, America will run the largest deficit in our history—more than $475 billion, excluding the President's request for Iraq. The $87 billion would be better used to create jobs and improve health care and education for Americans.

The substitute to the President's request offered by Congressman DAVID OBEY in the Appropriations Committee is a far better alternative. The Obey substitute insists on accountability and transparency for the expenditure of reconstruction dollars and encourages support from other nations thereby reducing the burden on American taxpayers.

Unfortunately, the Obey substitute was rejected in the Appropriations Committee and Republican leadership has blocked it from consideration by the full House. But the Obey substitute offered the best plan for fixing the chaos in post-war Iraq.

I voted against the original bill authorizing the President to use force against Iraq, but once our troops were put in harms way I, like all members of Congress, have done everything necessary to support our troops. Despite many reservations about going to war, my colleagues and I overwhelmingly supported the President's $79 billion supplemental to cover the cost of deploying and operating troops in Iraq. At that time, it was the largest supplemental bill ever considered by Congress.

These funds were to cover our troops' basic necessities such as water, body armor and the correct equipment needed for a desert conflict. I thought the necessary funds had been provided to achieve victory and bring our troops home swiftly and safely, and I assumed the President had a plan.

Yet, six months later, 80 percent of U.S. troops have been drinking putrid water and whole units have come down with dysentery. As many as 40,000 troops do not have the standard issue body armor and, in fact, are using outdated body armor from the Vietnam era.

Our Guard and Reserve Forces are caught in a hidden draft. They are being required to serve far longer in Iraq than they had been told because the troop rotation schedule is in chaos.

Sadly, this could have been avoided because the war on Iraq was a war of choice, not of necessity.

The administration's two primary reasons for the war—Saddam Hussein's alleged weapons of mass destruction and his alleged links to Al-Qaeda—were both intentionally exaggerated to build support for that war. No weapons of mass destruction have been found and the President has now downplayed the alleged link between Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaeda.

If the aftermath of the war were going well, Americans would probably overlook the deliberately misrepresented intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and its ties to Al-Qaeda. Now, as Americans are killed almost every day and it is clear that winning the peace will be a long, difficult and expensive process, people are questioning how we got to where we are today.

The swell of opposition to the President's request should surprise no one.

The American people are learning that the President's insistence on a unilateral war means that we will pay for a unilateral peace.

Even our closest allies are reluctant to pay for the aftermath of our war. International donors scheduled to meet in Madrid next month are expected to contribute no more than $2 billion to the reconstruction effort, while most recent estimates to rebuild Iraq over the next four years call for $55 billion above the President's current request.

By channeling $7 billion of reconstruction funds through the World Bank, the Obey substitute would reduce the burden on American taxpayers. This is an effective way to prevent cronyism in reconstruction contracts and to encourage international donors to contribute to the redevelopment of Iraq. The World Bank is much more likely to rely on indigenous workers and companies to carry out construction projects than is an organization that is tied to political appointees in the White House.

The President's request allows for sole-source, no bid contracts to be awarded without the notification of Congress. This is a thinly disguised appropriation for Halliburton, Bechtel and the President's other fundraisers. The Obey substitute includes mechanisms that limit these contracts and directs funding to cost-effective projects, rather than the large, capital-intensive, expensive contracts the President favors.

Mr. Chairman, the Obey substitute is an excellent proposal that will provide for much more effective reconstruction in Iraq.

The Obey substitute also provides the body armor, adequate purified drinking water, portable jammers and 20,000 additional troops to relive Guard and Reserve Forces. It allows our troops to finish their jobs and return home quickly and safely. It prepares for the return of our Guard and Reserve Forces by extending their healthcare coverage from 60 days to 6 months. The Obey substitute will force the President to fess up to the actual long-term costs of our military action, relieve pressure on the Guard and Reserve over time and make our troops safer.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed the President's war on Iraq, but I support the Obey substitute amendment. It makes better use of our limited resources to fix a horrible and dangerous situation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, Congress will provide the necessary support for our troops and we will make a significant investment in stabilizing and rebuilding Iraq. The question before Congress is how best to provide that troop support and how to make the appropriate investment in both Iraq and Afghanistan—two troubled nations that the United States now ''owns'' as a result of the Bush administration's policies. This $87 billion supplemental appropriation is not the best answer.

We have already provided huge sums that have not been well spent. The costs of Iraq policy are approaching $200 billion dollars of borrowed money with no end in sight. Our troops continue to have unmet needs that were entirely foreseen, like the flat jacket liners and armoring of vehicles. Tales abound of questionable expenditures and contracts, yet proposals were included in this request that simply don't meet the laugh test; millions of dollars for garbage trucks, zip codes, and a witness protection program (at $1,000,000 a person). It was wrong to give this administration a blank check to wage unilateral war and it is wrong to give them a blank check for reconstruction.

During debate, I offered an amendment that would save American taxpayers a quarter of a billion dollars and would have transferred money from Iraq reconstruction efforts to provide $247 million in additional funding for Afghanistan—a country with the same population as Iraq, an even larger land area, and that is still harboring terrorists.

Decades of conflict of Afghanistan, including the war against the Soviet Union, have left about 2 million dead and created 700,000 widows and orphans. Afghanistan remains a hot bed and safe haven for Al Qaeda—responsible for the launching of murderous attacks against the U.S. The UN estimates that 5–7 million unexploded landmines are scattered throughout the country. An estimated 400,000 Afghans have been killed or wounded by mines, leading to the highest per capita number of amputees in the world.

Estimates for reconstruction in Afghanistan range as high as $30 billion over the next decade. There is no shortage of need and the bottom line is we can do much more. Even after the $500 million this amendment removes from Iraq reconstruction, that country is still receiving the most generous aid package in history. Afghanistan was a real threat. We need to do more to make sure Afghanistan does not again spin out of control.

While my amendment did not pass, I was encouraged by the reaction of my colleagues

from both sides of the aisle who recognize the importance of additional funding in Afghanistan. I will continue to fight to ensure that the administration's discredited program for Iraq does not leave other Middle East priorities under-funded and ineffective.

Even though the administration was wrong to claim that this Iraq reconstruction could be financed by Iraq's own oil revenues, and even though it will be ill advised to hopelessly burden the future Iraqi government, the American public should not bare the burden of vast sums of borrowed money because the administration had neither the foresight nor the patience to develop realistic plans and partnerships. We should be working with creditors like the Russians and the French as well as international organizations like The World Bank to soften the impact on American tax payers.

While this proposal has been improved by the Appropriations Committee, it still falls short. There is still too much spent on the wrong things and administered by the wrong people. Congress does no favors to our troops, our citizens, or the Iraqi people, to continue to fund the administration's ill-advised plans.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, it is with a heavy heart that I vote for this bill. While I am deeply troubled at the prospect of adding even more to our rapidly spiraling debt, poor planning and severe mismanagement by the White House have left 113,000 American troops in a deadly situation in Iraq without the training or equipment they need.

We cannot make this bill a retroactive referendum on all the mistakes President Bush has made about this war. Nearly $65 billion in this bill is for our troops who are still in Iraq and Afghanistan, and they desperately need it. When I went to Iraq last month, I learned that there are literally thousands of American troops there who lack basic life-saving equipment like bullet-proof vests. How can we tell them their lives are not worth the price tag?

If we don't send the money our troops need, we leave them stranded in an incredibly dangerous environment. If we pull out our troops now, we will leave innocent Iraqis in a security and economic situation worse than before the war began and our own country more vulnerable.

I attempted to amend this bill to hold the administration more accountable for the $20 billion they are requesting for reconstruction. I believe that part, but not all, of the responsibility for reconstructing Iraq lies with the United States, and I call on the administration to increase its efforts to seek international support to pay for the reconstruction of Iraq. Until it is stabilized and self-governing, Iraq will remain a potential breeding ground for terrorism in a volatile region.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to put good public policy over politics and ensure bills as distasteful as these cease to be the norm in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3289, President Bush's $87 billion funding request for Iraq. This supplemental appropriations bill is not about showing support for our troops. We are all united behind their courageous efforts. This is about where the United States goes from here.

I think most Americans realized that our commitment overseas would be lengthy and it would be costly. However, the Administration has been unwilling or unable to state its plans for the creation of stable representative governments, able to police and defend themselves, in Iraq or in Afghanistan. We have absolutely no idea how long troops will be stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan and we have no idea how much money will be required to complete this mission. When pressed by the Appropriations Committee for answers on these points, the Administration declined to give any answers. That is not good enough. It is time for the President to provide us all with answers to those questions.

I understand that the President cannot set out a precise timetable for troop withdrawal and he may not be able to provide a guaranteed final budget figure. I am not expecting that level of detail. However, I do expect, and this great country deserves, basic information about the future of this mission. That information is not forthcoming, and yet we are being asked to provide an additional $87 billion for an effort that has already cost billions of dollars and hundreds of American lives—without an end in sight to costing more of both.

I opposed the initial decision to invade Iraq because I did not believe that we had given the international inspectors sufficient time to confirm the President's allegations. Furthermore, I do not agree that the United States can or should impose democracy by force. I believe that my vote was correct at the time and every passing day confirms my conviction that I judged rightly. I did not approve of the initial invasion, and until I hear a responsible and realistic plan for dealing with the consequences of the invasion, I cannot in good conscience vote to approve these funds.

I fear that we are lacking more than an exit strategy. We need a foreign policy. This Administration has failed to meet the challenges of the post Cold War, post 9/11 world. Today, I insist on a plan for Iraq. Further, I would respectfully ask for clarification on our plans relative to other countries—notably North Korea, Iran and Syria. I understand that these countries differ from Iraq, and from each other, in their domestic politics and geopolitical importance. Nonetheless, the President has singled out these countries as he did Iraq. How does he plan on addressing his stated concerns relative to each of these? Does he plan another military campaign? Will he rely on diplomacy? Will he engage the international community?

Finally, I would certainly approve the replacement of armaments used in Iraq—we need a well-equipped military. I would approve funds to rebuild Iraq—we have an obligation to leave that country on its feet when we depart and the world expects no less. I would approve funding to increase the size of our military so that Congress would not have to resort to the use of private security to protect our military bases as this proposal allows. If necessary, I would approve funds to provide basic necessities for our troops—such as Kevlar, adequately armored vehicles, necessary communications equipment and comfortable living accommodations. However, I believe that these latter items should have been funded in the annual Defense appropriation; they are foreseeable and should have been available prior to engagement.

I have supported similar appropriations requests in the past, for Iraq and for Afghanistan. I would support similar funding if it were accompanied by a plausible plan for the phased withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. However, absent such information, I cannot, and will not, support this request for funding at this time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the most solemn and weighty power conferred by our Constitution upon the Congress is the power to declare war and the power of the purse.

Last year, Congress abdicated its constitutional responsibility by approving a deeply-flawed resolution that gave the President the power to initiate a preemptive war against Iraq, which, in my judgment, expressed at that time, did not pose a clear and present danger to the United States. I opposed that resolution in the strong belief that Congress should have required the President to seek a formal declaration of war because the President had failed to demonstrate a link between Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorist attacks of September 11, failure to prove the presence in Iraq of chemical, biological weapons of mass destruction, a nuclear capability, or the capacity to deliver such weapons against the United States.

After September 11, our Nation was united in common purpose to combat terrorism, and the United States enjoyed near universal support among the community of nations for our actions to destroy the al Qaeda terrorist bases and their Taliban protectors in Afghanistan. While this Administration has not yet been able to achieve many of the goals for Afghanistan, I support the funding in this legislation for continued support to complete our mission there.

Our military campaign against al Qaeda and the Taliban enjoyed strong bipartisan support, and Congress moved quickly to appropriate the necessary funds to carry out this important mission. In the aftermath of the U.S. lightening military strike that toppled the Taliban in Afghanistan, the President maneuvered fervently to muster support at home and abroad for a preemptive war against Iraq. Even though these efforts failed to mobilize the support of many of our key allies, the Administration launched this unilateral war against Iraq, with the result that, we squandered the moral high ground and the support of the international community.

The Administration finds itself in this uncomfortable position, and also has retreated from presidential candidate Bush's pledge not to engage the United States in nation-building during his presidency. Now staring in the face of the reality of a long-term, debilitating military occupation of Iraq, the President has asked Congress to approve a second supplemental payment for the ongoing military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, without providing to Congress and the American people a full accounting of how the previous billions of taxpayer dollars were used, nor a detailed plan for how this money will be utilized. On that point, Congress must assert its constitutional responsibilities to ensure that this spending request is consistent with our national and international budget priorities. Because of the President's misguided economic and foreign policies, this $87 billion request represents money that we will have to borrow, which will increase the national debt, and this spending also represents dollars that could have been utilized to meet urgent needs at home.

It is very troubling that this Administration has expended considerable time and energy

to advance a divisive agenda at home and abroad that has not improved our national security. Recently, Congress approved the first appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security, which provides $30 billion for that agency to fulfill its critical responsibilities. The money in this supplemental package that we will spend in Iraq over the next several months is roughly equal to funding the Office of Homeland Security for three years—which raises the question, which is the more appropriate use of $87 billion to promote our national security.

The policy option the President and his team have set before the Congress and the American people will add $87 billion to our already exploding national debt while refusing to ask the wealthiest of the wealthy to forego a portion of their tax breaks in order to help finance this war. At a time when our brave men and women in the armed forces have made significant sacrifices for their nation, and some have made the ultimate sacrifice, it is unthinkable that the President has not asked wealthy Americans to make a modest sacrifice to pay for this war. It is further shameful that the Administration has failed to deliver on its pledge to restore Iraq's oil exports to pay for its own reconstruction.

Because the President failed to win broad international support for this war, the U.S. taxpayer must shoulder the costs of this ill-advised military campaign. It is quite clear, as well, that this $87 billion spending package will not be the final payment, as Congress will be asked to approve billions of additional dollars for Iraq, for many years to come, if this Administration remains in office and on its chosen course.

This supplemental request for Iraq, like all spending bills, reflects our national priorities. In the current budget environment, we must be ever mindful that every dollar that we borrow and spend in Iraq is a dollar that is added to the national debt and denies funds that we need to educate our children, heal the sick, and improve our infrastructure in this country. With this spending request, the President has made clear that he supports massive deficit-spending that will burden working families in this country, and opposes shard sacrifice for the rich or international burden sharing.

In short, this $87 billion spending bill is fiscally irresponsible, fundamentally unfair, and ignores our urgent domestic needs to finance a failed foreign policy. Congress has already provided a blank check for the President to initiate war; Congress must now reassert its constitutional responsibility and deny President Bush a blank check to continue this misguided mission. I cannot vote for this policy of ever-spiraling failure.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for this supplemental appropriations bill.

I voted against the resolution that authorized the President to begin military actions in Iraq at a time and under conditions of his own choosing, regardless of the likely costs and sacrifices that would be required. I was concerned that the Bush administration had a plan only for invasion, not for the subsequent ''peace'' and occupation, and was too ready to go it alone.

