United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2003 No. 145

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 16, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Congregational Methodist Church, Milner, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our most kind and gracious Heavenly Father, we thank You for this day and the privilege to approach Your thrown. We are grateful that one of our forefathers, Ben Franklin, had the foresight to request that Congress begin each meeting by imploring the assistance of heaven.

Lord God, I lift up everyone here today to You in prayer, realizing that we often refer to them as politicians, but in Your Holy Book, you refer to them as ministers. And they are responsible to those they represent but ultimately to You.

I pray Your wisdom, direction, and guidance upon them and their families. I especially ask You to be with President Bush; lead him as he leads our Nation. I ask You to be with our soldiers, no matter where they are serving; protect them, and bring them home safe.

Lord, we still believe what George Washington stated more than 200 years ago: ''It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible.''

May we always be keenly aware of what made this Nation great and may we return to You.

I pray all this, in the wonderful name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, until You come, we pray.

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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SOLIS 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 without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1474. An act to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1474) ''An Act to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3229. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to transfer to the Public Printer the authority over the individuals responsible for preparing indexes of the Congressional Record, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REVEREND DR. BENNY TATE

(Mr. COLLINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I introduce the Reverend Dr. Benny Tate from Rock Springs Congregational Methodist Church in Milner, Georgia. June and I are regular visitors to Dr. Tate's church.

Dr. Tate reminds me of a quote from Alexis de Tocqueville who came to America in 1831 to study democracy. And he wrote, and I quote, ''I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there; in her fertile fields and her boundless forests, and it was not there; in her rich mines and her vast world of commerce, and it was not there; in our democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution, and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good. And if America ever ceases to be good, America then will cease to be great.''

Fourteen years ago Dr. Tate relocated to Georgia to pastor the Congregation of the Rock Springs Congressional Methodist Church. Under his tenure, the average Sunday morning

Printed on recycled paper.

attendance has grown from 30 to 750. To accommodate this growth, the church is in a building program at this time to build and construct a 1,100-seat sanctuary. Their motto is if God builds it, they will come.

Dr. Tate is the author of two books, Happy Wife, Happy Life, and, One More Night with the Frogs. He also hosts a popular weekly radio program, Apples of Gold. He and his wife Barbara and their daughter Savannah reside in Griffin, Georgia.

Dr. Tate is a pastor that I love, a pastor that I enjoy, and a pastor with a message that if God builds it, they will come because his message is one of righteousness.

I am proud to introduce, Dr. Benny Tate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive 10 1-minute speeches on each side.

CELEBRATING THE 175TH BIRTHDAY OF LEXINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, Lexington, North Carolina, is celebrating its 175th birthday this year. Lexington is a furniture and textile center, known for its famous Lexington-style barbecue and its annual Barbecue Festival which draws 100,000 people each October.

There are numerous Lexingtons in our country, from sea to sea, border to border, across the fruited plain, but none dispenses barbecue that is as delectable and tasty as Lexington barbecue. Go visit the old girl on her 175th. While there, tell her you want to order a chopped tray, laced with hush puppies and slaw. You will come back.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and I, wish Lexington, North Carolina, a happy 175th birthday with wishes for many more to come.

CELEBRATING THE 175TH BIRTHDAY OF LEXINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the residents of Lexington, North Carolina, part of which is located in my congressional district as they celebrate the 175th anniversary of their city.

Lexington was incorporated on December 28, 1827, and the first town commissioners were elected February 7, 1828. They are celebrating their anniversary throughout 2003.

Today Lexington has around 20,000 residents and is a thriving part of North Carolina's Triad. Lexington is the county seat of Davidson County and is world famous for their Lexington-style barbecue, which many regard as the world's best. Lexington is also renowned for its furniture and is the home of artist Bob Timberlake.

I wish all the best to Lexington residents and Mayor Richard Thomas as they celebrate ''Lexington's 175th Years: Past, Present and Future.'' I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for joining me in honoring this city that we both are proud to represent.

THE MIRACLE ON MOTOR STREET

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about the miracle on Motor Street in Texas. There is a natural tension between competing constituencies in the arena of vying for Federal dollars.

Funding for research for health care may at times intersect sharply with those dollars required for engineering research. But sometimes it all coalesces and condenses around a single event that serves to demonstrate the importance of collaboration.

And we witnessed just such an event this weekend in north Texas with the apparent hugely successful separation of Ahmed and Mohamed Ibrahim.

The intersection of mechanical engineering, bioengineering, pharmacology medicine, and surgery quietly and completely joined together to give these two otherwise healthy boys their best chance at a normal life.

I have a new job now, one which deals more with policy than surgical skill. So how nice it was to stand with one foot in the political world, but one not too far removed from the medical world, and to vicariously savor the moment of triumph for, yes, our medical professionals and also for everyone who devotes a life to making things better for those around them.

And everyone was involved at Children's Medical Center in Dallas, from the doctors, nurses, technicians, to the theoretical and practical professionals who developed the specialized OR table, monitors, and medicines.

We are reminded of how sometimes, when we focus on the very big and noble causes, we are rewarded many times over.

BRINGING JUSTICE TO THE FAMILIES IN CIUDAD JUAREZ

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before you to tell you about a very moving experience I had this weekend. I traveled to the city of Ciudad Juarez in Mexico on a fact-finding mission with three other Members of Congress.

Over 300 young women between the ages of 15 and 20 years of age were either sexually assaulted, raped, tortured and brutally murdered in the Ciudad Juarez in the past 10 years.

I met with heartbroken families who were suffering from their losses. The families I met with wore pink hats and T-shirts with pictures of their loved ones that were missing, asking for justice, for ''Justicia.''

They are rightfully looking for justice and closure to these awful murders. Many of these women and girls were abducted on their way to work or returning home from work or school.

I wish all Members could see where some of these women live, in great miserable conditions where neighborhoods have no paved roads, no electricity, and no street lighting.

So women have to travel by walking several blocks in the evening. Once they come home from work, many of them work there along the border.

On Tuesday, the day that I returned from our trip from Ciudad Juarez, the body of a woman was found battered to death and then wrapped in a plastic bag. The fact is that this continues to happen, does not make it acceptable or tolerable.

In August, the Mexican Government established a commission that we hope will work and collaborate with our government, the FBI, and also other entities and the State Department to come to some conclusion.

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as part of the Washington Waste Watchers, I want to highlight, once again, the waste in the Federal Government.

Over the last 4 years the Department of Agriculture spent over $5 billion in food stamp improper payments. This could have paid for over a year of food stamps for over 3 million low-income Americans.

Improper payments alone last year could have paid for a year of food stamps for close to 800,000 low-income Americans, Mr. Speaker. And yet our friends the Democrats still want to raise your taxes to pay for more of this?

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are worried about spending more money to protect our troops and to provide for America's long-term security, but they have no problem in spending money to give benefits to ineligible recipients. We have to get our priorities right, Mr. Speaker.

Let us fight waste, fraud, and abuse. We ask our friends in the other party to help us in our long term security and not do anything to not fund our troops abroad.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is expected to vote on the President's $87 billion supplemental appropriations bill for Iraq.

This $87 billion is on top of the $79 billion we approved last spring.

This is not an easy vote, and I appreciate hearing from my constituents on this issue.

I have no objection to spending every dime necessary to make sure our troops are safe and well-supplied with everything they need to do their jobs, but the $18.6 billion in the bill for civilian reconstruction is simply too big of a handout.

Iraq has vast oil reserves, and we should lend the money to Iraq. The President has refused to separate the military portion of the bill from the reconstruction money.

I will offer an amendment to set aside enough money to pay a $1,500 bonus to every serviceman and woman who served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Another amendment would require the use of American steel to be used in the rebuilding of Iraqi infrastructure, helping to keep jobs here in America.

Our people at home are hurting for jobs for health care, for quality education, prescription drug coverage. I do not believe we can ask them to continue to sacrifice even more to assume an enormous additional debt for Iraq's civilian reconstruction. That is why I intend to vote against the supplemental appropriation bill.

□ 1015

QUERIA'S TRUE COLORS

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

Mr. PITT. Mr. Speaker, three Americans lost their lives this week in Gaza City. Several Palestinians died as well. They were part of a team being escorted by Palestinian security forces to bring relief to the Palestinian people.

The Middle East peace process sometimes looks like it will never succeed. But as we mourn the death of these Americans, we should keep a wary eye on what Arafat's new prime minister said in response to a question last week.

Asked whether he would support the road map and confront and shut down the terrorists, he responded, ''I will not listen to the Americans. I will listen to our national rights. We will not confront; we will not go for a civil war. It is not in our interest. It is not in the interests of our people and it is not in the interests of the peace process.''