But Congress unwisely authorized the President to make Iraq the center of our war on terrorism, even without broad-based international support, and did so without a responsible debate that fully weighed the pros and cons of this strategic choice.

In short, I did not think Congress should give the President such a blank check—but we did, and the bills are coming due.

The people of Iraq are freer with Saddam Hussein out of power—at least for now—but our go-it-alone policies have left us with few friends willing to help cover the costs of his removal or Iraq's reconstruction. And with both the stories Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and Saddam himself among the missing, it remains an open question whether the major result of our invasion and occupation of Iraq will be to make America safer or to fuel anti-American sentiment and support for terrorism in the Islamic world. It would be a terrible irony if the way we have waged this war means a critical loss of precious momentum against al-Qaeda and the creation of conditions for more attacks on our country.

So now, President Bush, having gotten us into one hell of a mess, is asking Congress for an emergency appropriation of $87 billion—the largest supplemental appropriations in history.

He is requesting this enormous sum at a time when our economy is weak and when domestic programs are being shortchanged. With 2.7 million jobs lost since 2001, we are on track to see a net loss of jobs over a presidential term for the first time since the Great Depression. New estimates project $5 trillion in Federal deficits over the next decade. And the president wants more tax cuts primarily benefiting the wealthy, despite escalating needs for national defense, homeland security, health care and education.

With the bills coming due, there are several questions to consider. First, should they be paid? I think the answer is yes. I support equipping our troops. And I support the concept of helping Iraq rebuild. I think a stable Iraq is in our national interest. A stable Iraq means a secure Iraq, which leads to a safer environment for our troops and eventually their ticket home.

But I don't support the idea that American taxpayers should pay for the entire $87 billion package.

And that leads me to the second question—who should pay the bills for Iraq? The bill we are voting on today puts the responsibility for rebuilding Iraq squarely on the shoulders of the American people, who didn't ask for this burden. It puts the responsibility on the shoulders of our children, as they will inherit the debt this $87 billion package will incur. And they didn't have a say in selecting the administration that has led us into this quagmire. Still, we ask them to sacrifice.

The Administration says its reconstruction proposal is like the Marshall plan for Europe after World War II. But the Marshall plan was not a $20 billion handout: It provided loans as well as grants. One way to offset reconstruction costs could be to provide loans to Iraq, conditioned on being matched by funds from other donors. Another way is to persuade our allies to forgive part of Iraq's $200 billion debt. The House voted yesterday on a resolution urging Germany, Russia, and France to do just that.

But the best way to offset reconstruction costs is to roll back the President's tax cuts for the wealthiest taxpayers. That's why I would have preferred the Obey substitute. Under this plan, the entire $87 billion bill would be paid for by canceling the tax rate cut for individuals with incomes in the top 1 percent. The substitute would take funds from the reconstruction portion of the bill and add them to programs that help our active and reserve forces and their families with their health care. It would also add funds to repair and replace equipment used in operations and construct water treatment facilities for our troops in Iraq. It would create accountability by requiring a detailed report from the President describing how funds in the previous supplemental have been spent, how funds appropriated in this bill will be spent, and the level and types of funding needed for the future. The substitute would also convert $7 billion of the reconstruction package to loans at a trust fund at the World Bank to leverage additional World Bank loans.

But we weren't allowed to vote on this substitute. Nor were we allowed to change the terms of the debate. For weeks now we have been debating where money should be spent. We should have been debating who should pay—because so long as we refuse to discuss that, we will not be facing all the realities.

We should also have been debating about the priorities on the war on terrorism. I have always believed that Iraq was not the imminent threat this administration made it out to be. While we have been preoccupied with Iraq, we've deprived Afghanistan of the funding it needs—and now that country threatens to revert to the lawless haven for terrorism it was before 9–11. The bill includes some funding for Afghanistan, but not enough.

And we should have been debating more broadly about this country's priorities, period. Sending $87 billion to Iraq undermines our ability to address unmet domestic priorities. The amount the President has requested is more than twice the amount of the Homeland Security Department's entire budget for FY2004—and yet we will still haven't provided our States and local governments with the assistance they need to improve the security of American citizens.

The leadership has refused to allow the House to even consider changing the tax cuts—in the same way that they are insisting on combining the reconstruction costs with the funds necessary to support and supply the troops. This is not the way we should do our work.

So I cannot vote for this bill today.

Rejecting this flawed bill will not immediately cut off funds for our troops. CRS has confirmed that they have enough money to continue operations at least for the rest of this year.

It seems clear that the Senate will pass a different version of this bill. If the House considers a revised version of the bill, I hope it is one I can vote for.

But today I must vote to send the bill back to the President, with this message: I will not vote to spend billions in Iraq unless the administration does what it should already have done—that is, to provide detailed plans for Iraq's reconstruction and security; make concerted efforts to secure increased international participation under a U.N. resolution; demonstrate greater flexibility and openness toward questions of control over reconstruction and democratization; and craft a fiscally responsible plan to provide for the billions of dollars necessary.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, last spring many of us warned that unilateral military action against Iraq would open a Pandora's Box; that the President had not prepared the American people for the sacrifices that would be entailed by such an action; and that to act without the support of the international community would seriously jeopardize our ability to win the post-war peace in Iraq. Regretfully, I fear that we were right. And there is little satisfaction in that realization—because the implications for our Nation and the American people are very serious indeed. Our President and his advisors have backed this country into a corner from which there is no easy escape.

Now the President has asked this Congress—asked the American people—for an additional $87 billion for the upcoming year to pay primarily for our efforts in Iraq. This request comes on top of the $79 billion already appropriated for these purposes this fiscal year and we can be sure that this will not be the President's last request for funds for Iraq. Iraq's stabilization and reconstruction needs over the next five years have been estimated at over $50 billion—without taking into the account the costs of continued troops deployment there.

In deciding whether or not to support this request, I believe we must consider three fundamental questions:

How did we get to the situation we are in today?

In light of the current state of affairs in Iraq, is the kind of investment the President has requested necessary to enhance our security and protect our national interests? and,

If this investment is necessary, has the Administration presented us with a responsible plan that will achieve our key national objectives, both in Iraq and at home?

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

Six months ago, the President informed the American people that Saddam Hussein posed such a dangerous threat to the Untied States that we had to wage war in Iraq to protect our national security. The President and his advisors sold the Iraq war to the American people primarily based on the argument that Saddam Hussein was a ticking time bomb; that he posed a serious and growing danger to America; and that the only way to eliminate the threat was to eliminate Saddam Hussein.

The Administration's argument was based on the marriage of two claims. The first was the claim that Iraq possessed an arsenal of chemical and biological weapons and would soon obtain a nuclear weapons capability. The second was the claim that Saddam Hussein was in league with Al Qaeda. Taken together, these claims painted a very ominous picture. While many in the international community—and here at home—had strong doubts about the nature, magnitude and imminence of the threat posed by Saddam, in its rush to war, the Administration exploited the fears of a post 9/11 America. They portrayed the United Nations Security Council, the U.N. weapons inspectors, most of the international community, and critics here at home as a bunch of spineless procrastinators who wanted to look the other way in the face of a growing Iraqi threat.

It now appears that the Administration's two most fundamental arguments for war were false. After interviewing hundreds of former Iraqi military personnel and allowing more than 1,200 of our own inspectors to roam across Iraq over the last six months, we have failed to uncover any actual weapons of mass destruction. The interim report submitted by Dr. David Kay, the Administration's own arms inspector, provides no hard evidence to support the kind of danger President Bush depicted when he made the case for immediate military action. In the absence of evidence of actual weapons, U.S. officials have shifted their rhetoric to focus on ''weapons programs'' and ''the intent'' of the pre-war Iraqi regime. And while it may be true that Iraq was not in full compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions, it also appears that the sanctions regime, coupled with the inspectors deployed under Resolution 1441, was successful at containing Iraq's ambitions to develop weapons of mass destruction.

Time has also not borne out the Administration's claim that Al Qaeda was in league with Saddam Hussein. There is no credible evidence of any collaboration between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda. This argument, made over the objections of many in the intelligence community and most regional experts in this town, was a calculated effort to establish a false link in the minds of the American people between the terrible terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the need to go to war in Iraq. This strategy of fear was not based on the facts, but on a desire to do whatever it would take to win public support for the war.

It is undeniable that Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator. However, the security threat he posed to the United States was grossly exaggerated by the President and his public relations gurus. The question now looms—Having eliminated the regime of Saddam Hussein, are Americans safer today than they were six months ago?

SITUATION ON THE GROUND

By almost every measure, the U.S. post-war mission in Iraq is not going well and the Administration remains deeply divided over the best way to proceed. While it is true that we have removed Saddam Hussein from power, it is far from clear that we have made the American people more secure as a result. The jury is still out on the implications of our actions for the Middle East region, the fight against terrorism and efforts to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The Iraq of today does not reflect the rosy pre-war predictions made by the Bush Administration. The situation on the ground is far from secure. Since the President declared the end of major combat operations, 198 brave Americans have died—sixty more than died during the war itself. Hundreds more have been severely wounded. Every week more Americans are killed, more car bombs go off and more international aid workers leave the country.

Our military forces are stretched thin and our troops are prime targets for former Baasthists and other extremists in a country overflowing with supplies of arms and munitions. The senior American commander in the Persian Gulf region has told us that we are engaged in a ''guerrilla war'' in Iraq. At the same time, the political process in Baghdad is bogged down over security issues, the friction of the occupation and increasingly bitter Iraqi-American arguments over the pace of turning over control and responsibility to Iraq's Governing Council. Increasingly, we find ourselves in a shooting gallery with no real exit strategy.

Terrorist Threat. In one of the terrible ironies of the war, in the name of fighting terrorism, we have increased the level of terrorist activity in Iraq. Administration officials report that Baghdad has become a new magnet and breeding ground for extremists and terrorists from around the region. Even worse, our actions in Iraq appear to have forged a link for the first time between the fanatical Islamic extremists of Al Qaeda and the traditionally secular remnants of Saddam's Baathist regime. These two groups, ideological antagonists before the war, have now been driven together in an unholy alliance to wage war on Americans. While the terrorist attacks attributed to this newly forged partnership have so far been confined to Iraq, this virulent combination could begin to extend their activities elsewhere.

International Community. The Bush Administration's contempt for the international community in the lead-up to the war has seriously complicated our ability to gain the cooperation and assistance of the rest of the world in support of common objectives. In the immediate aftermath of September 11, 2001, the entire world stood with us in the war on terrorism. The United Nations and NATO unanimously pledged their support in our fight and multinational involvement in our mission against the Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan was the highest ever. However, today this situation has greatly changed. Our friends and allies have been unwilling to participate in a substantial way in the reconstruction effort in Iraq. Even under the auspices of a new U.N. Security Council Resolution establishing a United Nations role along side the U.S. in Iraq, very little is expected in new troops and financial pledges for the Iraqi mission.

U.S. Credibility. The Administration's misleading statements about the nature and magnitude of the Iraqi threat have undermined our credibility around the world. Secretary of State Powell's report to the United Nations prior to the war relied on forged documents and information we later admitted to be unreliable. The nuclear specter that Administration officials pointed to has been discredited. Even more recently, Administration Inspector David Kay has been forced to back down from post-war claims that two mobile trailers found in Iraq were used for making biological weapons. The huge credibility gap that now exists for the Administration undermines our future ability to sound the alarm based on sensitive intelligence matters. Future claims about Iran, North Korea and others will be viewed with deep suspicion by a more skeptical public and an international community that, as the Economist described, sees the Bush Administration as having its own arsenal of WMD—''Wielders of Mass Deception.''

Regional Stability in the Middle East. The Bush Administration's predictions that the fall of Saddam Hussein would put extremists in retreat throughout the Middle East and spur progress in the Arab-Israeli conflict have not be realized. The Arab-Israeli conflict has gone from bad to worse in the six months since the end of the Iraq war. And while it is premature to reach any conclusions about the long term effects, the Administration's prediction that the fall of Saddam Hussein would trigger a kind of democratic domino effect, spreading democracy throughout the Middle East, looks unlikely in the foreseeable future. The trend is toward more violence and polarization in that troubled region.

Conflict Management. The new ''preventive war doctrine,'' articulated by the Bush Administration to justify our action in Iraq, has set a dangerous precedent in international relations. The Administration's assertion that America has the right to attack another nation based on the perception of a future threat has—especially in light of what we know now to be faulty and hyped intelligence—undermined many of the long existing norms for international engagement. The world will become much less secure if nations with long histories of bitter differences, such as India and Pakistan, should choose to follow our example.

By almost every measure, our virtually unilateral attack on Iraq has, at least in the short term, made American less—not more—secure. The difficult question we must now face is: Where do we go from here?

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The President's request for this $87 billion marks the culmination of his repeated failures—his gross exaggeration of the threats posed by Iraq in order to justify the war; his contempt for the international community before the war; his inability to gain significant international backing to share the military burden and the financial costs of rebuilding Iraq; his failure to level with the American people about the cost and challenges of ''winning the peace''; and, the list goes on. The Bush Administration deserves to suffer the political consequences of these miscalculations, misrepresentations, and missteps. But that decision will—and should—be left to the American people at the ballot box.

In the meantime, we here in the 108th Congress have an obligation and a responsibility to limit the extent to which the American people will suffer the consequences of the President's bad decisions. These decisons have placed not just the Bush Administration—but our entire county—in a difficult predicament. The terrible irony of the war in Iraq is that, in the name of making America more secure, it has—at least for now—made us less secure.

We cannot turn back the clock. The stablization and reconstruction of Iraq is now a critical interest of the United States, Iraq and the international community. I believe that we must help in the reconstruction of Iraq for two reasons. The first is based on the simple principle: ''If you break it, you fix it.'' The second is based on our security interests in preventing another rogue state from emerging in Iraq or the outbreak of a violent crime conflict that will further destablize the volatile Middle East region and further enflame Muslim and world public opinion against the United States. Unless we invest in maintaining and protecting our troops, and in helping to rebuild Iraq, we will make a bad situation worse; we will compound the damage done by the reckless actions of this Administration—and make the challenges facing our Nation in the years to come even more difficult.

AMERICAN TROOPS ARE STILL NECESSARY

Over two thirds of the request before us—$67 billion of the $87 billion—is allocated to cover the costs of maintaining and protecting the U.S. troop presence on the ground in Iraq. These troops are providing the security framework necessary to maintain some semblance of law and order as efforts are made to create a mechanism for writing a new constitution, holding elections and returning sovereignty to an internationally recognized and legitimate Iraqi authority. The immediate withdrawal of American troops would produce tremendous instability and would likely lead to civil war between the three major communities in Iraq—the Shia, the Sunnis and the Kurds. Just as the precipitous U.S. disengagement from Afghan affairs following the Soviet withdrawal from that country opened the door to the Taliban regime, premature U.S. withdrawal from Iraq would benefit extremists and terrorist groups. If we don't fill the power vacuum that exists, groups like Al Qaeda and Ansar Al Islam will help fill it.

In addition, the immediate withdrawal of American troops would undermine the status of our country around the world. The President engaged our military in Iraq with strong rhetoric about the type of Iraq Americans wished to enable Iraqis to create for themselves. He made pledges to the Iraqi people in our name. We must do what we can to make good on those pledges. Our hasty withdrawal would likely embolden our enemies in the region and around the world. It would be a setback to our common effort to expand representative government and combat terrorism.

The Administration has been forced to recognize that we cannot achieve our post-war goals in Iraq alone. We must do everything we can to replace our troops with international forces and a new Iraqi police force. However, we must be realistic. We face time and resource constraints. For now, it appears that we will be able to attract only a limited number of foreign troops. Our allies and other nations, still seething from the Bush Administration's pre-war treatment are not yet prepared to provide substantial troops and financial support for the current mission. The Security Council resolution passed on October 16th is unlikely to significantly change this situation. In addition, it will take time to train an Iraqi force that can assume day-to-day responsibility for security. Until that Iraqi force is trained, American forces will be needed to prevent chaos and anarchy.

IRAQI RECONSTRUCTION IS A CRITICAL U.S. INTEREST

About twenty billion of the President's $87 billion request is slated for reconstruction efforts in Iraq. This large investment is particularly difficult to stomach given both the mounting deficits caused by the Bush tax cuts weighted toward the super rich and the Administration's gross neglect of pressing needs here at home. However, I strongly believe that it would be short-sighted—and even dangerous—for our country not to do what is necessary to attempt to win—or at least not lose—the battle for the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. This will not be easy and the outcome is not guaranteed. Our chances of defeating the remnants of the Hussein regime and various extremists elements will be based in large part on our ability to show that the standard of living is better in the post-Saddam era. If we fail to create an environment in which the great majority of Iraqis see themselves as better off, we will open the door to ethnic, religious and regional strife. This could endanger our troops and undermine our efforts to build a new Iraq at peace with itself and its neighbors and on the course to representative government.

In the long run, our only chance of salvaging the situation is to make a substantial investment. The cost of not making a substantial investment today will be much greater sums tomorrow. We have opened a pandora's box. Significant funds are now needed to try to extricate ourselves from this difficult situation and try to ensure that over the long term the American people will not have been made less secure as a result of this war. The immediate withdrawal of our troops now is not a viable option. Handing the shattered Iraqi infrastructure, economy and body politic over to a makeshift government prematurely, is only a recipe for disaster. We must now all pay the price of the President's misrepresentations, miscalculations, and missteps.

RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP

The key question facing Members of Congress today, however, is whether the supplemental request before us reflects an effective and sustainable plan for U.S. engagement in Iraq—and one that meets the test, both at home and abroad, of responsible leadership.

The task before us is enormous. To succeed in Iraq we need a coherent and international plan for moving forward. The Administration's record has been poor and they have given us little reason to believe that they understand the mistakes they have made and will make much needed adjustments to the course they are taking.

Experience with other nation-building efforts tells us that the mission before us is difficult and costly. It will require an extended commitment over a long period of time. And, unlike the military campaign, winning the peace will require the help of our friends and others in the international community. The American people are only beginning to realize the enormous implications of our involvement.

The World Bank has estimated Iraq's reconstruction needs at an additional $55 billion over the next four years—not including the costs of the continued military presence in that country. In Bosnia, a country one-eighth the size of Iraq, the international community has spent close to $50 billion over the last 8 years in nation-building and reconstruction—troop deployments have cost an additional tens of billions for individual countries—and the end is not in sight. Let there be no doubt that the request before us today is just the tip of the iceberg.

Given the record of the last six months it is frankly stunning how unwilling the Administration has been to meet its critics even halfway, to address the problems that exist, to provide a coherent roadmap for moving forward together with the international community, and to ensure that the bill for this mission will not be borne by America's children and grandchildren.

First, the Administration has stubbornly failed to admit the serious mistakes that it has made and to address the serious credibility problem that they have created for themselves among the American people, the U.S. Congress and the international community. This was evident most recently in the President's handling of the report on weapons of mass destruction submitted by former U.N. inspector David Kay, now working for the Bush Administration. The Kay report findings seriously undermined key elements of the Administration's pre-war claims. Yet, the President stubbornly sighted them as proof of his case. In a recent interview, Vice President CHENEY suggested a link between Saddam Hussein and the attacks of September 11th, a claim the Administration had never previously made, and a link which the President himself rejected in statements a short time earlier. Unless the Administration is willing to address the serious credibility issue

that exists—or at least not compound it—it will be difficult for the American people to have any confidence in its statement about the situation in Iraq and its assessment of what needs to be done.

In addition, the Administration continues to act as though it has no responsibility or legal obligation to inform the Congress and the people of this country about how they plan to use the money that we approve in this chamber. In recent hearings Administration officials have refused to answer questions regarding the expenditure of funds previously authorized by this institution and to give little or no information on future projected costs. In my own committee I asked Administration representatives about U.S. commitments, financial and other, to the Turkish government in return for deployment of Turkish troops in Iraq and I was not able to get any satisfactory answers. If the American taxpayer is going to foot the bill for Turkish troops—by grant or by loan—they have the right to know. And if we are planning to send U.S. troops to fight—and maybe die—pacifying Turkish-Kurds opposing the Turkish government, then I believe the American people deserve the right to know about that deal.

Second, it has been true from the very start that the President's Iraq policy has suffered from deep divisions within the Administration on the most fundamental issues—dealing with the international community, organizing for reconstruction and interpreting the threat itself. These divisions have been the subject of recent public discussion over the announcement of a new task force headed by National Security Advisor, Condeleeza Rice, with the task of coordinating the stabilization and reconstruction efforts in Iraq. This announcement notwithstanding, there is considerable evidence to suggest that little real progress has been made in this area. Recent statements attributed to senior Administration officials are highly critical of the Bremer mission in Iraq and raise serious questions about who is calling the shots, even today, on U.S. policy.

Without a coherent plan that is implemented by a united Administration we cannot succeed. This plan does not exist today.

Third, it has long been clear that we cannot succeed in the post-war mission in Iraq alone. We must engage the international community for both political and material reasons. The Administration badly miscalculated the extent to which Iraqi suffering under Saddam Hussein would translate into goodwill toward America's role in Iraq. We must understand the complex situation we face today in our new role as an occupying force in Iraq.

Fourth, the Administration's actions must match its rhetoric about supporting Iraqi democracy. The $20.3 billion reconstruction budget presented by the Administration was drawn up without meaningful consultations with Iraqis. In addition, we watch as Administration officials arm twist the Iraqi Governing Council to accept the deployment of Turkish troops in Iraq over the strong objections of all three major Iraqi communities—the Kurds, the Shia and the Sunnis. It appears that the Administration has not grasped the first tenet of nation-building—that the Iraqi people must believe that they are rebuilding their own country.

Fifth, the Administration has ignored the importance of its role in accounting for the funds that we approve and preventing corporate profiteering and abuse of taxpayer money. It must take serious steps to allay fears that appropriated funds will be wasted on large favored corporations. In light of the many stories of abuse we have heard in recent weeks, the ''prudent'' transparency mentioned in Mr. Bremer's testimony before members of Congress does not go far enough. The Administration must provide a satisfactory accounting of how funds have been spent to date and how additional funds are being planned for.

Finally, and most importantly, the President is asking us to ignore the enormous budget implications of this request. Let's not fool ourselves or the American people. It won't be just this $87 billion. It will also require billions more in the months and years ahead.

While we have a responsibility to maintain security on the ground in Iraq and assist with the reconstruction of that country, we also have an obligation to level with the American people. The President totally failed to prepare the American people for the true costs of the war and of ''winning the peace.'' Now he seeks to escape responsibility for those costs by putting them on our national credit card and running up huge deficits. Every penny of the $87 billion requested by the President is borrowed money. But we all know there is no free lunch. His ''out-of-sight, out-of-mind'' approach to such important issues will wind up costing our children down the road.

We should not be waging war and peace by credit card. If we are willing to pay any price to defeat the scourge of terrorism, we must pay for it in an honest way. While the President has asked our troops and their families to make the ultimate sacrifice, he has given the wealthiest Americans a huge tax cut. That is wrong. It is wrong to pass the buck to the next generation; it is wrong to ask the younger generation, including our troops and their children, to bear the burden alone; and it is wrong to shield the wealthiest Americans from paying their fair share.

We have a huge responsibility gap in our government. It is the gap between those who understand that we have a responsibility to establish stability and help rebuild Iraq—and who are prepared to pay for it now, and those who call upon the country to pay any price in Iraq, but run from responsibility paying that price.

I had an amendment to fill that responsibility gap. It was an amendment to scale back the tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans to pay their share of the costs of this bill. Incredibly, the House leadership prohibited that amendment from coming to a vote.

This is a difficult time to be asking the American people to invest billions of dollars of their money to build schools, hospitals, roads, electric grids and communications systems. Here at home, our Federal, State and local governments are experiencing huge revenue shortfalls. The President's budget request for this year falls $9 billion short of what was promised by the Federal Government to meet our obligations to America's school children under the No Child Left Behind legislation. Three our of five children eligible for Head Start cannot receive help because of lack of funds. Years ago the Federal Government pledged to cover 40 percent of the costs of ensuring that children with disabilities received a good education, but today we are meeting only 18 percent of that cost. The same shortfalls occur in health programs, our national transportation infrastructure, and a range of other important domestic needs.

We must meet our needs at home at the same time we meet our international responsibilities in Iraq, Afghanistan and other places around the globe. We as a nation have enormous resources. We can meet both our domestic needs and our international responsibilities. We can help the Iraqis rebuild their country while we construct new hospitals and schools here at home. But we must be prepared to pay for them. If we refuse to pay now for our efforts in Iraq by reducing portions of the tax cut, it will make it impossible to make the investments we must make in education, health, transportation and other needs here at home. Already this year, when many of us called for full funding for No Child Left Behind and meeting our national obligations for special education we were told that we didn't have resources because of the large tax cuts. Adding this $87 billion to the deficit will make it even more difficult to meet those pressing needs. That is why we must pay now for the costs of our efforts in Iraq. We cannot put everything on our national credit card.

The President has totally abdicated his leadership responsibilities. His job is to level with the American people—to inform them that our international responsibilities require us to pay the price of leadership. Leadership is about setting priorities. The war in Iraq was a war of choice. Regardless of what each of us may think about how that choice was made, we now have a responsibility to pay for the consequences of that choice. The President—by refusing to pay for the war and its aftermath—refuses to acknowledge the real costs of those choices.

There are those who argue that, because the President has refused to scale back his tax cuts to pay for the war and its aftermath, those of us who believe we have a responsibility to provide security and aid in the reconstruction in Iraq have no alternative but to support the President's request for $87 billion without condition; that we have to go along with the President's plan to wage war and peace by credit card. That is an irresponsible position and a false choice. If paying for security and reconstruction is that important—and I believe that it is—when we should insist that we pay for it the right way. To do any less is to abdicate our responsibility to the American people.

THE FALSE CHOICE

Money alone is not the answer to the problems we face in Iraq. The stakes are high and the mission is difficult. For those of us who support making this enormous investment I believe that we have a duty to ask if the money will be spent wisely and where it will come from.

The Bush Administration has treated our concerns, and those of others, with contempt and arrogance—the same way they treated the international community prior to the war. I fear that if we buckle-in to the Administration's demand to do it ''our way or the highway,'' we will simply be acquiescing in the continuation of a fundamentally failed approach to a very sensitive and vital mission. We cannot allow ourselves to be caught in the false choice that we must engage the Administration's way or no way at all.

For weeks I have struggled with this vote. As the son of a U.S. foreign service officer, I have always had a strong personal commitment to our country's international role. It is with great difficulty that I cast a vote against

funds requested by a President in pursuit of U.S. policies abroad. However, the Administration's arrogant refusal to consider alternative approaches and, most of all, its refusal to pay now for the consequences of its choices has convinced me that they will not address these issues in a responsible manner until we demand a higher standard of leadership. If the President believes, as I do, that we have an obligation to provide security and help rebuild Iraq, he should have the simple courage to pay for it. Despite all my other reservations, if the President were to present a plan to pay now for the costs of our efforts in Iraq, or if my amendment to reduce the tax cuts to cover our costs were adopted, I would support this bill. The choice is not between doing nothing and doing it the President's way. We have a responsibility to the American people to do it the right way.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Iraqi supplemental spending request.

I strongly believe that both portions of the supplemental request are necessary. We have won the war in Iraq, now we must win the peace. The investment we make in Iraq today will help to ensure our safety and security against terrorism here at home in the future. We cannot leave the job of reconstruction unfinished in Iraq and leave open the very real possibility that another dictator or a terrorist regime will take over Iraq by winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people.

As a strong fiscal conservative, my first instinct was to provide the $21 billion for reconstruction as a loan—not a grant as requested. However, after a great deal of thought and research, I believe that the loan proposal is not the right approach. With a debt of $350–$600 billion, the likelihood that Iraq could pay off another loan is remote at best. It is important that America takes the lead and convinces Iraq's largest creditors, Russia, France and Germany, to forgive Iraq's burdensome debt. We must therefore not be hypocritical and contribute an additional financial burden.

Additionally, the $21 billion in reconstruction funding is just a portion of the $50–$75 billion overall cost of Iraqi reconstruction. Clearly, Iraqi oil revenues will be used to fund reconstruction and ongoing government operations in Iraq. Now that the United Nations has passed a resolution that will pave the way for greater international involvement, the remaining funds will hopefully come from international contributions. If the United States provided its reconstruction portion as a loan, we would find it very difficult to convince the rest of the world to contribute.

Although the $87 billion price tag is indeed a great sum of money, it is important to put the cost in perspective. The total Iraqi war is going to cost about 0.5 percent of our Gross Domestic Product (GDP), while the Vietnam War cost 12 percent and World War II cost 130% of GDP.

This supplemental spending request will give our troops the tools and support they need to further secure Iraq from the foreign terrorists trying to disrupt our reconstruction efforts while giving the Iraqi people a hope for a free and democratic country for years to come.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Georgia, which is home to several major military installations and where military retirees and veterans make up a big percentage of the population. At last count, 11,248 active duty, Reserve and National Guard personnel from Georgia bases are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. A total of 149 Georgia-based soldiers have been wounded in Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and 49 have been killed in action—49 brave Americans.

Like virtually everyone who lives in my area of southwest Georgia, I believe it would be an unconscionable dereliction of duty if we failed to provide for the essential needs of our troops we have sent into harms way. In spite of the strong objections many of us have about the bill's flaws, we cannot deny funding for such things as safe drinking water, which many soldiers lack; body armor and other equipment essential to the safety and success of our troops; and housing and other basic living needs.

We've learned many of the troops serving in Iraq have never been issued the Kevlar flak jacket inserts, or body armor, and some have spent up to $650 out of their own pockets to purchase this updated protective gear. We're told our troops have gone without other critical equipment, such as portable jammers to block the radio signals used to detonate remote control bombs—the same bombs we continually hear about, day in and day out, in attacks that are wounding and killing our soldiers.