He is right about a civil war. That is not what we want. But to say that he is willing to stand up to the people in his ranks who deliberately target and kill innocent people is ridiculous. Too many innocent people are dying, Israelis and Palestinians, to avoid direct confrontation with the forces that are killing those people.

IRAQ SPENDING DONE RIGHT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it was wrong to give this administration a blank check to wage unilateral war, and it is wrong to give them a blank check to rebuild Iraq. Total spending in Iraq is now approaching $200 billion of borrowed money, with no end in sight. We need to spend less, spend smarter and put someone in charge who knows what they are doing.

None of this controversy should prevent our providing our troops with the support they deserve. They will ultimately get flak jacket liners, protective vehicles, and for their basic needs like safe drinking water. It is just sad that it is taking so long. It is not the time to approve this reconstruction package, 10 times the size of the Marshall Plan even after being adjusted for inflation (on a per capita basis).

It is not being administered by the right people. I will offer an amendment to shift it to the State Department and USAID. Our troops, the Iraqi people, and the American public deserve this to be done right.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FLORIDA MARLINS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate the Florida Marlins on a wonderful victory as the National League champions for the 2003 season.

The Florida Marlins was a team that few expected to reach the playoffs, and their victory last night proves that you can win with hard work and nothing is out of reach. Well, perhaps for the Cubbies a ball in left field may be out of reach. But for fellow Miamians and the faithful Marlins fans, winning the National League title comes as little surprise for a team that is known for incredible come-from-behind wins and dramatic finishes such as the 1997 World Series.

Congratulations are in order for the Chicago Cubs for a great season that wound up just short of their hope to reach the World Series since 1945.

Last night's victory was both thrilling and breathtaking. As our Marlins head to the World Series, I wish them the best of luck, and I know that they will certainly prevail as the 2003 World Series champions.

Felicidades a los Marlins.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Unfortunately, domestic violence continues to be a major threat facing women of all ages. The most conservative estimate indicated that each year 2 to 4 million women are battered or beaten, and nearly 200,000 of these cases are serious enough to require hospitalization or emergency room use.

While there are many support groups and organizations dedicated to helping people of domestic violence, there are still those who would seek to undercut these services.

Recently, a lawsuit was filed by the National Coalition of Free Men who claimed that 10 shelters in Southern California provided services to abused and battered women and were engaging in unlawful sex discrimination because they did not accept men at their shelters. The California Women's Law Center and the law firm of O'Melveny & Meyers represented a majority of these shelters, pro bono, and successfully argued that this lawsuit had no merit.

While it is important to provide services for all abused and battered persons, it is equally important that these services not be denied to those who need it the most, women and children who are the most vulnerable to these attacks.

COMMENDING THE GEORGIA BOARD OF HUMAN RESOURCES

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the mental health community of southeast Georgia celebrated a victory.

After the outgoing Human Resources commissioner proposed the closure of Georgia Regional Hospital in Savannah last month, the Georgia Board of Resources voted yesterday to keep this important hospital open.

Last month, I wrote the Governor with my concerns over the closure of Georgia Regional. I was deeply concerned that the decision to close the facility was made by only looking at the direct cost savings and did not include the services that this facility provides to southeast Georgia.

I was concerned about the additional costs that the region would incur due to the closure, as well as the difficulties that people with psychiatric and developmental disabilities and their families would endure.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Georgia Board of Human Resources for agreeing to keep this necessary facility open in Savannah, Georgia.

HUNGER CRISIS IN AMERICA

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

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, when Americans think about hunger, we usually think about mass starvation in faraway countries. But hunger too often lurks in our own back yards.

In the United States, over 33 million people live in households where people have to skip meals or eat less to make ends meet. In many homes in my State of Oregon, an estimated 720,000 people ate meals from emergency food boxes at least once last year.

Children comprise nearly 40 percent of those receiving emergency food, yet this administration is considering making changes to the verification process for the free and reduced-price school meals that could eliminate more eligible low-income children.

Today, four of my Oregon colleagues and I sent a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Ann Veneman asking her to reconsider making such costly changes to the system until we better understand the potential consequences of these changes.

It is my hope that the administration will continue to work to remedy the hunger crisis in our Nation without using costly and ineffective measures that will impede our children's access to nutritious and low-cost school meals that they need to grow and learn. I am committed to finding a solution to the problem, and I ask my colleagues to come together and find effective solutions and show that hunger does indeed have a cure.

AMERICA IS FULL OF OPPORTUNITIES

(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, in picking up the USA Today's money section: ''Economy: Good News, Prices Tame, Jobless Claims Down.'' Coca-Cola's earnings up 12 percent. IBM earnings rise 3 percent, will add jobs. Apple swings to a quarterly profit based on back-to-school sales. Intel sees quarterly profits soar. Harley Davidson cruises to record profits.

These are as a result of this administration and this Congress's passing tax relief for American families. The Committee on Ways and Means will be considering additional tax relief for corporations to keep domestic employment higher than it is currently to save jobs in America.

Now, despite the pessimism you have heard from the nine Presidential candidates on the other side of the aisle, we are winning the war both in the economy and we are winning the war in Iraq. I wish the nine people running for the high office of President would be more supportive of this administration, more supportive of our troops in Iraq, and more supportive of the economy.

America's best days are yet ahead, not behind us; but the other side would lead you to believe the worst is yet to come. Let us be positive. Let us be optimistic. This is a great Nation. We have great opportunities.

SMART DECISIONS FOR A STRONG FUTURE

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker. America's greatest days are yet to come. But not if we make a bunch of stupid decisions here in Washington.

The great debate today will be whether the $18 billion going to build Iraq is going as loans or as gifts. But first we will take up H.R. 198, which I know leadership plans to pass by unanimous consent. Well, I will reserve the right to object.

H.R. 198 is being brought up at this time as is a bizarre and inadequate fig leaf designed to say, well, it is okay if we give away $18 billion of the taxpayers' money, as long as on the same day we make a request that Germany and France renounce the debts that are owed to them by Saddam Hussein.

If we need a Marshall Plan for Iraq, remember, the first step in the Marshall Plan was that Hitler's debts were renounced. Promissory notes signed by Hitler were never paid. And we can make an $18 billion loan to Iraq if it renounces its Saddam debt.

SOUTH CAROLINA VICTIM ASSISTANCE NETWORK

(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, I rise today to recognize the outstanding efforts of the South Carolina Victims Assistance Network led by Public Policy Coordinator Laura Hudson, CEO Veronica Swain, and VIP Director Nicole Goodwin.

This group tirelessly works on the victims of crime that are often forgotten by the public after their trauma no longer merits headlines. The Victim Assistance Network advocates on behalf of all victims and witnesses of crime, establishes a communications network, enhances public awareness, facilitates research and evaluation, serves as technical support, provides quality training, educates and coordinates policy development while encouraging citizen and victim participation.

As we recognize President Bush's Domestic Violence Awareness Month this October, I ask all my colleagues to join in support of organizations like the South Carolina Victim Assistance Network. These groups serve as a wonderful example of a community reaching out with compassion to offer hope to victims of crime.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN FOR OUR SENIORS

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, we most certainly today are going to be making very important decisions concerning the situation in Iraq. But Friday is the self-imposed deadline of the Medicare conference. We all need to make a concerted effort to work towards pushing this important legislation of a prescription drug plan for our seniors through Medicare through this Congress.

This is an opportune time for movement forward to improve our Nation's Medicare system. With the rising price of prescription drugs, preventive care and innovative medical technologies, we need to make sure that our seniors are able to access these privileges. Medicare needs to be reformed now so that these seniors who need assistance paying for prescription drugs will receive it.

I urge my colleagues serving on the conference committee to rise above partisanship so we can deliver to America's seniors a prescription drug benefit. The time is now. We are closer than ever. It is time to deliver the prescription drug plan to our seniors through Medicare.

IRAQI GRANT NO GIFT TO AMERICA'S CHILDREN

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today we will be discussing a supplemental which provides $87 billion for Iraq, $18.6 billion of that going as a reconstruction package.

The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) was right when he suggested this is the pivotal decision that will be made today. The American people should pay close attention to what their Representatives are doing and should contact their Representatives if they believe that if we are going to give $18.6 billion away, it should be in the form of a loan which will be repaid once Iraq, which could be one of the richest oil producing countries in the world, gets back on its feet. It should repay that $18.6 billion. We should not just be giving it as a gift.