Today, we have an opportunity to correct these troubling deficiencies. And we must not fail.

At the same time, people in the Second District are also concerned about the extreme federal deficit, the shortcomings in our own infrastructure, and the burden this added spending imposes on taxpayers. I, too, am concerned when Congress could avoid a bigger deficit by deferring tax cuts just for the wealthiest 1 percent of our citizens, and when U.S. taxpayers are stuck with the entire cost of Iraqi reconstruction even though Iraq is capable of eventually paying for its infrastructure upgrades from its vast oil reserves, the second largest in the world.

It's an affront to the people I represent to spend millions of dollars for roads, schools, hospitals and economic development initiatives in Iraq while these same needs are drastically under funded in the U.S.; to provide high-speed internet access to the people of Iraq while widespread areas of the U.S. including areas of the Second District, are denied the same access; to provide millions of dollars to train unemployed Iraqi workers while U.S. job training programs are cut.

I'm not against helping Iraq rebuild. I support efforts to secure Iraq's borders, to train Iraq's security forces, to restore Iraq's water sanitation, electricity and other utility services, to restore Iraq's transportation and oil production capability, and to help provide the Iraqi people educational and employment opportunities.

But I'm concerned when we unnecessarily pay for these needs with borrowed money, when we fund non-essential reconstruction projects as well as essential ones, which we shortchange the needs of our own communities, and when our international partners have not stepped up to the plate to contribute their fair share of the reconstruction costs.

Mr. Chairman, I support our troops and the funding they must have, while I continue to look to the Administration to present a clear and fiscally responsible plan that makes it possible for our service men and women to carry out their mission as safely and effectively as possible and to bring stability and democracy to the suffering people of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the entire Persian Gulf war 12 years ago cost the United States much less than $8 billion. The total cost of that war was $61 billion, but because allies were participating, our share was only 12 percent of the total cost. We have already spent $79 billion on the present war on Iraq, and now we are asked to appropriate another $87 billion for a total of $166 billion, so far.

To put the $166 billion into perspective, the total appropriation for this fiscal year (FY 2003) for the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of State was less than $166 billion.

And on a per person basis, $166 billion is more for each person in Iraq than the total annual U.S. Government spending for each American citizen for everything other than Social Security and Defense.

Although this is a huge expenditure, the administration fails to even give lip service to explain how the bill will be paid. No outline of spending cuts or increased taxes has been presented. The Administration has opposed lending any portion of the funds to Iraq because the Administration claims that Iraq is too far in debt already, even though the national debt in Iraq is approximately $4,000 per person while the national debt in the United States is approximately $20,000 per person. It therefore has to be assumed that all of the money will be borrowed by the United States government. At 5-percent interest, the annual interest on this $166 billion of additional debt will be $8.3 billion or $160 million per week. A yes vote on the bill commits this country to additional annual interest payments that are more than the annual cost of the entire Head Start program.

The vote on this bill represents the only opportunity Congress has had to consider the President's policies in Iraq since October of last year. The President's decision to invade unilaterally, without allies, has meant that we are paying 100 percent of the costs of the war, in cash and in casualties. In the Persian Gulf war, allies paid more than 85 percent of the costs; if they were paying only 50 percent of the costs of this war, we would save $80 billion and countless lives. Unfortunately, a yes cot on the bill will mean that no significant attempt will be made to engage the international community's participation.

There have been widespread reports of financial waste in Iraq. A few weeks ago, ''60 Minutes'' chronicled the profitable no-bid contracts enjoyed by Halliburton and others and pointed out that there were firms who could do much of the work for half of the price paid to Halliburton under those contracts. Last week, National Public Radio's ''Morning Edition'' described sweetheart deals and corruption. Questions have also been raised about the extravagance of the reconstruction of Iraq and whether more modest construction might accomplish the same goals. A yes vote on this bill will mean that no change in contracting procedures will be made.

During his campaign, President Bush frequently insisted that no troops should ever be

deployed without an ''exit strategy''. Not only do we have no apparent exit strategy, we also have no apparent entry strategy: the President recently admitted that Iraq had nothing to do with September 11th; no weapons of mass destruction have been located; Iraq was never an imminent threat to the United States. We cannot develop an exit strategy, if we cannot articulate what the entry strategy was. A yes vote on the bill forfeits a Congressional opportunity to require the administration to clearly establish an exit strategy.

Notwithstanding all of the reasons to vote ''no'', if the passage of the bill would result in a safer America, it would be worth the cost. Unfortunately, even before the war, the CIA concluded that Iraq posed very little threat to the United States at the time, but would pose an increased threat if we attacked them. A letter form CIA Director George Tenet to the Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, dated October 7, 2002, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD stated that: ''Baghdad for now appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or CBW (chemical and biological weapons) against the United States. Should Saddam conclude that a United States-led attack could no longer be deterred, he would probably become much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions.'' Certainly we cannot be any safer than the CIA said we were before we attacked; but, most recent reports describe more terrorists now gathering in Iraq than before the war. So, the policy which includes the expenditure of $166 billion and the loss of many courageous lives has failed to make us safer.

Because the appropriations in the bill represent more than the United States last year for the United States Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of State; because there is no plan for paying the bill; because failed policies will be validated by the passage of the bill; and because we are in fact more at risk, not safer as result of those polices, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this request for nearly $87 billion to continue the occupation and rebuilding of Iraq and Afghanistan. This is money we do not have for a foreign welfare program. The burden on our already weakened economy could well be crippling.

Those who argue that we must vote for this appropriation because ''we must succeed'' in Iraq are misguided. Those who say this, have yet to define what it means—in concrete terms—to have ''success'' in Iraq. What is success in Iraq? How will we achieve success in Iraq? How will we know when we have succeeded in Iraq? About how long will ''success'' take to achieve and about how much will it cost? These are reasonable questions to have when we are asked to spend billions of taxpayers' dollars, but thus far we have heard little more than nice-sounding platitudes.

We have established a troubling precedent that no matter how ill-conceived an intervention, we must continue to become more deeply involved because ''we must succeed.'' That is one reason we see unrelated funding in this supplemental for places like Liberia and Sudan.

Mr. Chairman this reconstruction of Iraq—that we are making but a down-payment on today—is at its core just another foreign policy boondoggle. The $20 billion plan to ''rebuild'' Iraq tilts heavily toward creating a statist economy and is filled with very liberal social-engineering programs. Much of the money in this reconstruction plan will be wasted—as foreign aid most often is. Much will be wasted as corporate welfare to politically-connected corporations; much will be thrown away at all the various ''non-government organizations'' that aim to teach the Iraqis everything from the latest American political correctness to the ''right'' way to vote. The bill includes $900 million to import petroleum products into Iraq (a country with the second largest oil reserves in the world); $793 million for healthcare in Iraq when we're in the midst of our own crisis and about to raise Medicare premiums of our seniors; $10 million for ''women's leadership programs'' (more social engineering); $200 million in loan guarantees to Pakistan (a military dictatorship that likely is the home of Osama bin Laden); $245 million for the ''U.S. share'' of U.N. peacekeeping in Liberia and Sudan; $95 million for education in Afghanistan; $600 million for repair and modernization of roads and bridges in Iraq (while our own infrastructure crumbles).

There has been some discontent among conservatives about the $20 billion reconstruction price tag. They fail to realize that this is just the other side of the coin of military interventionism. It is the same coin, which is why I have consistently opposed foreign interventionism. There is a lesson here that those who call themselves fiscal conservatives seem to not have learned. There is no separation between the military intervention and the post-military intervention, otherwise known as ''nation-building.'' Fiscal conservatives are uneasy about nation-building and foreign aid. The president himself swore off nation-building as a candidate. But anyone concerned about sending American tax dollars to foreign countries must look directly at military interventionism abroad. If there is one thing the history of our interventionism teaches, it is that the best way for a foreign country to become a financial dependent of the United States is to first be attacked by the United States.

This request—which was not the first and will not be the last—demonstrates in the most concrete terms that there is a real and concrete cost of our policy of interventionism. The American taxpayer paid to bomb Baghdad and now will pay to rebuild Iraq—its schools, hospitals, prisons, roads, and more. Many Americans cannot afford to send their own children to college, but with the money in this bill they will be sending Iraqi kids to college. Is this really what the American people want?

The real point is that the billions we are told we must spend to rebuild Iraq is indeed the natural outcome of our policy of pre-emptive military intervention. All those who voted for the resolution authorizing the president to attack Iraq have really already voted for this supplemental. There is no military intervention without a ''Marshall Plan'' afterward, regardless of our ability to pay. And the American people will be expected to pay for far more. This current request is only perhaps step four in what will likely be a 10 or more step program to remake Iraq and the rest of the Middle East in the image of Washington, D.C. social engineers and ''global planners.'' What will be steps five, six, seven, eight? Long-term occupation, micro-managing Iraq's economy, organizing and managing elections, writing an Iraqi constitution. And so on. When will it end?

There is also much said about how we must support this supplemental because to do otherwise would mean not supporting the troops. I resent this dishonest accusation. It is nothing but a red herring. I wonder if an American currently serving an open-ended occupation in Iraq would think that bringing him home next week would be a good show of support for our troops. Maintaining an increasingly deadly occupation of Iraq and bankrupting many of our reservists and national guard troops by unilaterally extending their contracts to serve in an active deployment is hardly ''supporting the troops.'' Perhaps that is why a Stars and Stripes newspaper survey of the troops in Iraq this week found that a majority had very low morale. And according to the same Stars and Stripes survey, an increasing number are not planning to re-enlist.

Conservatives often proclaim that they are opposed to providing American welfare to the rest of the world. I agree. The only way to do that, however, is to stop supporting a policy of military interventionism. You cannot have one without the other. If a military intervention against Syria and Iran are next, it will be the same thing: we will pay to bomb the country and we will pay even more to rebuild it—and as we see with the plan for Iraq, this rebuilding will not be done on the cheap. The key fallacy in the argument of the militarists is that there is some way to fight a war without associated costs—the costs of occupation, reconstruction, ''institution-building,'' ''democracy programs.''

I opposed our action against Iraq for two main reasons. I sincerely believed that our national security was not threatened and I did not believe that Saddam Hussein's regime was involved in the attack on the United States on 9/11. I believe what we have learned since the intervention has supported my view. Meanwhile, while our troops are trying to police the border between Syria and Iraq our own borders remain as porous as ever. Terrorists who entered our country could easily do so again through our largely un-patrolled borders. While we expend American blood and treasure occupying a country that was not involved in the attack on the U.S., those were responsible for the attack most likely are hiding out in Pakistan—a military dictatorship we are now allied with and to which this supplemental sends some $200 million in loan guarantees.

Our continued occupation of Iraq is not producing the promised results, despite efforts paint a brighter picture of the current situation. What once was a secular dictatorship appears to be moving toward being a fundamentalist Islamic regime—not the democracy we were promised. As repulsive as Saddam's regime was, the prospect of an Iraq run by Islamic clerics, aligned with Iranian radicals and hostile to the United States, is no more palatable. There are signs that this is the trend. The press reports regularly on attacks against Iraq's one million Christians. Those hand-picked by the United States to run Iraq have found themselves targets for assassination. Clerics are forming their own militias. The thousands of non-combatants killed in the U.S. intervention are seeking revenge against the unwanted American occupiers.

Mr. Chairman, throwing billions of dollars after a failed policy will not produce favorable

results. We are heading full-speed toward bankruptcy, yet we continue to spend like there is no tomorrow. There will be a tomorrow, however. The money we are spending today is real. The bill will be paid, whether through raising taxes or printing more money. Either way, the American people will become poorer in pursuit of a policy that cannot and will not work. We cannot re-make the world in our own image. The stated aim was to remove Saddam Hussein. That mission is accomplished. The best policy now for Iraq is to declare victory and bring our troops home. We should let the people of Iraq rebuild their own country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this supplemental request.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost, I want to say that I fully support our troops. I am so proud of the job they are doing in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are sacrificing greatly overseas so we don't have to fight the war on terror here on our shores. To bring this conflict to a successful conclusion, $65.2 billion of this supplemental request is essential to help provide every resource our men and women need.

That being said, I work for the people of the 9th District of North Carolina and they cannot understand why the remaining $21.6 billion of the Iraq Supplemental may not be given in the form of a loan. Iraq contains the second largest oil reserve in the world and will have an astonishing $5 billion surplus at the end of this year—all this, while we have record deficits in our own country. For decades to come, America's children will be paying for this reconstruction grant on behalf of the Iraqi children. That is unconscionable! Again, that country has the great wealth of oil. They can pay us back.

The majority of this bill will provide for our troops and that is good. It was my strong desire to have the opportunity to debate and vote on the defense money and the Iraq reconstruction money of this supplemental in separate bills. However, we don't have clean bills in this House; so we don't have that opportunity.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the legislation to approve the administration's request for $87 billion in additional funding for operations in Iraq. We must provide our men and women in uniform in Iraq with the resources they need to complete their mission, as safely and securely as possible. They have performed brilliantly—protecting civilians, maintaining order and promoting democracy while facing the threat of attacks each and every day. We are proud of them and we need to continue supporting them. I will vote to provide whatever resources our troops need to complete their mission.

Unfortunately, the administration and leadership have brought this request before us under a process which forces us to approve $20 billion in spending for an ill-advised plan for Iraq reconstruction. Many of the items in the reconstruction are more appropriately the responsibility of the Iraqi provisional government or have extremely inflated costs. I commend the work of Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member OBEY and the rest of the Appropriations Committee to scrub the administration's request and remove many questionable or low-priority items.

Even with these improvements, many questions remain about how these funds will be used. Our constituents deserve to know that their tax dollars are being used in the most effective manner possible. The missteps of the past must not be compounded by wasteful spending now. The President must be willing to report to Congress—and the American people—on how the money is spent. That is what this amendment would require. A detailed accounting is needed.

The American people also deserve to know what our plan is for successfully completing our mission in Iraq to improve the security and political situation and reducing our presence. While the battle to oust Saddam Hussein was well-planned and well-executed, we did not plan well for winning the peace and rebuilding the nation of Iraq. Our troops have been taking almost all the risks, and American taxpayers have been paying all the bills.

Our ''go-it-alone'' strategy must end. This amendment will require the President to present a detailed plan for improving the situation in postwar Iraq and report on our progress in achieving the goals of improving the political and security conditions in Iraq.

Congress and the American public need to know the impact our operations in Iraq will have on a federal budget that is nearly a half trillion dollars in deficit already. It is now abundantly clear that the costs of operations in Iraq will be much greater than was anticipated when the budget was approved just six months ago. Already, we have spent $63 billion in Iraq this year, and we are being asked to provide an additional $87 billion in this bill.

That would bring the total spending on operations in Iraq to $150 billion in the year 2003—a staggering figure for one year—with more to come. There is no question that we will be in Iraq for a long time, at great expense to the American taxpayers.

We have a responsibility to reevaluate our budgetary priorities to reflect that reality so that these additional expenses are not simply added to the national debt. It would be irresponsible to completely ignore those costs. We need to budget honestly for the costs of continued operations in Iraq so that Congress can consider the tradeoffs necessary to provide the needed funding without adding to the national debt. Paying for our operations in Iraq will require sacrifices. It would be extremely irresponsible for us to refuse to make any sacrifices ourselves and expect our troops to also pay the financial debts once they return home. The cause of freedom and justice is great, but it demands great commitment and sacrifice by all of us who enjoy its benefits, not simply by the men and women in uniform.

Like all of my colleagues, I pray for the successful completion of our mission in Iraq and the safe return of our men and women in uniform. This amendment will help ensure that we have a plan to accomplish this goal as quickly as possible.

There being no further amendments in order, pursuant to House Resolution 396, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 396, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KILPATRICK. Yes, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3289, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 51, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3007. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' may be provided in a form other than loans.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the obligation of the initial 50 percent of the funds referred to in such subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion to recommit.

□ 1400

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recommit the bill and ask that the Members please look at this closely. Here we have an amendment before you to recommit that would require that 50 percent of the funding for reconstruction be given in a loan, and we have had much discussion over that, although we did not finish the discussion. Because Iraq has at least $2 trillion of oil reserves in the ground it is anticipated that they will be able to cultivate over the next year, because Iraq will have the wherewithal over the next 5 years to repay much of their debt, the question before us is should we require 50 percent of our reconstruction funds be repaid back?

It is very disturbing to this Member that we are worried about Iraq's debt and not worried about our grandchildren's debt. This is a very straightforward amendment that would ask that 50 percent of our reconstruction dollars be in the form of a loan to Iraq. We have talked about it quite a bit, and it is because the long-term tax burden will be great on our own United

States citizens that we do this at this time so that we will see, in our own efforts, that half of the money for reconstruction be given back to the American taxpayers to lighten their burden over the next several years. There are no surpluses projected for our own country over the next 10 years, and the least we can do is ask that half of the reconstruction money be in the form of a loan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the reason that I keep hearing over and over as to why the American taxpayer needs to give an additional $10 billion to Iraq in foreign aid cash is that when Saddam Hussein was in power, he accumulated approximately $130 billion in debt primarily owed to France and Germany. So if we put that additional $10 billion in loans on top of the $130 billion, then it is going to make it more difficult to pay back France and Germany. In other words, the American taxpayer needs to give cash in its foreign aid so that Iraq can save its oil revenue to pay back France and Germany. If you agree with that rationale, you should vote ''no'' on this motion to recommit. But if you think this $10 billion should be paid back to America to build schools, roads and bridges in this country, then vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, $87 billion is a lot of money to add to our already exploding debt. There is no question we will be in Iraq for a long time at great additional expense to American taxpayers. Many of us are willing to make tough choices to pay for these costs. The cost of freedom and justice is great, but it demands great commitment and sacrifice by all of us who enjoy its benefits. Since the leadership of this body will not even allow us to consider options to pay for these costs, the least we can do is require a portion of the spending on rebuilding Iraq to be repaid by those who will benefit most from that spending. Every dime we spend in Iraq will come from borrowed money added to our national debt. It is extremely irresponsible for us to expect the young men and women who are making great sacrifices in Iraq today to also bear the burden of the financial debts for rebuilding Iraq once they return home.

I urge a vote for this motion to recommit.

Ms. KILPATRICK. And so, Mr. Speaker, we ask Members to support the motion to recommit. Are we going to take care of the taxpayers of America and our children and our health centers and our roads and bridges? Are we going to allow a country who has $2 trillion in oil reserves in the ground not to pay us back at a time when our country sees no surpluses and will, in fact, be in debt over the next 10 years? I urge a vote of ''aye'' on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I plan to use about 30 seconds for myself and to say that we have debated this issue over and over and over again. During the debate on the rule, we have heard that we did not give you enough debate. We just spent 3 days, almost, on this one subject alone. The House dealt with this issue already. The House rejected this proposal, and we are going to reject it again today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 37 times in the 1990s President Clinton put our troops in harm's way. Thirty-seven times. In none of those cases were we asked to pay the money up-front. Eleven times the Congress, led by the Republican side, gave the money that President Clinton wanted to pay for those 37 deployments after the fact. Eleven emergency supplementals. Eleven times. We also cut the Defense budget by $43 billion to pay for those deployments. Where is the consistency? None of those deployment costs, none of them, were made in the form of loans. All of them were allocations directly from the appropriations by this body.

I say to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we did it 37 times for President Clinton. Thirty-seven times we voted for those supplementals to support those deployments. This time we need to fund the support for President Bush and to solve the problem in Iraq.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the end of this debate, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, we have debated this issue many times. Let me, once more, reiterate why this is a bad idea to do this through a motion to recommit.

First of all, there are, of course, the technical reasons. The amendment states that 50 percent of the obligations from the Iraq reconstruction funds must go in the form of loans, but there is no authority to provide those loans. There is an implication, but there is no actual authority provided in this recommittal motion. It is not clear whether the amendment intends the loans to be guaranteed, whether it is mixed financing, what form of loans they would be in. The terms of the loans are not at all clear. Are we talking about no interest for 50 years? Are we talking about repayment over 25 years? How would they be repaid? There are a lot of the questions that remain on the technical issues. It puts a lot of faith, frankly, Mr. Speaker, in the Office of Management and Budget and the President to interpret what the Congress would do here with this very simple, very broad loan authority and to make a determination as to what that actually means.

But there are the substantive arguments that I think are more important, and I know my colleagues have listened to me say this several times here in the last 3 days on the floor, but, again, let me point out, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, General Abizaid, the Central Command commander, when asked how important are the dollars for the troops as opposed to the dollars for reconstruction, he said in very clear terms, every dollar that we spend on reconstruction is just as important as what we spend on our troops, that if we really want to have our troops come home, if we really want to protect them, if we really want to have them carry out their mission, then the dollars for reconstruction are an absolute, vital part of it.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot separate what we are doing militarily in Iraq in that region, you cannot separate it from the dollars that we are spending on reconstruction. They are both a part of our national security objectives. They must go together.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say there is only one thing we really ask from Iraq in terms of repayment. We ask for them to give us a stable, a free, a democratic government, a people committed to peace and security in the region that will help to bring about peace and security for all the peoples of that region and for the United States. What more repayment could we wish than that? And how can we achieve that better than by helping to speed the reconstruction process forward?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Chabot
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—235

Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Case
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Capps
Clay
Greenwood
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1428

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes and would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted as follows: Rollcall Nos. 553—''yes''; 554—''yes''; 555—''yes''; 556—''yes''; 557—''yes''; 558—''no''; 559—''no''; 560—''yes''; 561—''no.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill. Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 125, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

YEAS—303

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)

Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—125

Abercrombie
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berry
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Majette
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Capps
Clay
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1436

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my friend the distinguished majority leader for the purpose of discussing the schedule for the coming week and perhaps the weeks thereafter.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Monday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of today.

On Tuesday, the House will convene at 9 a.m. for morning hour and 10 a.m. for legislative business. We may consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules. We also hope to have the conference report on H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2003, ready for consideration.

In addition to that, there is a chance that we could consider a number of appropriations conference reports, as well as the Department of Defense authorization conference report.

Members should also be aware that we will likely move a continuing resolution next week, as the current one expires on October 31.

Finally, I would like to make all Members aware that we may be working into the late evening on Tuesday as we work to complete these important pieces of legislation. I urge Members to plan accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to answer any questions the gentleman may have.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the majority leader for his information.

Just to reiterate for the Members, am I correct that we will have votes starting at 6:30 on Monday?

Mr. DELAY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Then we will be going in at 9 a.m. on Tuesday?

Mr. DELAY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Which is different, a little earlier. I thank the gentleman for that.

The continuing resolution, Mr. Leader, you point out there will be a continuing resolution that, perhaps, will be considered next week. The current one goes to October 31.

Can you tell the Members what date you contemplate the continuing resolution going to?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, we have not consulted with everyone yet, and certainly we will consult with the minority, but in talking to the other body, our goal would be to complete the first session by November 7. So, hopefully, the continuing resolution would match that timetable.

Mr. HOYER. So am I correct then that the contemplation would be that the CR that we would consider next week would go until November 7? I know that is not firm, but is that your current thought, that that would be the objective?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding further. We are talking to the committee now, and really have not decided what that would be. I would assume that, at the very least, the CR would be until November 7, but there may be other CRs under consideration.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, with respect to the appropriations conferences, I know the chairman is on the floor, but could the leader tell us which conference reports are most likely to be on the floor and will those be, I take it, single in nature, that is to say, a conference report on one of the appropriations bills, as opposed to an omnibus bill or a multiappropriation bill piece of legislation?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, this is a very difficult thing to predict with any level of certainty. It does appear that the more likely candidates for conference reports are the four appropriation bills that are now in conference. Off the top of my head, I think they are Labor-HHS, Military Construction, Energy and Interior. The other body has not passed six of their remaining appropriations bills.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I will certainly not ask you which party is in charge of the other body. That might not be an appropriate question on the floor of the House. But having said that, Mr. Leader, the chairman, again, being on the floor, I am on the Labor-HHS committee, and I have not attended any meeting of any conference committee on the Labor-HHS bill. You say it is in conference. Where?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I am not advised as to any meetings that are going on. I am sure I can convey the gentleman's interest in going to meetings. I know of his love for meetings. But we have encouraged the Committee on Appropriations to get these conference reports done.

□ 1445

All we can do on our side: our Members are ready to go. The other body has their own problems that I cannot discuss here, but as soon as we can get the two sides together, hopefully, they will have those meetings and the gentleman will be invited.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am sure if it is up to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I will be; but in a nonhumorous, but still friendly way, we are very concerned on this side, Mr. Leader, when we hear you announce that there are conferences going on, that conference reports may come out and, to our knowledge, we have not been invited to any conferences. We have not sat down to try to resolve differences in the bills.

As the gentleman knows, the labor-health bill in particular was very controversial on this side of the aisle. We want obviously to participate and try to resolve those differences and try to address those deficiencies that we see. Therefore, in light of the fact that we are going to be leaving tonight, tonight is Friday, not coming back until Monday night, and if we have a conference report, presumably that has to come out and the staff work is going to be done, because we cannot have a conference Tuesday morning or Monday night; no conference has been called as far as I know on the labor-health bill, and we cannot have the committee staff do its work between Tuesday

morning if we had a conference and Tuesday afternoon, that just will not work, for us to consider the conference report.

So we have a concern on our side of the aisle, Mr. Leader, in terms of how conferences are being carried out and, frankly, the definition of what a conference is now-a-days. A conference seems to be the appointment of conferees on either side of the aisle, and then the ranking Republican, either of the committee or subcommittee, meeting with the ranking Republican or Chair of the committee or subcommittee in the other body; and that is now called a conference. That may be a meeting of your side of the aisle, but it is not our perception that that is a conference as we have historically known it.

When we were in charge, frankly, I did attend on a regular basis conferences with both sides of the aisle, with my ranking member when I chaired the Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury and Independent agencies, and where the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and his ranking member attended when they had conferences. I do not mean that they did not discuss things, but I think it is appropriate for us to voice that concern.

Next, on the Iraq supplemental which we have just passed, do you expect a motion to go to conference next week on that? I yield to the leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the other body is prepared to complete consideration of their bill, hopefully, this afternoon; and assuming they finish and request a conference, I would expect us to be able to appoint our conferees when we return next week.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman mentioned also, Mr. Leader, reclaiming my time, the energy conference report. How likely is it that we will have that on the floor next week? Is the gentleman pretty confident that that will be here? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, from all of the numerous meetings that have been held, it is my indication that progress on that bill has been very encouraging. A lot of hard work has been done on the Energy Policy Act, and we have every expectation that we could consider that bill next week.

If the gentleman will further yield, I would just point out to the gentleman, as the gentleman knows and the other Members, but especially to the new Members to this body, when we get into an end-of-the-session like this, these things are very hard to predict. Once a decision is made on a bill, it could usually come straight to the body for a vote, but sometimes these bills take quite a bit of time to work out the differences between the two Houses.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that information. I would reiterate, having discussed with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who is, of course, the dean of this House and has 50 years of experience in this House, his concern that he is not sure what is going on in the conference on the energy bill. He is not sure what the schedule is on the energy bill. Neither his staff nor he know what product is going to be reported out.

Again, we are meeting next week for maybe, if we go late into the night, maybe 10 hours, 15 hours next week, and without really having had the opportunity to be fully involved in that conference. As a result, if that happens, our conferees on our side are not going to have any time to consider that substantively, not to mention the Members who will not have time to consider it in a very substantive way.

So I do not think there is any way to solve it now, because as far as we know, there have been no meetings of the conference scheduled. We have not been noted for conferences either Saturday, Sunday, or Monday. So that if something is going to happen, it apparently is going to happen without a formal meeting of the conference if that conference report comes to the floor on Tuesday.

I do not know whether the gentleman wants to comment on that. That is just our concern, Mr. Leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's concern is duly noted. And as the gentleman knows, at the end of a session like this, there are conferences and meetings going all over the place trying to get these bills wrapped up for the end of the session, and formal notices and appropriate notices will go out in a timely fashion so that Members will have time to understand what is in these bills before they vote on them.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am not sure how that is going to happen, Mr. Leader. I hope it happens. I hope the gentleman's representation is carried out, but it is hard to see in the next 72 hours how that can be effected, not counting the balance of today.

In any event, can the gentleman tell me if the gentleman expects the conference report to include the Clear Skies initiative? Does the gentleman have knowledge?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman asking me if the Clear Skies initiative is going to be in the energy conference report?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, sir. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge and have not been advised as to what is in the conference report that has not been completed. So when I know, the gentleman will probably know.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, but I do know that our conferees again who have not been included in the discussions are very concerned about an issue that is rumored to be included in the conference report that has not been debated at all by either the conferees or by the House. So I raise that concern and would hope that the gentleman would raise that concern with the Chair of the conference committee.

I know today is the day the congressional Republican leaders have articulated as the day that they would complete the conference on the Medicare prescription drug bill. Could the majority leader bring us up to date on the status of that and when, if the gentleman expects between now and November 7, for that conference report to be brought back to the House. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. On the Medicare conference, a lot of meetings have been held. Progress is being made. But as the gentleman knows, this is a very, very complicated issue with a whole lot of different, moving parts; and it is a very difficult issue to bring together. But even with the time frame that we have and have laid out, as far as timing as to when we might be able to finish that, I really cannot tell the gentleman with any degree of, any level of certainty. Work is going on. Those that want a bill are working very hard to get one, and we just hope that they can get it done before the end of this session.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, of course, as the gentleman knows, we all would like to have a bill; but there are, obviously, differences of opinions as to what ought to be included in that bill, which always makes the legislative process difficult and time consuming. But this is another example, Mr. Leader, whereon Mr. BREAUX and Mr. BAUCUS on the Senate side have been included, to some degree, in the conference. However, on this side, none of our Members have been included in meetings related to the policies that ought to be included in the conference report.