The Rohrabacher amendment insists that it be given as a loan instead of a gift and that it be repaid. And if the Rohrabacher amendment is not permitted, if it is ruled out of order, I will move the next Rohrabacher amendment, which would be to cut that $18.6 billion from the request. And within a matter of days, the administration will

come back with it in the form of a loan.

If you do not want to give away this money, if you want your children not to have to repay this money that we are borrowing in deficit spending, vote for the Rohrabacher amendment.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT FRANCE, GERMANY, AND RUSSIA CAN BEST CONTRIBUTE TO RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ BY FORGIVENESS OF OUTSTANDING DEBT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 198) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, and Russia can initially best contribute to the reconstruction of Iraq by the forgiveness of outstanding debt between both Iraq and France, Iraq and Germany, and Iraq and Russia, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I rise to support this important resolution, H. Res. 198.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution encourages France, Germany, Russia and other countries to forgive the debt owed to them by Saddam Hussein's regime; to make generous pledges for Iraq's reconstruction at the forthcoming Madrid donor conference; to work with the Paris Club on debt forgiveness issues for Iraq; to acknowledge the role that Iraq's current debt has in hindering reconstruction efforts; and to educate their populace about the importance of debt forgiveness in Iraq's reconstruction.

France, Germany, Russia and other countries have all been vocal about opening up Iraq's reconstruction contracts. If they wish to participate in this process, they should have the generosity and decency to contribute positively to the reconstruction effort by forgiving the debts.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable for nations to expect the Iraqi people to repay the debts contracted by the terrorist and despotic regime of Saddam Hussein, particularly when those people were in part the victims of that regime and had no say in the loans in question. H. Res. 198 will assist the public debate in these issues going into the Madrid conference of donors and will put this House on record for supporting debt forgiveness on this significant issue.

Mr. Speaker, America's given its most sacred resource, the lives and blood of its soldiers, as well as billions of dollars, in order to rid Iraq of Saddam Hussein and begin the difficult task of reconstruction. It is only right that other nations should forgive their debt and begin to participate in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is a good bill if it came up at any other time, but today, it serves a unique purpose, and that is, to deal with the great debate that is the big issue that will come up today as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) pointed out. That issue is whether the $18 billion, not to rebuild Iraq but to build Iraq as it has never been built before, whether that money will go in the form of a loan or some other collateralized instrument, perhaps an advance payment on the purchase of oil, or whether, instead, it will go as a gift.

What are we told? We are told that we cannot make it a loan because the Iraqi balance sheet is already in such terrible shape. I would first point out that the American balance sheet is not in great shape either, and we will be adding $500 billion to the debt side of that just this year.

But why is the Iraqi balance sheet in bad shape? It is in bad shape because Saddam borrowed $100 billion, and the people who hold the promissory notes signed by Saddam want to be paid, and for reasons I cannot figure out, the administration feels it is a critical national priority that those who lent money to Saddam get repaid. Promissory notes were signed by Adolf Hitler; they were not repaid. Promissory notes were signed by the Imperial Government of Japan; they were not repaid. Why is it that this administration believes that we cannot burden Iraq with $18 billion in debt because we must preserve their ability to pay the $100 billion of debt that Saddam Hussein borrowed?

Follow the money. Because in 2008 and 2010 and 2012, Iraq, a country with the second largest oil reserves in the world, will be exporting more oil than it needs, the revenue to finance its ongoing operations. It will be able to pay debt service. It has collateral. That is why these folks lent Saddam $100 billion. It will have that money.

Where will that money go? If none of it comes to us, the first claimant for $25 billion is Saudi Arabia. The Saudis are not content with the revenue from their own oil. They want $25 billion to be paid by the new Iraq because they have a loan made to the old Iraq. Who is second? Kuwait is in for only $17 billion, except they claim that they are also owed reparations for the invasion. Okay. That is interesting. The new Iraq should pay for the invasion of Kuwait by Saddam.

So we are told by the Kuwaitis that not only, not only did we have to spend our treasure and our blood to liberate them, not only do they have more oil than one can imagine per capita, but that they should have a high claim on Iraqi oil and that the American taxpayer should be at the back of the line.

I would say that we must do more today than give $18 billion to Iraq and then have this resolution saying, oh, please, pretty please, these other creditors should forgive their debts. First of all, the resolution identifies as the main creditors France and Germany and Russia when, in fact, the major creditors of Saddam are Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

Second, they do not have to forgive the loan. What incentive do they have? It is not like we are saying forgive your loan and this will happen or we will make our efforts contingent upon yours, but rather, today, we are going to be asked to give $18 billion to Iraq to eliminate any possibility of adding an incentive for others to forgive their debt to enshrine the debt signed by Saddam while denigrating the American taxpayer.

We will be talking about more of this in the rest of today, but no one should believe that the passage of H. Res. 198, a mere plea to the wrong people that they forgive debt that they have no intention of forgiving so that we can give away American taxpayer dollars, that we do not have to give away, this is the smallest fig leaf for the biggest problem.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the resolution and thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for his work.

This resolution is a good start but I believe the House must do more to promote debt relief for Iraq. The sense of Congress states that France, Germany and Russia should recognize the role that Iraq's current debt could play in hindering its reconstruction. I strongly agree with this language but we should move beyond France, Germany and Russia on this issue.

While total debt figures are difficult to gather, Representative Coalition Director Paul Bremer has put the number at roughly $200 billion, and actually, the debt of France, Germany and Russia is just a fraction of the total debt. Russia's estimated to be owed between $9 and $12 billion. The amount of Iraq's debt to France ranges from $1.7 to $4 billion and Germany is owed $4 billion. Iraq owes its neighboring countries far, far more money than it does Germany and Russia and over $4 billion is owed to the United States.

Together with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) I have introduced a bill, the Iraq Freedom from Debt Act, and this legislation would require the U.S. representatives at the IMF and World Bank to vote within these highly influential international financial institutions to reduce the debt owed to Iraq.

The IMF and World Bank are owed roughly $150 million, and together with the U.S., these institutions are working with the international community on the donor conference to reduce Iraq's debt.

As my colleague pointed out, the neighboring countries of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait owe much much more. Just this past weekend in Qatar, the foreign minister indicated the $1.5 billion owed to Qatar, they would negotiate relief in that debt. Much of this debt was odious debt to build palaces for Saddam Hussein, and certainly the people of Iraq should not be saddled with having to repay it.

I will put the balance of my remarks in the RECORD in the interest of time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am going to yield to my colleague from Texas, but let me point out one use of this $18 billion.

Two billion dollars of it is going to go to build new oil wells and oil facilities in Iraq. This will be the first time in history that we invest $2 billion in oil drilling, hit oil and get nothing. Why do we need these $2 billion of additional oil wells and oil facilities? So that Iraq can produce more oil, so they can sell that oil, so it can give the money to Saudi Arabia. What a great deal for the American taxpayer.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will take just a brief moment to bring this point to the table.

This is a meritorious resolution if we had had a consensus and a collaboration with France and Germany and Russia on how they would participate in the overall rebuilding of Iraq, but I do believe, as my colleague from California has indicated, that this is only sort of a stopgap or sort of a distraction from the overall massive debate of how outrageous the $87 billion is, and I will just say this, Mr. Speaker, and then I will yield back.

Right now, the $87 billion in comparison to the Marshall Plan will generate about $900 per Iraqi, per Iraqi, if we were to give that amount of money. That is a far cry from the amount of money that was generated on behalf of those during the Marshall Plan when there were 16 countries involved, and even though it was in those dollars, it was somewhere around $200 per capita.

This would be a good resolution if we had had a cooperation or collaboration or agreement with our allies on how they would participate in the rebuild, but right now we are sort of making a statement to those who are actually not going to listen.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, noting that another gentleman from California may also wish to object.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me note that I support H. Res. 198, and I commend the author for trying to do something.

I would note to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) that a fig leaf is better than no leaf at all, and this is a step, a very small step in the right direction that focuses on the debt forgiveness and how important that is that we do not keep a mill stone around Iraq's neck, and the people of Iraq, they are going to be democratic.

If they are going to have the stable society, they cannot have this massive debt hanging around their neck that was left them by Saddam Hussein. These are debts that were given to Saddam Hussein, loans that were given to him by these major financial international partners, for example, the Saudis and certainly German and French banks. We should not be saying that they have to repay these loans because no matter how much money we give them or how much is in the donor's conference, they will never prosper with these loans around their neck.

We tried this with Russia and we tried this with Eastern Europe. We insisted that they repay the debts of the Communist-era debts, and it created chaos and undercut progress in that part of the world for 10 years. We cannot afford that with Iraq.