I have mentioned now the appropriation bills, the energy bill, and now the prescription drug bill. It is of great concern to us that there is an obvious pattern of not including the minority, who are appointed conferees by the Speaker, not including them in discussions. And in light of the fact that there are no meetings formally of conferences and are not noted for conference meetings, it is impossible for us to know, A, what is going on; B, to have input; and, C, reach any kind of an agreement which might make the passage of prescription drugs, child care tax credits, an energy bill, appropriations bills, or any other legislation on behalf of the American public, made easier. I do not know if there is anything further the leader can say on that.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Members will

have every one of their rights protected when it is time for the conference to formally act on a bill. Certainly they will be included. As the gentleman knows, around here, the meetings that are being held in different areas and in different subsets of Members are being held with Members that want a bill and are trying to get a bill done, rather than to obstruct a bill. And Members' rights are always protected whenever they want to change a bill, substitute it, or whatever; and in the formal meetings of a conference, they can do so. But it wastes everybody's time, quite frankly; the reason for a conference committee is to be small with just a few Members so that we can work it out and get it done in an expedited manner. So those meetings are being held with Members who want to get a bill to the floor and to the President.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not want to be very confrontational, and I do not think these colloquies ought to be confrontational; I think it is a good discussion, but I think the gentleman needs to know honestly our view on this.

Let me remind the gentleman of the Patients' Bill of Rights. It passed the 106th Congress of this House with some 60-plus Republicans. However, the gentleman indicates that conferences are being held with people who want to pass a bill. The Speaker, as the gentleman knows, appointed over two-thirds of the Republican conferees who voted against the bill, and that bill never came out of conference. We were not surprised. In the 107th Congress, we were precluded from having a bipartisan bill because the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) concluded that he was going to withdraw from discussions with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) on that.

So with all due respect, Mr. Leader, if you make a judgment that you are not going to include people that you think do not have the same view that you have or that your chairmen have or that your Chairs of subcommittees have, then calling them conferences, we believe, is not appropriate. They may be meetings; they may be meetings of the Members of your side of the aisle who have responsibilities for the bills, but they are not conferences in any classic sense of bringing together the two Houses and all of the conferees who were appointed by the Speaker, not by us.

Conferees are appointed by the Speaker. We are not given any notice of hearings, we do not attend any hearings. And for the gentleman to say that people are meeting, we do not doubt that. We think the gentleman is absolutely right. We hear about those meetings. We read about those meetings. We read about the large conference on the energy bill when the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and Mr. DOMENICI get together and talk. We think that is appropriate. They ought to do that. They need to do that. It is their responsibility. But it is not a conference from our perspective. And there is not an opportunity for us to sit down and represent the point of view that we bring to the table, that we have been elected to put forth.

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

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I would just remind the gentleman, again, that formal conferences are held. When the formal work of the House, through its conference committees are to be done, at that particular time, Members that oppose the bill will have all of their rights protected, and they can go to those meetings and participate in the conference process.

But in order to get a bill, particularly a bill as complicated as an energy bill or the Medicare bill, it has never been, even when the gentleman's party was in the majority, it has never been the practice of having big, huge conference meetings and debates on a daily basis or a regular basis. These things are worked out with those who want a bill and then presented to the full conference in the light of day so that people can express themselves, and it is brought to this floor for further debate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observation; and, obviously, he and I disagree as to how this process occurred when we were in charge and how it is occurring now. But the gentleman and I have both had the privilege of being on the Committee on Appropriations for many years.

□ 1500

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is now, as the majority leader, not on the committee because he has been elevated to his present position. But the gentleman and I have sat in many conferences together, he on one side of the aisle, me on the other side of the aisle, in which we had probably 30 members of the Committee on Appropriations from our side, usually eight or nine from the majority side, 12 or 15, so 20 to 25 Members, and discuss issue by issue and go through it. That is what we expect the conference to be, because that is what we expect the democratic process provides in a conference committee to resolve differences that might exist.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield? I just remind the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) in that particular case the gentleman is absolutely right. But everyone sitting at that table, at the time, wants a bill. And they work hard to get the bill rather than try to kill a bill. So, it is very easy to work in that configuration as the appropriators usually do.

And when everybody comes together and everybody knows that they are trying to get a bill and want a bill to be brought to the House, they are included. And it is no different than any other conference.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to assure the majority leader we want a prescription drug bill. We have been fighting for a prescription drug bill, but that does not necessarily mean we want your prescription drug bill. We want a bill that has the support of the majority, the American people, and that we believe we can have. We are fighting for such a bill.

We want an energy bill. We think this country needs an energy bill, certainly in light of the August 14 blackout in the northeast. We think we need to address that issue.

So let me assure the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) that we want to see these bills passed. But let me also assure the gentleman that if the condition preceding to having a conference in which we are included is saying that we will agree to it as it passed the House, if we oppose it, that is neither a reasonable request on your part, I believe, nor is it the expectation of either side that they be included in a conference only on a condition that they will agree to what the leadership wants to do.

I think we have probably discussed this sufficiently, but it is a real concern that we are not including both sides in these conferences. Because on the energy bill, I do not believe there has been a conference nor does the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) as we understand a conference. But we have a different view, perhaps.

Mr. Speaker, unless the majority leader wants to make additional comments, I would yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108–136)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2003, to the Federal Register for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the Federal Register on October 18, 2002.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property of interests in property that are in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons and by depriving them of access to the United States market and financial system.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 2003.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCOTTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TROOP/VETERANS AMENDMENTS BLOCKED BY HOUSE LEADERSHIP FOR CONSIDERATION OR DEFEATED ON HOUSE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, well, that was a quite a week's work for the United States Congress. We just managed to add $87 billion to the debt of the United States of America if this legislation stands in conference with the Senate. $87 billion will be borrowed to continue the conflict in Iraq and to build a vibrant new economy for Iraq, roads, bridges, highways, telephone systems, 9/11 ports, a lot of things that we could use here in the United States, investment that if it was made in the United States, would put more than a million people to work.

But in the wisdom of the Republican majority in the House, this will be money that will be borrowed and spent in Iraq. They would not allow us to convert it to loans. One gentleman from Indiana famously stood up with an amendment to convert it to loans last night. He knew his amendment was not going to be made in order. He got an hour to debate it and then went away like a sheep when his amendment was not allowed, did not even challenge the ruling of the Chair, did not even try to get a vote. And then when he was offered a chance to vote on a democratic amendment to turn it into a loan because they have $7 trillion of oil reserves, he voted no.

People like that are going to have to explain that to their constituents. How is it more important that the working people of America assume billions of dollars of debt, that people for three generations are going to repay over the next 30 years for the people of Iraq so they may prosper, so they may better exploit their $7 trillion of oil reserves, and we cannot ask them to contribute to that process. It is not about war damage. It is about the damage done to their economy by a brutal dictator.

Here are a few things that were not in the bill. Even though we are borrowing $87 billion, it did not include $4.6 billion transferred from rebuilding Iraq to quality-of-life enhancements for our troops so they can have potable water, health and dental screening, postdeployment health care coverage for the Guard and Reserve, prepaid phone cards, transportation home on leave, they would not allow that. It was more important to borrow the money and spend it on Iraq.

An amendment to increase imminent-danger pay for the troops, the American men and women serving over there. And family separation allowance, prepaid phone cards, and $25 million in loans to Reservists who own small businesses disrupted by this deployment. That was not in the bill because it was more important to borrow and spend the money to rebuild Iraq and to benefit the Iraqi people.

An amendment to add $1.8 billion for veterans health care was not part of this bill. An amendment to add $1.8 billion, another, a second one, by reducing the Iraqi construction account for veterans health care was not allowed.

I guess we know where the parties stand. We hear a lot about the Republicans are with the troops. They may be good at wrapping themselves in the flag, but when it comes to putting the money and their vote where the troops are, they are not there. They are AWOL. And they were AWOL on these amendments. They were AWOL on the amendment to add the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act to the bill. It would not have taken any money away from the Iraqi people, but would have given benefits to the people in the Armed Forces here.

An amendment to provide additional compensation to Guard and Reserve members, an amendment to provide Guard and Reserve members medical and dental screening upon being called to active duty, tricare coverage to certain Reserve members. An amendment to increase the basic pay of Reservists by $1,000 a month.

An amendment, this one was quite an amendment, it was a tie vote, so that means that any person who voted against it on that side of the aisle, and 99 percent of them did, to give a $1,500 bonus to those serving in Iraq or Afghanistan, and it would have come out of the foreign aid portion, the build-Iraq portion of this budget.

So the Republican majority decided it was more important to give more money to a country with $7 trillion of oil reserves than it was to give a $1,500 bonus. I guess they have not talked to their Reservists who have been called up. I have. Many of them have taken huge cuts in pay. They are putting their family businesses at risk, if they have family businesses. Yeah, they may get their jobs back when they return, but they are never going to make up for that income.

This would have just been a fraction of what many of them lost. But, no, they could not do that. It was more important to give $20 billion to the Iraqi people to build their infrastructure, their roads, their bridges, their health care, their education system, their sewer, their water systems, things that we could use across America.

An amendment to reimburse any servicemember or any family who purchases protective body armor. We voted $79 billion last April, we borrowed, the House of Representatives, the Senate, the President, borrowed $79 billion for this war last April, and it did not include the body armor. Well, the money was there, yes. But Rumsfeld did not order it because he said, oh, the troops are not going to be there long enough to need it, and people are going to greet them by waving little tiny American flags. So he just did not order the body armor. It is not that they did not have the money. They did not order it. They did not order the armored Humvees for our troops.

What they have not done is incredible, but what they have done is even worse. They have indebted the people of the United States of America for $87 billion, most of it to benefit the residents of another nation and not here in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DISAGREEING WITH THE PASSAGE OF H.R. 3289

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I think we need to put in perspective what just happened and unfolded on the floor of the House. And I think it is important to share this with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because that is what we are sharing with this afternoon, the journey that we just took and the importance and the monumental statement that we made today.

Just for a slight bit of history and fairness to the debate, might I just say that I opposed the War Resolution of 2002 on the basis of facts. The first question was whether or not the administration made its case on the existence of weapons of mass destruction and whether or not the United States was under imminent attack.

Though I am trained to be polite, and I do not want to say I told you so, clearly this war was not about weapons of mass destruction which have not yet been found, and clearly the United States with the condition of Saddam Hussein and the poorness of his country were not about to be imminently attacked. But the war did occur.

And so I disagree with the majority leader, it is not war. The war against terrorism is our war. And that war had the embrace of the world leaders and nations after 9/11. And we blew up that coalition by going singly, unilaterally without a Constitutional vote in a war against Iraq. We broke the coalition. We broke the friendships and the alliances around the war against terrorism. The war against terrorism is our mutual vote. But there is no suggestion that Iran or Iraq or Korea is anymore engaged in the war against terrorism that would have warranted a preemptive attack against Iraq. But yet our young men and women went forward to the front lines, our neighbors or friends, our sons and daughters, and we rallied around them.

I take issue with the majority leader who would question any Member's patriotism because we refused to go down the rosy path of destruction and foolishness of this administration. How dare you suggest who is unpatriotic and who is not? Yes, I support the troops, and you cannot dare tell me I do not. What have you done?

This past weekend I spent many, many hours with troops in the Middle East, young men and women who did not care whether or not their names were cited. They wanted us to know that there is no exit strategy, that they have been there for 7 and 8 and 9 months and no one will tell them when they can go home, that there are no jobs for them to do there in terms of their particular responsibilities, that the part of their work is over, and yet they still cannot go home, that carpenters and painters and electricians are being used as police officers to knock open doors. Why not the Iraqi police?

When they ask about their pay, Reservists and National Guard, they cannot even get paid proficiently and efficiently. But yet, Madam Speaker, today the majority of this Congress voted $3.2 billion for security and law enforcement in Iraq, $1.3 billion for justice public safety and civil society infrastructure, $5.65 billion for electrical generation, and $2.1 billion for oil infrastructure, and $4.3 billion for water resources.

□ 1515

Of course we should help rebuild Iraq; I am not an isolationist. As we should Liberia and Haiti. But it is interesting how you can find little help and little resources for them.

This U.N. Security Council resolution that we are bragging about, it is a paper tiger. There is no commitment of troops. There is no fresh infusion of troops. The RAND Corporation said that if we were going to have the number of troops that we needed, we needed 350,000 troops on the ground. We have barely 130,000. We do not have fresh troops to be able to put in so our other troops can go home. And then on top of that we have a situation where we are not paying our troops.

So my amendments regarding making sure they get paid, not allowed. My amendments saying there should be an exit strategy, not allowed. My amendment to prohibit funds to be used until there is an exit strategy, not allowed. My amendment that would restore back to Condoleezza Rice the right to coordinate the funds to oversee the President's plan, stricken or not allowed. They have language in there that says she cannot control the monies, and she has been put over the plan that should be rebuilding Iraq.

My amendment to separate the vote, meaning vote from the troops separately from the rebuild so that we can collaborate in the Madrid conference, not allowed. None of the serious amendments allowed on the basis of supporting our troops was in order. We were stopped in our tracks.

I am glad to say that most of the American people have enough sense to know that this is a foolish, misdirected, and unfortunate policy of the United States. I hope we will come together on behalf of the troops. And how dare you suggest that any of our patriotism should be questioned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SKELTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MISGUIDED POLICY OF NATION BUILDING IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I want to spend a little bit of time this evening talking about the bill that we spent 3 days debating. That is the $87 billion appropriations bill that we just voted on and passed, not so much that I want to rehash what we did during these 3 days as much as to make a point that we ought to be debating something other than the technicality of how to spend $87 billion of the taxpayers' money. And that has to do with overall policy.

I think so rarely we deal with policy and we deal only with technicality and accounting and an attempt made at oversight. So I would like to spend a little bit of time emphasizing a different type of foreign policy that we have become unaccustomed to. Because there was an American foreign policy once well known to us, to our country and especially to our founders, a policy of nonintervention. Today, and essentially for a hundred years, we have been following a policy of foreign intervention, that is, that we assume more than I believe we should overseas. And I object to that because I see it as not gaining a constitutional mandate as well as I see it as being a great danger to us both in the area of national defense, national security, as well as the economic dangers it presents.

The debate has ended, it is said, with this vote; but in many ways I think the debate is only really getting started. The debate has been going on a long time dealing with Iraq.

It did not even start after 9–11. It is true within weeks after 9–11 the Project for New American Century saw this as an opportunity to bring forth their suggestions that they had made many years ago, and they have been agitating forth for over 10 years, and that is to go into Iraq; and they saw this as an opportunity. But actually, this debate has been going on even a lot longer. Certainly since the first Iraqi war in 1990 and the persistence of our bombing of Iraq, as well as the embargo and boycotts of Iraq served to do a lot of internal damage to the Iraqi people.

But the debate, instead of ending, I think is really just starting. Because the vote today, although it was overwhelmingly in support of the $87 billion, I noticed a lot more people in the Congress voted against the appropriations reflecting probably the views of many taxpayers in this country who are very reluctant to spend this kind of money overseas, especially if they perceive what we are doing is not being very productive. And not only do we have to deal with whether or not what we are doing is productive or not, but the final analysis will be, can we afford it?