So I support H. Res. 198, but the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) was absolutely correct when he said this is only part of the major debate which is should the $18.6 billion that we are going to provide as reconstruction money go to Iraq as loans or go to Iraq as a gift. The reason why they are saying it must be a gift is because of these loans that these big bankers made to Saddam Hussein when he was in power. That is no excuse at all. We should not be protecting the validity of $100 billion for the loans to Saddam Hussein from these heavy international financial institutions by giving our money away. We are borrowing this money, this reconstruction money, $18.6 billion because we are in deficit spending, and we are expecting our children to pay it back rather than to have the Iraqi children pay it back when they are on their feet 10 or 20 years from now, when they are the biggest oil producer in the world. We are going to end up paying it back rather than them paying it back. It makes no sense at all.

So I would ask my colleagues to make sure that they pay close attention to the Rohrabacher amendment which makes sure that this will be a loan to Iraq and not a grant and a gift or a giveaway. With that, I support H. Res. 198.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on a day when we are posed to debate the Emergency Supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan, it is critical that we call on France, Germany, Russia and other nations, to contribute to Iraq's reconstruction, including by making generous pledges at the Madrid Donors' Conference.

It is a matter of fairness and equity. Many of these nations are starting to benefit from a free, liberated Iraq. Their companies will reap financial windfalls from reconstruction efforts. Yet, they expect the U.S. and a small group of nations, to bear the financial burden.

France, Germany, and Russia, in particular, should be called upon to match the generous commitment from countries such as Japan which, despite suffering from a severe fiscal situation, has pledged more than $1.5 billion for the immediate reconstruction needs of Iraq.

These countries and all of the creditor nations to Iraq should provide debt relief, that will enable the Iraqi people and a future freely-elected government, to rebuild Iraq's infrastructure and industries which deteriorated so severely during the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein.

Were it not for the ongoing commercial relations and close links between the governments and companies of France, Germany, and Russia and the Hussein regime, the Iraqi people would not be confronted with $21 billion in debt to 19 creditor nations. The Iraqi people and their new leaders should not be held responsible for the corruption and mismanagement of the Hussein regime.

The Iraqi people did not have a say in any of the policies or decisions of the Hussein regime. They were victims in their own homeland. Therefore, it is critical that they not be punished or made to pay for the actions of their oppressor.

We call upon France, Germany, and Russia to acknowledge this reality and make amends for the role they played in prolonging the existence of the Hussein regime and, in turn, the suffering of the Iraqi people.

Through the resolution we are considering today, we call upon these three nations to make a public commitment to debt reduction in the meeting of Paris Club creditors. We further ask them, and all nations, to make generous pledges for Iraq's reconstruction.

We hope they will answer this call.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Gentlewoman for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

I would have preferred to see this resolution considered by the Committee on International Relations so that we could debate and discuss its provisions. It is unfortunate that a resolution like this was taken directly to the floor rather than first being considered by the committee of jurisdiction as House Rules provide.

In calling on Russia, France, Germany, and other nations to forgive Iraqi debt, this resolution focuses on one of the issues most important to Iraq's future development.

Because of Saddam Hussein's profligate and murderous ways, Iraq is saddled with an international debt estimated to be as high as $200 billion. That means an inordinate amount of Iraq's resources will be devoted to debt repayment, unless something is done such as

this resolution suggests. Unless that debt is dealt with soon, Iraq will be unable to develop as its resources and the skills of its people would otherwise allow. This is an absurd situation and an affront to any reasonable standard of justice.

The Iraqi people had absolutely nothing to do with the acquiring of this debt. Creditor nations supplied Saddam resources to build up his army to invade his neighbors and attack his own citizens; for his effort to develop weapons of mass destruction; and for his building of palaces and monuments for self-aggrandizement.

This money did not serve the needs of the Iraqi people. These loans were not used to develop the infrastructure and resources of the country. The Iraqis not only failed to benefit from this policy of relentless borrowing; they were its primary victims.

Without debt forgiveness, we are now asking the Iraqis literally to pay for Saddam Hussein's crimes for generations to come. By way of illustration, let me boil this absurd situation down to a simple truth: Without debt forgiveness, generations of Iraqi Kurds will be asked to pay the bills for developing the chemical weapons that were used to kill and maim their brethren at Halabja.

As a further absurdity: If the Iraqi people are forced to repay Saddam's debts, most of these repayment funds would be directed to creditor nations that actually opposed Iraq's liberation.

Mr. Speaker, our nation not only liberated Iraq. It has also already donated—I repeat, donated—approximately $3 billion to provide for Iraq's humanitarian needs and rebuild its crumbling infrastructure. And now it has been asked to give more. It is time for Iraq's creditors to step up to the plate and at last do something for the Iraqi people, instead of for Saddam Hussein. As both direction to Administration policy-makers and to strengthen their hand, it is important that this body go on record with a clear demand for international debt forgiveness for Iraq.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 198. This is a resolution which I introduced several months go to address the inadequacies of France's, Germany's, and Russia's efforts in participating in the reconstruction effort. In doing so, I believe it best to highlight the outstanding debt owed to them by Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the consideration of its resolution. In the past year, the United States has committed its most precious commodity, the lives of our men and women, for the liberation of an oppressed people. It is not an action which we took lightly as a Congress, and one which we took after much consideration. Now we must win the peace, and in doing so, call upon the very nations who have indicated they would like to see the successful reconstruction of Iraq to forgive its debt.

The odious debt which the regime of Saddam Hussein contracted with numerous countries is not one which would be foisted upon the innocent people of Iraq. Now is the time for debt forgiveness and now is the time for the community of nations to come together and assist in solving this problem. In particular, France, Germany, and Russia must bear special responsibility for this because they represent the countries most vocal in supporting the illegitimate regime of Saddam Hussein.

The Speaker, the past policies of these countries were particularly helpful to Saddam Hussein's regime when United Nations Resolutions prohibited such relationships. They have requested that they be allowed to assist in reconstruction, and this is a first step.

Furthermore, because of their particular role over the last decade, it would be particularly helpful if they were to pledge greater amounts of money to aid in Iraq's reconstruction at the upcoming Madrid Donors' Conference. Thus, we have amended this legislation to reflect that fact.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to enter into a great debate over the substance of a Supplemental that will directly aid Iraq in its reconstruction. While there are a variety of opinions on the Supplemental, there is little doubt that America will keep her word to the Iraqi people and directly aid her in reconsideration. There is absolutely no question that we will not hold the innocent people of Iraq responsible for the actions of Saddam Hussein.

Vote ''yes'' on House Resolution 198.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 198

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations have expressed an interest in assisting in the reconstruction of Iraq;

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations have previously encouraged and provided debt relief as a way to assist other nations;

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations had extensive trade relationships with Iraq;

Whereas loans and other support from France, Germany, Russia, and other nations were used by the Saddam Hussein regime to support the development of its weapons of mass destruction programs, the expansion of the Iraqi Army that the regime used to invade its neighbors, and the building of palaces, monuments, and other means of aggrandizing Saddam Hussein;

Whereas the United States has already provided approximately $3,000,000,000 in the form of grants to provide for the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people and to rebuild Iraq's crumbling infrastructure; and

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations are capable of making generous pledges for the reconstruction of Iraq at the International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq to be held in Madrid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, Russia, and other nations—

(1) should work with multilateral institutions and with creditor nations in the ''Paris Club'' to establish a debt forgiveness program for Iraq to aid its reconstruction;

(2) should make generous pledges for the reconstruction of Iraq at the International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq to be held in Madrid; and

(3) should acknowledge the role that Iraq's current debt plays in hindering its reconstruction.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, Russia, and other nations—

(1) should work with multilateral institutions and with creditor nations in the ''Paris Club'' to establish a debt forgiveness program for Iraq to aid its reconstruction;

(2) should make generous pledges for the reconstruction of Iraq at the International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq to be held in Madrid; and

(3) should acknowledge the role that Iraq's current debt plays in hindering its reconstruction.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

□ 1045

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 198, the resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HASTING of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 396 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 396

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with ''Provided'' on page 32, line 7, through ''Act):'' on line 20; section 3005; and section 3006. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes 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. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 396 is an open rule waiving all points of order against consideration of H.R. 3289, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004.

The rule also waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI except as specified in the resolution. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

In accordance with the rules of the House, the rule provides that the bill shall be read by paragraph. The rule also authorizes the Chair to accord priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 3289, was approved and reported out of the Committee on Appropriations by a strong bipartisan vote, with a majority of Republicans and Democrats on the Committee on Appropriations supporting this emergency funding measure.

The Committee on Appropriations worked diligently to review the administration's request; and having personally observed a portion of the committee's work, I can attest to the seriousness with which they approached their responsibilities.

The bill provides a total of $86.9 billion in supplemental appropriations with $64.7 billion dedicated to our military personnel and national defense, $18.6 billion for Iraq relief and reconstruction, and $1.2 billion for Afghanistan relief and reconstruction.

The funding provided in this bill is vital to winning the war on terrorism, Mr. Speaker. The bill places a priority on ensuring our men and women in uniform receive the support that they need.

Funding is provided to protect our forces, including increased funds for body armor and equipment to jam radio frequencies to better protect our soldiers from explosives detonated from afar by cell phones. The bill also fully funds hazardous pay and family separation allowances.

Winning the war on terrorism requires us to ensure that the removal of Saddam Hussein from power leads to a free and secure Iraq, and not a haven and breeding ground for terrorists.

The Iraq reconstruction funds provided in this bill are not only an investment in building this safe and secure Iraq; it is an investment in protecting America and in making Americans safer from terrorists.

The bill includes a commonsense provision that prohibits the use of any of these emergency supplemental funds from being used to pay any of Iraq's foreign debts.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, this emergency supplemental received strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Appropriations. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule, House Resolution 396, 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, I voted to authorize the war to remove Saddam Hussein from power, and I believe we must provide the resources to finally finish this war and to ensure Iraq transitions to a stable democratic nation. So I anticipate supporting this bill, despite the fact that it still asks for too much from U.S. taxpayers while also doing too little for U.S. troops.

President Bush and his administration have created a very difficult situation for themselves, for Iraq, and for the United States. So while they will likely get the $87 billion they have requested, I personally doubt that they will get more for reconstruction in the future, even from this fiscally irresponsible Republican Congress, if they continue to force American taxpayers to shoulder this burden alone.

I hope that the Bush administration is finally able to convince our allies to share this burden by providing significant financial and military help, like the first President Bush did in the first Gulf War, and I am frankly mystified that they have failed to get it done so far. There is no good reason to force Americans to pay for this reconstruction alone or to shift the burden to our children and grandchildren by adding its cost to our already monstrous national debt.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are generous, but the United States has needs of its own. The Republican Congress refuses to fix our crumbling schools or help with sky-high prescription drug prices, and too many military families still live in sub-standard housing. If the Republicans who control this government can find money to take care of Iraq, why will they not take care of our needs here at home?

Moreover, the Bush administration did not prepare the American people for the costly and deadly reconstruction efforts they are now witnessing. Many Democrats in Congress repeatedly urged the President to be completely forthright with the public and to share his post-war plan. Needless to say, the administration did no such thing. Instead, they told us not to worry about the post-war plan. And whenever people like General Shinseki and Larry Lindsey let slip the truth, that it would be very expensive and require lots of troops, they were publicly rebuked and then relieved of duty.

Well, Mr. Speaker, ever since President Bush landed on an aircraft carrier and declared the war officially over, the American people have seen for themselves the post-war plan he told us not to worry about, and the public is worried because they have seen over 180 Americans killed in Iraq since President Bush declared victory. And they have seen reconstruction costs explode while certain big corporations are making massive profits at the expense of the public.

Mr. Speaker, before the war, the American people were told Iraq was an oil-rich country that could fund its own reconstruction. So the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, will offer an amendment to turn this reconstruction gift into a loan so that Iraqis can use their future oil wealth to help Americans pay to rebuild the Iraq that Saddam Hussein destroyed.

Now, for some reason, the Bush administration insists that American taxpayers should shoulder this burden alone, so they oppose the Lantos amendment. President Bush has even personally lobbied Republicans against such a measure.

Like the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), I cannot imagine that Iraq's proven oil reserves have disappeared since the war began, and I do not understand the administration's opposition to protecting American taxpayers. Because the Bush administration is basically saying that Iraq oil revenue cannot be used to pay for rebuilding Iraq and instead must be used to repay the debts that Saddam Hussein ran up to rebuild his war machine.

The administration is saying that paying off Iraq's debts to countries like France and Germany, which opposed our efforts against Saddam Hussein, is a better use of American taxpayers' money than paying off America's own national debt or investing in priorities like education, health care, and the economy. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, this is simply wrong.

But if the Bush administration insists on forcing American taxpayers to foot the entire bill for rebuilding Iraq, they should at least pay the tab, instead of passing the buck on to our children and grandchildren by adding it to our massive national debt.

Make no mistake, there is a simple way to pay for it. Since President Bush took office, he has given massive tax breaks to the very wealthiest in this country. If you simply ask those wealthiest few, individuals making over $350,000 a year, to take a smaller tax break, then you can pay for this entire bill and have some left over for the next bill for Iraq.

That is why the substitute legislation, written by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, is so important. The Obey amendment provides more resources for U.S. troops, $4.6 billion more for priorities like 20,000 additional U.S. Army soldiers, better health care, and increased military family support services. The Obey amendment forces the administration to share the financial burdens for rebuilding Iraq by working through the World Bank. And instead of passing on the cost to our children, the Obey amendment pays for itself by asking the wealthiest few individuals, those making over $350,000 a year, to take a smaller tax break than the one Republicans have already given them.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons I cannot explain, the Bush administration opposes this reasonable, fiscally-responsible, and pro-defense plan. They would force all Americans to sacrifice in the future because President Bush will not ask the wealthiest few to take a smaller tax break now. They would raise taxes on our children in future years because they refuse to ask people making over $350,000 to take a smaller tax break.

Last night in the Committee on Rules, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans blocked the Obey amendment, preventing it from even being considered on the House floor. As a result, Members of this House have only one way to increase help to U.S. troops and relieve the burden on U.S. taxpayers, by voting ''no'' on the important parliamentary vote known as the previous question.

If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to allow the House to consider the Obey amendment. But if Members vote ''yes'' on the previous question, they will be voting to deny the House the opportunity to vote on the Obey amendment, and they will be preventing the House from helping the taxpayers and the troops today.

That should not be a difficult decision, Mr. Speaker. So I hope my friends on the Republican side of the aisle will not allow blind party loyalty to keep them from doing what is right for the country and for the American people.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this Iraq supplemental because it specifically includes language which I insisted on, which prohibits any American taxpayer dollars from being used to pay Iraq's foreign debts. Americans would be justifiably outraged if a dime of the taxpayer aid requested by President Bush allowed Iraq to pay creditors in France, Germany, Russia, or Saudi Arabia. I applaud Chairman YOUNG for including this language to make sure that does not happen.

□ 1100

As we move forward, we must do two things. First, while supporting President Bush and our troops, we must make sure that other countries and the Iraqis themselves contribute substantially to the rebuilding effort. Second, we must work toward the day when we can bring our troops back home and turn control over to a free Iraq. To achieve this mission, Iraqis are creating their own constitution. They are working toward free elections next year, and they are training 55,000 of their own people to provide their own future security.

Now in the interest of straight talk, let me squarely address what may be the most controversial aspect of this bill, and that is whether the money to rebuild Iraq should be in the form of a grant or a loan. After personally speaking with Ambassador Paul Bremer yesterday, who was kind enough to call me from Baghdad, I decided to support President Bush's proposal to make this money available in the form of a grant. And let me tell the Members why. The cost of rebuilding Iraq is estimated to be $55 billion, and the United States is proposing to invest $18.6 billion toward that effort. That means other countries and the Iraqi people themselves will be expected to pay two thirds of the cost for rebuilding Iraq, which is appropriate.

Supporting President Bush's proposal to make this money available as a grant has two key advantages. First, the conference in Madrid, Spain, on October 23 and 24 will remain a donors conference and not turn into a lenders conference. And second, Iraq will be in a much better position to write off nearly all of their foreign debt incurred by Saddam Hussein.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues to support President Bush and vote ''yes'' on the Iraq supplemental and vote ''yes'' on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, last spring we appropriated $79 billion, it was just this past spring, to fund the war on the reconstruction efforts in Iraq. And again the administration is asking us to open up the Federal purse and hand over billions more. The Federal Government is already facing record deficits, the highest deficits the country has ever faced. But the President now wants our permission to charge $18 billion more, which would have to be charged, by the way. We have no money to pay for that, pay for Iraqi reconstruction on the American credit card. What happened to the $79 billion that Congress handed to the administration? One might well ask. Why are American soldiers being sent into life-threatening situations without the body armor or adequate training?