It may be that the lack of affordability may bring us to our senses before the logic of a foreign policy. That might make more sense than what we have been doing. Before the Iraqi war, the 18 months, actually there was a pretty strong debate here in the Congress. Several of us, quite a few of us, got to the floor and talked about the potentiality of war and why we thought it was a bad idea. My conclusion in October of 2002, 6 months or so before the invasion, was that we should not go in to Iraq. And it was a deeply held conviction, not only philosophically, because of a strong belief I have in nonintervention and the restraints that are placed on us by the Constitution, but also because I was convinced that our national security was not threatened by Saddam Hussein and that 9–11 had nothing to do with Iraq and Iraq had nothing to do with 9–11 nor Saddam Hussein. And I think the events since that time have proven that assumption to be correct.

There is no evidence that Saddam Hussein was capable of fighting or invading anybody. There was no resistance and he had been shooting at our airplanes for over 12 years and never hit one of them. To assume he was a threat to the world was, I think, overblown. Those are the reasons why I so strongly objected to it.

Now, the argument goes that whether or not we supported the war at the beginning, we should support the troops now. The troops are there and if you vote against the appropriations, it means that you lack support for the troops. Well, this is not true; and those who argue that case know it is the case, that it is not true because the funding that is already in the pipeline is certainly enough for several months of leaving and coming home. And so that argument just does not hold water. And besides, if you really talk to the troops, and now we are getting so much more information from the troops, if you ask them whether there is somebody in the Congress that votes to have them come home, whether that indicates a lack of support for them, I think you would get a very clear answer. Probably a very large number, if not all of them, would like to come home tomorrow and they do not see a lot of benefit by the sacrifices that are being made over there. But I think if the support for the war is weak, why are we there? What drives us? And what drives our foreign policy?

Basically, we have come to the acceptance, at least especially throughout the 20th century, of accepting the notion that we have some moral obligation to make the world safe for democracy. And we have heard so much about this that we are over there to spread democracy. Well, if you look to the Constitution, there is no grant of authority even to the Congress or to the President that that should be a goal. That does not mean that our values should not be looked upon and spread; but to be done through the military and by force, that is an entirely different story.

What we are involved here now with our intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places, we are involved in nation-building. And nobody in this country campaigns, whether it is for the Presidency or for a congressional seat or a Senate seat, nobody goes out and says, Elect me to Congress because I want to get into the business of nation-building. Nobody does that and yet really that is what we are talking about today.

We are very much involved in nation-building in Afghanistan, and the successes there are very shaky. We probably occupy one city and not much more. And everybody reads daily about the shakiness of our occupation of Iraq. And we are very much involved in internal affairs of other nations, the kind of thing our founders said do not get involved in. Do not get involved in the internal affairs of other nations. Stay out of entangling alliances. And we are very much involved. The entangling alliance that I had the strongest objection to is the entangling alliance with the United Nations.

So although it was seen by the world that we went into Iraq by defying the United Nations, if anybody would like to check and go back and look at the authorization for the use of force which was a transfer, illegal transfer of power to the President to pursue war, the United Nations was cited 16 times. There was a need to enforce the United Nations resolution. That was the justification for the Congress to transfer this power to the President in allowing him to make his own decision.

Well, that is technically flaunting the Constitution and that the proper method for us going to war is for the Congress to declare war, and then, of course, go out and win the war. But the authority comes from the people to the Congress and the Congress cannot transfer this power and this decision-making to the President under a majority vote in the legislative body.

There have been others, in particular the neo-conservatives who have been very influential in foreign policy the last several years and who have been associated with the Project for a New American Century. They have been explicit in their goals. And one of their explicit goals has been to redraw the lines of the Middle East and to have preemptive regime change. These are serious beliefs that they have; and everybody has a right to their beliefs. Their beliefs that we have this obligation to remove regimes that we do not like and to redraw lines and to spread our way of life and our democracy by the use of force, they sincerely hold those beliefs; and I sincerely disagree with them.

But I believe that the Constitution is on my side and not on their side. And when we do what they want and what we have done and have been doing, it is dangerous. It is dangerous to our security. It is dangerous to our financial situation and our economy. And it is a tremendous drain on so many taxpayers here trying to struggle and make a living.

There are others who influence our policy, and it is not the conspiracy buffs that had coined the phrase ''the military industrial complex.'' And everybody knows where that phrase came from. But it is alive and well. Believe me, it is alive and well. There is a tremendous amount of influence by those who make profits, refurbishing the weapons they get, rebuilding the bombs, rebuilding the airplanes and lining up at the trough to see how they will get to participate in this $87 billion that has just been recently appropriated.

□ 1530

This is one of the reasons why I think the debate just in these last couple of days on whether or not the money would be a loan or a grant really did not have a whole lot of merit. I happen to have supported all the amendments that said it should be a loan, not a grant, but it does not make a bit of difference because the likelihood of a country like Iraq, that does not have a government, being able to make a promise and then pay us back, we generally never get paid back anything. So that to me was a red-herring argument that was sort of one of the tactical or accounting arguments that occupied a tremendous amount of time here by avoiding the bigger issue on whether or not it is a proper role for the United States to be telling the rest of the world how to live and it is our obligation to nation-build and our obligation to redraw the lines of the Middle East. That is the bigger question, and this is the debate I hope to hear that we have on this floor some day.

The policy of interventionism, I think it is dangerous as instead of reducing the odds of a terrorist attack, I believe it increases the odds of a terrorist attack. When I see us occupying Saudi Arabia, having an air base on land which is considered holy land, occupying the Persian Gulf that has a lot of oil, and it has been said we are there to protect our oil, that it would be equivalent to the Chinese coming in to the Gulf of Mexico and saying we do not have enough oil. And if they happen to be stronger and that they could come over and say, well, we are more powerful, we need imports, we are going to protect our oil in the Gulf of Mexico, we will have our Navy in the Gulf of Mexico, and if we need to we are going to put air bases in Florida and Texas and wherever. And then if the Chinese come in and say, well, your way of life is not our way of life, and we should teach you a better system, that is what I see as being equivalent to us being in the Persian Gulf occupying the Arab lands, and especially, now, Afghanistan and Iraq.

In other words, no matter how well-intended those individuals are who drive our foreign policy and drive these expenditures and drive our military around the world, no matter how well-intended under these circumstances, if what I am saying is correct, there is no way it is going to work, and the sooner we admit it and the sooner we discover it is not going to work, the better it is for all of us and the less killing that is going to occur.

So I am strongly suggesting that we here in the House someday get serious about talking about the big picture, the strategic picture, the philosophic picture and the Constitution, deciding what we really should be doing in our foreign policy.

Some people say, well, it sounds to me like what you are advocating is isolationism, and nobody wants to be an isolationist. When they throw that term out, it is usually done there to try to discredit those individuals, like myself, who are arguing the case for nonintervention. Isolationism is quite a bit different. Isolationism is those who want to put barriers on trade and travel in exchange of ideas. That is true isolationism. That is mercantilism and protectionism. That is not what I am talking about, and that is not what nonintervention is.

Nonintervention in foreign policy means we do not impose our will on other people, something that a lot of very conventional politicians have talked about for years as a matter of fact, especially when they are campaigning.

I would like to quote from the memoirs of George Bush, Senior, which he wrote, and they were published approximately 5 years ago, dealing with Iraq and what he thought about it, about the invasion of Iraq and why he did not go into Iraq. This comes from A World Transformed. This is George Bush, Senior. He says, Trying to eliminate Saddam would have incurred incalculable human and political costs. Apprehending him was probably impossible. We would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq. There was no viable exit strategy we could see, violating another of our principles. Furthermore, we had been self-consciously trying to set a pattern for handling aggression in the post-Cold War period. Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land.

That comes from George Bush, Senior. That is not coming from me, who has always had great concern about our military activity. I think that is sound thinking and sound advice, totally ignored.

In the campaign before the last Presidential election, our President said, If we are an arrogant Nation, they will resent us. If we are a humble Nation but strong, they will believe us. If we are a humble Nation, they will respect us as an honorable Nation.

I think we have lost a little bit of our humility, to say the least, and, as of now, I do not think that our reputation has been enhanced, especially in the Arab-Muslim world, and that concerns me because it is this lack of civility between countries and the antagonism which leads to conflicts and hatreds and killing and guerrilla wars which we are fighting right now.

I express my concern about the way we went to war because it was a transfer of power from the Congress by mere vote, which circumvented the Constitution, rather than a declaration of war, and I base my concern on the fact that we have had a lot more trouble in the last 50 years when we quit declaring war and at least prior to that the wars we declared, they came to an end.

Look at Korea. We did not declare war there. We went there under a U.N. resolution. We are still there. We spent over $1 trillion, and we are still in conflict with North Korea, and it is a serious problem, and we do not trade with them.

Going into Vietnam, we went once again into Vietnam without a declaration of war. It really came to no resolution other than the fact that we walked away. We had to get out because we were not winning. The determination to win was not there because the Vietnamese were not a threat to our national security. Nobody was going to declare war, but look at the difference.

We are still in North Korea. That was under a U.N. resolution, and just look at what has been achieved by leaving Vietnam. They have become Westernized and, to a degree, capitalized. They are more capitalistic. We trade with them, making the point that it is very, very hard to impose our will and our system of values on somebody with the use of arms, but by the willingness of trade and exchanges with people and ideas, they are more likely to come in our direction. So the difference between the 10 terrible years in the 1960s, as we lost 60,000 men and achieved nothing, compared to the next decade or two, how we have become more friends with the Vietnamese, there is a powerful message there if we would listen to it and pay attention to it, but no, since that time we have continued to go into many areas.

I think this was a problem going into Iraq in 1990. It was an undeclared war. It was a U.N. war. It did not end it. It continued and it is still continuing into its 15th year, and here we are still arguing over the financing which I think is at very early stages. How long will we be there and how many men are going to die and how is it going to end? I am convinced as long as we follow this principle of foreign interventionism that we take it upon ourselves to spread democracy around the world, we are going to be running into trouble like this.

James Madison early on in 1798 gave us some advice about the Presidential power and congressional power to go to war, but he was explaining why it was important to keep it in the hands of the legislative body. He says, The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrate, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and the most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war in the legislature.

That is what our Constitution did, but because now it has drifted from the legislature, we allow our Presidents to do more than they should be able to do, and then we allow them to incorporate this into United Nations' mandates. It means that the people have lost their control.

How do the people stay involved in this? In one way, they pay the bills and the young people die. That is what is at stake. Our economy's at stake, our young people are at stake and our freedoms are at stake because we allow the

prerogatives that were explicitly given to the Congress to drift away and get into the hands of the executive branch and into the United Nations. We do not declare war. We do not win them. They persist, they last a long time, and this is the reason why we should really and truly talk about how do we get out of this mess, instead of just expanding the mess, how do we get out and restore a policy that makes a lot more sense.

The famous General, General Douglas MacArthur, who knew a lot about war, also had advice to us about how to handle the issue of war, and he said, The powers in charge keep us in a perpetual state of fear, keep us in a conscious stampede of patriotic fervor, with a cry of grave national emergency. Always there has been some terrible evil to gobble us up if we did not blindly rally behind it by furnishing the exorbitant sums demanded. Yet, in retrospect, these disasters seem never to have happened, seem never to have been quite real.

Here is a man who knew about World War I, World War II and Korea, and he was suggesting that they were overblown.

One thing that we did not talk about in the debate of the $87 billion was a $600 million appropriation. It is not written in there explicitly, but there is a $9.3 billion authority to transfer funds over into the Pentagon and more or less having a slush fund to spend just about any way they want without any significant congressional oversight, but the $600 million has been asked for and will be achieved through this appropriation to continue the search for weapons of mass destruction. They have spent $300 million for six months, with 1,200 individuals combing the entire country of Iraq, and nothing has been found. So typically, American style, modern America, that is, double the amount of money, double the number of people and keep searching, because something will be found.

My answer is, what if you do find something? What does it prove? Does it prove that he was a threat to our national security? No way. Does it prove that it was a relationship to Iraq and 9/11? No way. So this obsession is for saving face and nothing more. If there was a major nuclear or chemical weapon available that was about to be unleashed against us, it would have surely been found by now, but that was not debated, but I am sure that search will go on, and ''when something is found,'' and I put that in quotes, there will be a lot of questions asked. More questions will be asked than answers given.

I guess early this week we also had another vote that emphasizes my concerns, because it again is going in the wrong direction, and that was the vote we had on Syria. A couple of us voted against this. Syria is a hard country to defend, and I am not going to defend Syria. I am defending the Constitution, and I am defending nonintervention, but the Syrian resolution was more or less the first major step in the direction of war against Syria.

This is exactly what the project for a new America century wants. Syria is on their list and the sanctions put on Syria are essentially a prelude to war because that country, as part of the axis of evil, we have to get rid of that regime and they are helping the Iraqis so, therefore, war is coming, and I just cannot see how the average American is sitting around worrying about the Syrians, but they said the Syrians, there may be some people going back and forth from Syria and participating in the guerrilla war in Iraq, which may well be true, but then again, what about other borders?

There is a border between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Pakistan's on our side, Afghanistan is half and half, but right on that border is Osama bin Laden most likely.

□ 1545

And he is probably in Pakistan. So do we decide that we have to go after Pakistan? No, we recognize that the borders are uncontrollable.

Here we are putting sanctions on Syria because we do not like the way they are handling their borders, but there are a lot of people in this country who would like to see us do a better job with our own borders. We do not have control of our own borders, yet here we are putting on sanctions and initiating another step towards war against Syria because we are not satisfied with what they are doing.

We cannot achieve some of these goals that we have set for ourselves through force. We have what comes close to an obsession with democracy. You hear it constantly. We are over in Iraq because we are going to make it a democracy. Well, democratic elections are the way we all get here; but this obsession with democracy, well, democracy means there is a ruling of the majority. But what if the majority does not support freedom?

I would like to see a time come to this place where we talk a lot less about democracy and more about liberty. Liberty is where the minority is protected. Under democracy, the majority is protected, and they can obliterate the minority. And this, in a sense, is what we keep talking about. But let us say they do not want democracy. Are we going to force it upon them? It looks like that is our goal; that we will, by gosh, force them into it if we have to.

I have come to the conclusion that you cannot achieve this through the force of arms and that if you are participating in an unwelcome occupation, you cannot change a culture, you cannot change religious values, you cannot change a legal system. We would not accept the Chinese trying to tell us to live like the Chinese; and we are just as strange and different in Iraq as the Chinese would be here. So even with this grand motivation, it is a lost cause; and the sooner we own up to it, the better.

If we want Iraq and other countries to act more like we do, it can be done; and that should be a goal. But there is a difference. There are two different ways we can do it. One, we can force people to do things and the other way is we can try to talk them into doing it in a voluntary fashion. If we did an exceptionally good job and we had a truly prosperous economy, which I believe a free market would achieve, which we do not have, where the greatest number of people would have the greatest benefits, truly set an example, have democratic elections but obey a constitution that is designed to protect liberty and protect minorities, if we set an example, then I sincerely believe others then would be more inclined to emulate us and to see us as an example.