We do not know the answers to these questions, but we do know the conditions in Iraq for our military is shameful. I have received volumes of calls and letters from the families of soldiers serving in Iraq. They are concerned about their children, their brothers, sisters, husbands, and wives suffering from heat exhaustion and dehydration. We just heard that they are just now beginning to study the possible 12 suicides of our service people since they have been in Iraq. Some soldiers are rationed only two bottles of water a day despite the 120 degree weather, and we have been told that they have often had to survive on one meal a day.

I was flying back to D.C. this week to go to work on this appropriation. At the airport a TSA official told me of her recent assignment at the airport in Baghdad. She, a civilian employee, was housed in an air-conditioned trailer; but the U.S. soldiers had no relief. She felt so bad for the Army that she would let them sleep on the floor of the trailer just to get a little nap and escape the sweltering heat.

Just this morning, The Washington Post reports that many soldiers have very low morale. In fact, a poll was done by ''Stars and Stripes'' that says that only half the people in Iraq now think that the morale is any good at all; 48, 49 percent say the morale is very low; and the same number, about 50 percent of those who are there now, say they will not reenlist. They claim that their mission lacks clear definition and they characterized the war in Iraq as of little or no value. These are the people who are there fighting it. Fully 40 percent said the jobs they were doing had little or nothing to do with the training that they had received.

The largest proportion of this appropriation that has been asked for, some $60 billion, is for the troops; and they desperately need more. They need more water, more food, more adequate shelter, more body armor to save their lives, and other essentials. We were also told this week that ammunition dumps are all over the country of Iraq where we know where they are, but we do not have sufficient troops to guard them. These are supporting the ammunition which is being used to shoot at our soldiers. These men and women have to be our top priority.

Congress must demand and receive a full accounting of the reporting on the Federal dollars appropriated for our brave troops and for rebuilding Iraq. No one has been able to tell us that they know where the $79 billion has gone. Congress must demand to receive a full and thorough accounting and justification for any Federal taxpayer dollars spent anywhere, but it is as part of a contract that did not go through a proper competitive bidding process that is particularly egregious. I intend to offer an amendment to ensure that Congress receives the specific information on no-bid contracts that our oversight duties and obligations to our constituents demand.

Mr. Speaker, I find it odd we cannot find the funds to pay for the mandates of No Child Left Behind or fully fund Medicaid or upgrade America's electrical grid, but somehow there is money to build schools and hospitals and an electrical grid for Iraq. The people of New York will pay $1.26 billion of the $18.6 billion to rebuild Iraq. That could be used to place almost 150,000 children in Head Start programs.

This money could also be used to fund healthcare for over 150,000 New Yorkers. We cannot forget the great needs at home. If State and local governments received matching funds for the $18.6 billion to rebuild Iraq, New York State would receive approximately $2 billion in State and local government budget relief. That is why I am cosponsoring the American Parity amendment.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule, and I oppose the underlying bill. Our policy toward Iraq is one of the biggest issues facing this country today, and every Member of this House deserves an opportunity to have their voices heard. Shamefully, the rule before us does not meet that standard and should be rejected. I also believe that the underlying $87 billion supplemental appropriation bill fails in several key areas.

The administration has not provided an adequate plan for success in Iraq. The United States invaded Iraq and now occupies that country. In my view, the war was a mistake based on inadequate and shifting rationales unsupported by the evidence and damaging to our security at home and our standing in the world.

Having said that, I recognize that we now have a moral obligation both to support our troops in the field and to help rebuild Iraq. Our soldiers deserve the equipment, training, and supplies they need to continue their remarkable work; and the people of Iraq deserve help in rebuilding their infrastructure and establishing a democratic society. Those are the goals that all of us share, but I have seen nothing from this administration that leads me to believe that a plan exists to get us there.

How long will our troops be stationed in Iraq? Why have we not successfully reached out to our allies for help? When can we expect the security situation to improve on the ground? What is the strategy for dealing with increasing ethnic tensions? What is the total price tag of our policy? How many more emergency supplemental bills? Has the war made us safer? Has it reduced terrorism? These are not trivial matters, Mr. Speaker. They are serious and fundamental questions, the answers to which will help determine our success or failure in building a more stable, more secure world.

In addition, I am deeply concerned that this bill shortchanges important priorities here at home. Yes, we should build schools and hospitals and roads and bridges in Iraq, but we should build them in this country too. To make matters worse, this bill has no offsets. It is not paid for. It will add $87 billion to our national deficit, and it passes the cost on to our children and our grandchildren, and that is wrong.

It has been nearly 6 weeks since President Bush made a speech to the country requesting the money. I simply cannot believe that in those 6 weeks given all the smart people we have in this Congress that the leadership could not come up with a single offset, a single deferred tax break for millionaires, a single corporate loophole to pay for this. But, no. Instead, we are going to charge this money on the national credit card and send the bill to our kids.

We are constantly being told that we are at war and that wars demand sacrifices. The young men and women who are serving, being attacked and in some cases dying in Iraq, are certainly sacrificing. The people in the middle class and those trying to get in the middle who rely on adequate funding for education, health care, and housing, veterans benefits, they are sacrificing. But heaven forbid that we ask the Nation's millionaires to defer a small portion of their tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, our policy in Iraq is not working. I simply cannot support a bill that merely endorses the status quo. We are being asked to close our eyes and spend $87 billion on top of the $79 billion that we have already spent and that nobody can seem to account for. Right now there is a kid from Massachusetts on some corner in Baghdad wondering what he is doing there, wondering when he is coming home, wondering if he will have a job or health care when he comes back. He deserves a voice in this Congress.

This House spent a grand total of 1 day, 1 day, debating the resolution authorizing war. We did not ask the tough questions. We did not get straight answers. We abdicated our responsibilities, and we must not make the same mistake again. Congress should do its job. We need to get this right, to spend this money wisely, not just for the future of Iraq but for the future of that young man from Massachusetts, his family, the thousands like him serving in Iraq, and the millions of Americans here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. FROST. 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 ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and bill. Anyone who has read a newspaper or watched a news program can hardly argue that American troops need and deserve additional support. I have voiced my support for an amendment to this bill, several as a matter of fact, but more specifically one offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). That amendment will increase imminent danger and hardship duty pay for our military. It would increase the family separation allowance and add funding to a program that assists disabled service members who are returning to civilian life. The Spratt amendment will also eliminate the fees currently charged to hospitalized service members and several other vital themes for our military. That amendment was not made in order.

However, because of my support for the members of the armed services, I cannot in good conscience vote in favor of this massive supplemental blank check, at least not until this administration is forthcoming in answering the questions that Congress has asked again and again and again. My good friend, the dean of the Florida delegation, the chairman of the appropriations committee and my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations on yesterday both

averred that they were unable to answer in detail how 79 billion taxpayer dollars are being spent. That is unconscionable, and not to mean that we did not have general understanding as to how the money was spent; but we as persons with oversight responsibility have a responsibility to have a detailed analysis.

Thirteen months ago when we were debating a resolution on the use of U.S. Armed Forces against Iraq, at that time I offered an alternative war resolution, one with some definitive conditions. It called on the President to provide Congress with a comprehensive plan for the long-term cultural, economic, and political stabilization in a free Iraq. When I presented my resolution, I said, ''The young men and women of our Armed Forces are already fighting a war on terrorism. Before we expand their role and send them even deeper into harm's way, I want assurances that we have a plan for maintaining stability in the region once we declare victory.''

Mr. Speaker, I gave that speech on September 23, 2002. More than a year has passed. More than 320 U.S. troops have lost their lives in Iraq, and hundreds more have been wounded. I am still waiting for an answer. The only thing we have been told by this administration is that the next installment, this one, is going to cost American taxpayers $87 billion.

We have already seen what happens when we relinquish our oversight authority and fail to hold this administration accountable ahead of time. There are far too many questions that need to be answered before we abrogate our responsibilities to the American taxpayer and simply hand over nearly $87 billion. For instance, where is the comprehensive strategy that will ensure our goals for the Iraqi people will be met?

□ 1115

How long will it take to implement that strategy? How much is it going to cost the American taxpayer? And, finally, exactly how did this administration spend the $79 billion we already appropriated for this war? And just how much more are we going to do by way of supplemental without benefit of authorization, without benefit of clear understanding, without benefit of oversight responsibility.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have previously appropriated almost $80 billion to deal with the problems in Iraq and now we are being asked to provide $87 billion more. We have had no real accounting of how that previously appropriated money has been spent, and we certainly have no line item information about how the next $87 billion is going to be spent. If that is not a blank check, it is certainly a malleable one.

It seems to me that if the administration wants us to consider their aid package today, that we have a right to see to it that we can offer on the House floor a responsible, comprehensive alternative. But under this rule before us, we are being denied that opportunity. The majority Members of this House will say the rule gives us an open rule. That is a meaningless comment. Because the key to understanding our problem is to understand that the rule waives several of the House rules to enable the committee to bring its bill to the floor but then when we want to bring a parallel substitute to the floor, they say, ''oh, no, no, no, you can't waive those same rules to allow your package to come to the floor.'' So that is the way that the majority leadership funnels us into a situation where it is either their way or no way. That is not the way to unite people in fighting a war.

What we are asking is to give the minority the same right to offer a comprehensive amendment that was given to the minority in the Senate. Here is what the amendment would say. The amendment would essentially say if this House is hellbent on providing $87 billion, then there is a better way to do it.

If any Member of this House votes for the previous question without allowing our amendment to be made in order, that Member will be voting to block our efforts to transfer about $4.5 billion of badly-thought-out reconstruction plans to categories in the budget that would do us a whole lot more good.

Example. We want to do something about the fact that 80 percent of American troops in Iraq right now are drinking putrid water, getting dysentary. There is absolutely no reason that we should not provide clean water to 100 percent of American troops in Iraq. If you vote for the previous question, you will be denying us the opportunity to correct that. If you vote for the previous question, you will denying us the opportunity to provide predeployment health and dental services to Guard and Reserve forces who right now have to pay those expenses on their own. If you vote for the previous question, you will be blocking us from extending postduty health care coverage from the 60 days which Guard and Reserve people now have when they are coming off duty to 6 months. That is what you will be doing. You will also be preventing us from providing the money that the Army and the other services asked for to refurbish equipment which was worn out or used up in Iraq.

The Services asked for the full amount that they could spend on that over the rest of the year, but the Department slashed those recommendations, in my view, in order to hide from the public the full cost of reconstituting that equipment which will approach $20 billion by the time it is done rather than about the $2 billion asked for by the administration.

If Members vote for the previous question, they will be voting against our efforts to relieve pressure on Guard and Reserve forces, many of whom have now been told they are going to have to serve an extra year. You will prevent us from correcting the mess that we now have in our troop rotation schedules. What we try to do to correct those items is to recognize the validity of General Shinseki's warning when he warned us that we should not follow a 12-division strategy if we only had a 10-division Army. So what we do is face up to the need to create another division so that you can restore order to the lives of Guard and Reserve forces and restore order to the rotation schedule for our regular troops.

If Members vote for the previous question, they will also be swallowing, swallowing whole, the administration plans to rely on huge contracts with politically well-connected multinational corporations rather than relying on more appropriate low-technology contracts with indigenous groups within Iraq so that we can put Iraqis to work doing something constructive besides shooting Americans.

If you vote for the previous question, you will be blocking our efforts to convert one-half of the reconstruction funds in our package to loans by running that portion through the World Bank and having it matched by other international contributors. You will also be preventing us from insulating those contracts against cronyism if you have an agency administering these contracts that is responsive to the political appointees at the White House. And, most importantly, if you vote for the previous question, you will be blocking our efforts to meet our responsibilities to our taxpayers by paying for this adventure rather than putting it on the cuff.

We have got two choices on that score. We can either charge this bill to our kids or we can pay for it now.

There is a whole lot of talk about shared sacrifice on this floor. We heard a lot of it last night. I would like to ask who on earth in this country is being asked to share the sacrifice except the troops and their families? The Guard and Reserve forces right now face a total discombobulation of their life. Our regular troops face the same thing. They are sacrificing in spades. Yet, if you vote for this previous question motion, you will be denying our effort to say there is a better way to achieve self-sacrifice.

What is wrong with asking a millionaire to settle for a $53,000 tax cut rather than the $130,000 tax cut they will get absent our amendment? Persons in the $50,000 to $75,000 range will get on average from all sources perhaps $1,000 if they are lucky under the tax cuts now in effect. Persons in the $200,000 to $500,000 range will get $2,200. Why shouldn't millionaires be happy with 25 times that amount?

I ask Members to vote against the previous question to give us a chance to offer an amendment that is a truly balanced, comprehensive alternative.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Chamber needs to support this important funding package. The President made it very clear when he articulated his plan to fight the war on terror. In no uncertain terms he declared that Iraq is now the central front in this war. The job is only half done, though. Terrorists still roam the globe and threats still exist. If we leave Iraq now, we essentially allow the country to become a terror magnet, a flypaper that attracts terrorists from all over the world to its vast deserts and its countless caves. Iraq will become their home base as they wage their war against freedom, their war against civilization.

Mr. Speaker, to vote against this funding package and the goals it seeks to achieve would be to vote in favor of terror and against America's homeland security. It is that critical. This package will provide the funds necessary to establish a working society in Iraq. A government that is run by free Iraqis is a government that provides hope to her people. A free government responds to the wishes and desires of those whom it governs. People who live under a responsive and fair government have no need for terrorism. They do not experience the desperation and destitution that so often are the precursors to a life dedicated to terror.

So, Mr. Speaker, a free Iraq keeps terror out of that country and, therefore, out of ours. A free Iraq will send a clear message to people of the Middle East and around the world that freedom and democracy, not violence and terrorism, are the best paths for the future. Hope and stability in Iraq translate into security and peace for Americans here at home. We are close. Iraq is experiencing the first fruits of freedom and now they must be completely transitioned into a state of stability. So far, the coalition provisional authority has made significant progress on infrastructure improvements and governmental restructuring. All of Iraq's hospitals are now fully functional. Schools are opening and running. They are now places for young minds to receive information, not indoctrination.

Colleagues of ours who have been there talk of wheat fields and oil fields and cotton fields. This is progress. It is a beautiful picture of what comes of our noble pursuit in the fight for freedom and the war against terror. But more is needed to secure Iraq to bring our troops home soon. The funding in this package will provide the body armor that is so essential to protect them from terrorists. It will provide extra pay and benefits to the soldiers who are already sacrificing so much on our behalf. It will provide our troops the weapons and systems necessary to finish the mission we started and get our troops home to their families. Finally, this package will effectively help to revolutionize Iraq, turning this country from a terrorist breeding ground into yet another beacon of democracy in the Middle East. Terror will be shunned rather than invited.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill to secure America by stabilizing Iraq.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to visit an Austin widow with three preschool children and no longer a husband is to understand that far more than $87 billion is involved in what we do today. We all honor those who die for our country. But the question for Congress is whether we can pursue a policy that allows more of these brave young Americans to live for America.

We do not have a shortage of money in Iraq. We have a shortage of sound thinking and in good planning in pursuit of international cooperation in Washington, DC, where we have Washington ideologues paired up against courageous young Americans who are fighting for us in Iraq.

Our responsibility in Congress is to ensure that more lives and more tax dollars are not squandered as quickly as this Administration squandered international goodwill after 9/11. To those in Washington who defend this failed policy by saying, ''we have to stand with our troops,'' of course, this Administration did not even ask for additional spending until last month. Until that point, they told us nothing was necessary. Indeed a nonpartisan report released yesterday, as reflected in this chart, indicates that if we did not appropriate a single cent today, the Army has enough appropriations to last through half of next year. This question is not about providing more Kevlar vests for our troops. It is about providing ''political Kevlar'' for those who want to get through the next election.

Those who pursued an extreme ideology have reversed 50 years of bipartisan American foreign policy in favor of a preemptive war, and today a large number of Members of this Congress are going to say ''no,'' not to our troops, who we stand with and honor, but ''no'' to a failed policy. We are going to stand by the courageous young men and women in Iraq in uniform, but not with the ideologues in Washington in business suits who have failed them with their policies.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think that too many of us are ignoring the big picture during this debate, and sometimes we lose sight of what this money will mean, not only to America but for the entire world.

□ 1130

I have got an article off of CNN.com that just came out that shows that Damascus even ended up voting for the Security Council resolution this morning. They want stability, they want security.

There is another part of this debate that we get caught up in. We all agree that the $66 billion portion of the supplemental is absolutely critical for our troops, for their well-being as they are defending freedom. The debate that we have set about today and through the past couple of weeks, not only as a legislative body but as a people, has really focused on the remaining $18.6 billion of the appropriation.

Let me put it this way: In my district, one of the things we have talked about is that the $66 billion is for the military, and that $18.6 billion that is for reconstruction, that is for you, Mr. Speaker, it is for me. That $18.6 billion is for every single American man, woman and child who never, ever, wants to see another September 11 take place. It is for every American who understands that we have an opportunity, a very unique opportunity, to help reshape a region of the world that has been a breeding ground for hatred and for terrorism.