In a way, what happened in Vietnam, the achievement there without the Army was far better than the losses that occurred when we were trying to use force. But I just am worried about what is happening. I am worried about the expenditures. I am worried that the guerilla war is going to spread. I am concerned because I believe so sincerely that our policy of foreign intervention serves more to incite terrorists against our country than we will calm down by our being over there.

I am convinced that these articles that now appear in the media about the al Qaeda now having an easier time recruiting, I believe those stories. I believe them. Whether it is right or wrong, I do not want to get into that issue, but I believe they are true. And that is a practical reason why nonintervention is so much better than intervention. Intervention leads to trouble, and it leads to expenditures. It leads to debt.

It is such a grand idea that the Founding Fathers gave us about nonintervention and nonentangling alliances. It will do more to serve the cause of peace and prosperity than any other single change of any policy we could have here in this Congress.

I am a little bit encouraged, though, about the fact that the debate may be shifting. In the Congress, not yet. Not yet. There are not too many supporters, and I know that, for nonintervention, for a constitutional foreign policy, to looking to the Founders. It is considered old-fashioned, and that truths do not stay so static, and times are different, and we have this obligation, and all the reasons why we have this moral obligation to go about the world. But where I am encouraged is outside of this place, where the American people are getting concerned.

I would bet if we had a referendum in this country today with this $87 billion, I will tell you where I think that vote would have come down. I bet the American people would not have voted for it. I am convinced of that. But just yesterday, there was an announcement of a group that has organized that I find very fascinating and very encouraging. This group is called Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy.

I have a copy of their statement of principles. More than 100 individuals are involved, mostly professors and other academicians and think-tank people. I do not know if there are any politicians in there. Hopefully, no politicians will be involved. But this is important. This is important because they want to get together and try to change the tone and the nature of the debate. Now, are they liberals or are they conservatives? Are they libertarian or are they constitutionalists? All of them. It is a mixture. They do not want just the liberal flavor or just the right-wing conservative flavor. It is anybody who is willing to sit down and talk about the disadvantage, the practical disadvantage of this road to empire and why we come up on the short end and that this moral obligation of us policing the world really is not a wise idea.

I want to read a little bit from their statement of principles. It says: ''We are a diverse group of scholars and analysts from across the political spectrum who believe that the move toward empire must be halted immediately. The need for a change in direction is particularly urgent because imperial policies can quickly gain momentum with new interventions begetting new dangers, and thus the demand for further actions. If current trends are allowed to continue, we may well end up with an empire that most Americans, especially those whose sons and daughters are or will be sent into harm's way, don't really favor.

''The American people have not embraced the idea of the American empire, and they are unlikely to do so. Since rebelling against the British Empire, Americans have resisted the imperial impulse, guided by the founders' frequent warnings that republic and empire are incompatible. Empire is problematic because it subverts the freedoms and liberties of freedoms at home while simultaneously thwarting the will of the people abroad. An imperial strategy threatens to entangle America in an assortment of unnecessary and unrewarding wars.

''There are ominous signs that the strategy of empire has already begun to erode our fundamental rights and liberties. More and more power is being claimed by the executive branch. And on the economic front,'' which is important in my argument, ''on the economic front, an imperial strategy threatens to weaken us as a Nation, overextending and bleeding the economy and straining our military and Federal budgets.''

Further reading on from the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy: ''The defenders of empire assert that the horrific acts of terrorism on September 11 demand that we assume new financial burdens to fund an expensive national security strategy, relax our commitment to individual liberty at home, and discard our respect for stated sovereignty abroad. Nothing could be further from the truth. Following 9–11, we should have refocused our attention on the very threats facing us in the 21st century. As a nation, we must not allow the events of 9–11 to be used as a pretext for reshaping American foreign policy in a manner inconsistent with our traditions and values and contrary to our interests.''

And that is basically a brief outline of the principles of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy.

We have been told by some of our leaders that standing up for good against evil is very hard work and it costs a lot of money and blood, but they have gone on to say we are willing to pay. These are the politicians. This has been true for thousands of years. The politicians are always grandiose in their goals and their schemes and their plans for what they think is best for the world, and they are always willing to pay with dollars and blood.

But the politician never pays. Politicians here on the floor who are so anxious to go, many of them have not served, and many of them would not be very anxious to be serving over there. It is the politicians who promote the wars that rarely serve. The only way that anybody on this floor should ever vote to send our troops into harm's way is they should look at it in a very personal way. They should look at it in the sense of what would it be like if I would go there and I would be carrying a rifle on the front line, or I would be a target for some sniper. Do I want to be there? Is it worth that? Or would I send my son to do that, or would I send my grandson or my granddaughter to that type of danger?

It has to be personalized. Because if it is just, oh, we are willing to pay. Where does the money come from? We are flat-out broke. We have had the biggest deficit ever. Our dollar is going down on the market, and we are now assuming more liabilities. When we spend $87 billion in Iraq, that is literally taken out of our economy. Imagine how many jobs and how much improvement on the standard of living of Americans could occur with $87 billion, and at the same time believe sincerely that a policy of nonintervention would be the best policy for peace and prosperity.

I do not know how anybody could reject that policy. It is fantastic. It is the policy of free people. It is not the policy of empire. It is not the policy of imperialism.

But I am going to win this argument. Not because I am persuasive. I will win this argument that we have gone too far and have overextended. Sadly, I will win this argument because we are going to go broke. Because all great nations who believe that they can spread their will around the world, they always overextend; and then it virtually always leads to the debasement of the currency.

In the old days, they deluded the metal or clipped the coins. Today, it is more sophisticated, because we run up the debt, we send it over to the Fed, and they print the money. But that is debasing the currency, and it undermines the standard of living, already occurring with people on fixed incomes. So it will finally come to a halt, just as our intervention in Vietnam finally came to a sad halt. It did end. But the rest will come to an end when we can no longer afford it.

We should have greater faith and greater confidence in freedom. Freedom works. And that was the message of the Founders. That is the message of the Constitution. But we have lost our confidence. We have lost our way. We cannot even have one single problem exist throughout the country without coming here for another law.

I think it is time that free people gain some confidence, believing sincerely that we will all be better off, we will all be more prosperous, we will all be much freer, and we will all be much safer. And then, when we achieve that, then I believe other countries of the world will have a stronger desire to emulate us, rather than hate us.

□ 1600

MEETING OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I opposed the President's decision to rush to war earlier this year. Many of us, at that time, warned of the high costs and difficulties of winning the peace that we face today in Iraq. But the President's poor decisions have painted our country into a difficult corner, and I believe that we now have a responsibility to provide funds and to maintain security on the ground in Iraq and to assist in the reconstruction of that country.

Let us not fool ourselves or the American people. It will not just be the tens of billions of dollars that we passed in the bill today. It will require billions more in the years ahead. We also have other responsibilities, to level with the American people and to pay for our efforts in Iraq in a straightforward and up-front manner. The President shirked the first responsibility by failing to prepare the American people for the true costs of the war and winning the peace.

Now, he seeks to escape responsibility for the second by putting those costs on our national credit card and running up huge deficits. Every penny of the $87 billion requested by the President is money borrowed from the next generation of Americans. His out-of-sight, out-of-mind approach to such important issues will end up costing our children down the road. We should not be waging war and peace by credit card. If we are willing to pay the price to defeat the scourge of terrorism, we

must pay for it in an honest way. While the Bush administration has asked our troops and their families to make the ultimate sacrifice, the President has given the wealthiest Americans a huge tax cut. That is wrong. It is wrong to pass the buck to the next generation. It is wrong to ask the younger generation, including our troops and their children, to bear the burden alone. And it is wrong to shield the wealthiest Americans from paying their fair share.

We now face a huge responsibility gap in our government. It is the gap between those who understand that we now have a responsibility to establish stability in Iraq and help rebuild Iraq and who are prepared to pay for it the right way and up front and those who call upon the country in their rhetoric to pay any price in Iraq, but then run from responsibly paying that price. I filed an amendment in this House to fill that responsibility gap. It was an amendment to scale back the Bush tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans to pay for the costs of the bill we passed today. Incredibly, the House leadership prohibited that amendment from even coming to a vote.

The President is asking the American people to invest billions of dollars of our money to build schools, hospitals, roads, electric grids and communications systems in Iraq when here at home our Federal, State and local governments are experiencing huge revenue shortfalls in this very difficult economy. The President's budget request of this year falls $9 billion short of what was promised by we, the Federal Government, just a year and a half ago to meet our obligations to America's schoolchildren under the No Child Left Behind legislation. Three out of five children in this country who are eligible for Head Start cannot receive help because of lack of funds. Years ago, the Federal Government pledged to cover 40 percent of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a good education in this country. That was the right thing to do. But today we are only paying 18 percent of what was promised. The same shortfalls occur in health programs, our national transportation infrastructure, job creation initiatives and a range of other important domestic needs. We must meet our needs here at home at the same time that we meet our international responsibilities in Iraq, Afghanistan and other places around the globe. We as a Nation, as a people, have enormous resources. We can meet both our domestic needs and our international responsibilities, but we must be prepared to pay for them. If we refuse to pay now for our efforts in Iraq by reducing portions of the tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, it will make it much, much harder to make the investments that we also must make in education, health, transportation and other needs here at home.

Already this year when many of us in the Committee on Education and the Workforce called for full funding for No Child Left Behind and for special education programs, we were told we did not have the resources because of the large tax cuts disproportionately weighted to the wealthiest. Adding this $87 billion to the deficit will make it even more difficult to meet those pressing needs. We must pay now for the costs of our efforts in Iraq. We cannot put everything on our national credit card.

The President, I believe, has totally abdicated his leadership responsibilities in this area. Our international responsibilities now require us to pay the price of leadership. Leadership is about setting priorities. The war in Iraq was a war of choice. Regardless of what any of us may think about how that choice was made, we now have a responsibility to pay for the consequences of that choice. The President, by refusing to honestly pay for the war and its aftermath, by refusing to reverse the tax cuts on even the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, refuses to acknowledge the real costs of those choices.

There are some who argue that because the President has refused to scale back his tax cuts to pay for the war and its aftermath, those of us who believe we have a responsibility to provide security and aid in reconstruction of Iraq have no alternative but to support the President's request for $87 billion without conditions, that we have to go along with his plan to wage war and peace by credit card. That is a false choice, and, I believe, an irresponsible position. We have an obligation as a Congress to hold the President to a higher standard of leadership. If the President believes, as I do, that we now have an obligation to provide security and help rebuild Iraq, he should have the simple courage to ask the wealthiest Americans to give up some portion of the huge tax cuts to help pay for our efforts in Iraq. The choice is not between doing nothing and doing it the President's way. We should do it the right way.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARSHALL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, October 20.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 20, 2003, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4801. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4802. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the revised Strategic Plan for the fiscal years 2003 to 2008, pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4803. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the strategic plan for fiscal years 2003 through 2008 in compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4804. A letter from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''Comparative Analysis of Actual Cash Collections to Revised Revenue Estimates Through the 3rd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2003''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4805. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the sixteenth report in a series on The Impact of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA), pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2704; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4806. A letter from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting the ninth annual report on the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA) entitled ''Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Drug Crop Eradication and Crop Substitution,'' pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 3204; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUYER:

H.R. 3330. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to amend the Federal charter of the United States Olympic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CARSON of Indiana (for herself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs.

NAPOLITANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 3331. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive practices by organizations providing debt counseling, debt consolidation, or debt settlement services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 3332. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a safety net Medicare outpatient prescription drug program for indigent beneficiaries without other outpatient prescription drug coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOYD:

H.R. 3333. A bill to exempt certain coastal barrier areas in Florida from limitations on Federal expenditures and financial assistance under the Coastal Barriers Resources Act, and limitations on flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 3334. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design and construction of the Riverside-Corona Feeder in cooperation with the Western Municipal Water District of Riverside, California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 3335. A bill to reduce the instances of releases from underground storage tanks by strengthening tank inspections, operator training, program enforcement, oxygenated fuel cleanup, and providing States greater Federal resources from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 3336. A bill to clarify congressional approval of certain State energy production tax practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3337. A bill to give livestock operators holding a grazing permit or lease on Federal lands in the State of Arizona the opportunity to relinquish their grazing permit or lease in exchange for compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 3338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive to individuals teaching in elementary and secondary schools located in rural or high unemployment areas and to individuals who achieve certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TIAHRT, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 3339. A bill to expand upon the Department of Defense Energy Efficiency Program required by section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2002 by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to enter into energy savings performance contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Major League Baseball officials should select Monterrey, Mexico, to host 25 percent of the total number of Montreal Expos games in the 2004 season as a gesture of goodwill between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. FROST):

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution honoring the service of Native American Indians in the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H. Res. 405. A resolution commending Michigan State University President Peter McPherson for his service to his country and his significant contribution to the financial reconstruction of Iraq; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Res. 406. A resolution recognizing the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Women's Memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 34: Mr. BELL.

H.R. 65: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 97: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 284: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 303: Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 331: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 391: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 645: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 664: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 742: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 764: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DICKS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BELL, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 791: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 806: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 839: Mr. SWEENEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BELL, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1155: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1157: Mr. BALLANCE.

H.R. 1345: GRIJALVA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. ROSS, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1372: Mr. WU.

H.R. 1430: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1482: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1513: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1554: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1563: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1592: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1662: Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 1749: Mr. GOSS and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1755: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1787: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. CASE, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 1860: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1910: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. MAJETTE.

H.R. 1916: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WATT, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1919: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1924: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1943: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2021: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 2038: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2047: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2096: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BAKER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2131: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACEVDO-VILA, Mr. BELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON, of Connecticut, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. OSE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2203: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 2244: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 2246: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 2255: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 2262: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2318: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 2366: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2394: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2402: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2517: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2519: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2638: Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 2694: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2699: Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 2700: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 2719: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 2720: Mr. REGULA, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 2816: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2883: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2915: Mr. WALSH and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 2932: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2952: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 2953: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 3003: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3015: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 3051: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3052: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 3069: Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 3109: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3122: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3125: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 3130: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 3160: Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 3190: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 3204: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 3208: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 3226: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3228: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3235: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3237: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3242: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 3243: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 3244: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3263: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GOSS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BACA, Mr. BELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. OSE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 3270: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 3276: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3276: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3295: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 3306: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3323: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3325: Mr. CASE and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Con. Res. 69: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 126: Mrs. CUBIN.

H. Con. Res. 165: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. WAMP.

H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 280: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. JANKLOW, and Mr. BUYER.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. EHLERS.

H. Con. Res. 288: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WYNN, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H. Con. Res. 292: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MURPHY.

H. Res. 38: Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Res. 300: Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. DEMINT.

H. Res. 307: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 387: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. WYNN.

H. Res. 400: Mr. HYDE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. REYES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. WOLF.