I have visited with my constituents at Fort Campbell, people that have family members deployed over there. I have stood on the tarmac to shake the hands of the men and women that are returning from over there. These are people that are on the front lines and they understand what is at stake, and they have told me that they think it would be a mistake to withdraw now; if we choose to leave, we will have done a tremendous disservice to our children, to our country; that the work there that we are doing is an investment in making the world a safer place.

I am going to be going to Iraq this month because I want to see the progress that we have made there. I want to see it with my own eyes. I want to thank our men and women in uniform, and I want to let the Iraqi people know we understand that they will be an important and valuable ally in our war on terrorism, but only if we do what is right and necessary for the future and for our kids' futures by providing a critical investment in that country.

We can talk all day about domestic needs and different needs and all sorts of programs that are great programs, but there will never be an end to these, and it is necessary that we fight the war on terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to step back, take another look at the bigger picture, to support this.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the former speaker's comments, but I rise today to oppose the rule and the underlying bill, because I think the very thoughtful

amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) should have had a full discussion on the floor of the House.

Maybe we have not listened to the words of the administration. I do not believe that $20 billion is for any one of you in America. It actually is undermining the needs of Americans with Medicare and Medicaid and jobs.

Secretary Rumsfeld said just a few weeks ago, ''If you worry about just the cost, the money, Iraq is a very different situation from Afghanistan. Iraq has oil. They have financial resources.'' But yet we find the administration coming and asking us for $20 billion.

There is no reason to vote for this supplemental under the guise of supporting troops, when our troops do not have the armor, they do not have the water, they do not have the right kind of equipment.

I would say to this body, it is imperative that you use your oversight responsibilities to stand with the troops, to make sure that they have the number of troops so they can be refreshed and cycled back home. You have troops on the frontline that I have met this weekend in the Mideast who told me that they have been there for 6 and 7 and 8 months and nobody will tell them when they can go home.

I am going to stand for the troops today. Vote against this ill-fated, misdirected $87 billion, because the administration does not know what they are talking about.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I stand in support of the rule and support of the emergency supplemental bill.

Here is what it does. It does four very important things.

Number one, it supports our troops. We have troops on the ground. We need to support them. Republicans in Congress supported President Clinton when he had, I think, something like over 30 deployments. I hope that the Democrats will support our President by supporting the troops and put aside partisan differences in support of this bill for our troops on the ground.

The second thing it does is it supports freedom in Iraq. There are those on the left who truly believe that this war was such a mistake that the people of Iraq were better off under Saddam Hussein, even after we found jet airplanes that were buried, even after they violated 17 UN resolutions, even after we found something like hundreds of thousands of mass graves. There are people in America, liberals on the left, who believe that Iraq was better off before we got there. This bill supports their freedom.

The third thing it does, it helps them begin reconstruction. It is going to cost about $150 billion to rebuild this country. This bill has a little bit over $18 billion to get that started. It is a grant, it is not a loan. The reason is we want other nations around the globe to step forward and pull out their checkbooks. There will be meetings coming up in the next month to try to urge them to do that. If we start off by saying we are going to lend you this money, Iraq will never be rebuilt.

Think about the great strides that have already taken place. Electricity and water in 80 percent of the country. Health care, $200 million has already been spent, compared to $13 million spent previously under Saddam Hussein. Newspapers, 150 newspapers are up and being published in Iraq every day. Police forces in the municipalities have already been trained, some are up and going and some are on line to come. Those are steps of great progress. That is why this reconstruction effort cannot stop midstream.

Finally, the fourth and final thing this bill does is it brings security to the people of the United States and all over the world. What if we had left Saddam Hussein in charge in Iraq? What if all this saber rattling to the terrorist organizations of the world was for naught? What if we just wanted to continue with the rhetoric, as opposed to action? We would just be sitting, waiting, counting the clock for another 9/11. It still could happen, but it is not going to be the same world as it would have been if we had just sat back and said, well, America likes to run its mouth, but not have action.

This bill today and our war effort helps bring peace and stability to the world, and we cannot afford to stop with the job half done. Please vote for the rule and the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the underlying legislation, and I rise to observe, first of all, that there are at least four different points of view being expressed in the debate leading up to this vote that we will have either today or tomorrow.

First of all, there are those who feel that the military action against Saddam Hussein was the right thing to do and that we should stay the course.

Secondly, there are those who never supported the President's action and see no need to support him now.

Then there are those who disagree with what we did in Iraq, but also realize that we have an obligation, having gone in, to bring stability to the region.

Finally, there is at least a fourth group, Mr. Speaker, who were happy to pay for the war, to appropriate funds for the bombs and tanks and ammunition and for our troops, but who are suddenly taken by surprise to learn that we must now spend money to protect the peace.

I find myself in the first group, those who support President Bush's action in Iraq and who realize how important it is now to do what is necessary to win the peace.

I firmly believe that the United States of America did the right thing in removing Saddam Hussein. It has cost us the lives and health of hundreds of young Americans, to be sure. It is costing our taxpayers billions of dollars, but it is worth the cost.

When we consider the history of Saddam Hussein, his torture and cruelty, his use of weapons of mass destruction in previous wars, his repeated defiance of the United Nations, and when we learn what has already been uncovered since our military offensive, then it becomes clearer and clearer that this Congress and this President made the right decision.

Contrary to the initial media analysis of the Iraq Survey Group on weapons of mass destruction, the report of Dr. David Kay details discoveries of dozens of WMD-related activities, including significant amounts of equipment that Iraq concealed from the United Nations, a secret network of laboratories, strains of biological organisms hidden in a scientist's home, plans and advance designs for new long-range missiles, and details of secret negotiations with North Korea to secure technology to develop ballistic missiles, cruise missiles and other military equipment. I believe these findings provide strong justification for our military action.

Finally, it bothers me to hear some of my colleagues refer to the $18 billion in Iraqi reconstruction as an outright gift to Iraq. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, whether in the form of a loan or an outright grant, these are taxpayer dollars being spent in the U.S. national interest. Some Americans will be employed using these dollars. There is an element of altruism and charity involved, to be sure, but these reasons are secondary. The principal reason we are appropriating these reconstruction dollars is that they will be used to protect our troops as long as they have to be over there and to provide electricity, water, public safety and other infrastructure so that Iraq can have stability and so that our troops do not have to go back and win this war yet another time.

Mr. Speaker, today is a day when we will be called upon to make some tough votes, votes which may not be politically popular at first blush, votes which may require some explaining, but which we are fully able to explain and justify. That is one definition of leadership.

President Bush is providing strong national and international leadership. I believe the actions he has taken and that this Congress will take this week are the best chance for a true and lasting resolution to the Iraqi situation, and, in the long run, will provide enormous dividends in our continuing struggle against world terrorism.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating an issue that has tremendous consequences, certainly for America, for Iraq, for the entire world. After the absolutely horrific attacks on our Nation of the 9/11, I think the al Qaeda thought America would respond by perhaps shooting off a few cruise missiles and go right back to our couches watching the football games. They calculated that Americans would not have the political will to respond; that we would be afraid that if we did respond, that terrorists might ratchet up their attacks against us.

Well, they calculated wrong. They seriously underestimated the resolve of the American people, and they most certainly did not understand an American President who was not afraid, who was willing to take the fight to them. They never expected Afghanistan, and they certainly never expected Iraq.

Today, we have successfully removed the regimes of both the Taliban and of Saddam Hussein, and, as we continue to successfully prosecute the war on terror, as we liberate millions of people, as we continue to export freedom and democracy and liberty across the world, the burden is on us to recognize that we are at a pivotal moment in world history, that we face the task of either stabilizing and ensuring a free Iraq, a democratic Iraq, or not. We need to decide if this war was truly about liberation and not occupation, or let the enemies of freedom point to the United States and say, see, they never really meant it, that this really was about the oil after all, anyway.

□ 1145

Conflict with Saddam was never optional; it was only a matter of when. And if we would have waited, the cost would surely be higher, both in terms of dollars as well as in terms of human life.

Our mission in Iraq has been incredibly successful, and that success has translated in mitigation against future terrorist attacks whose cost cannot be calculated. Today, the entire world watches this vote, and the citizens of the world will be trying to decipher the message that we are sending.

I say the message that we should send is that America is there to help. America will not cut and run. America is serious about assisting them to build their own democracy.

The world is watching us now. We must not fail.

Pass the supplemental.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Texas (Mr. FROST) that we just have one more speaker, so if he wants to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2½ minutes.

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

I would like to make a clarification for the record. In the report to accompany this rule, I am recorded as having voted ''aye'' to report the resolution. However, the fact is that I was recorded as having voted ''no'' on the motion to report.

The report submitted by the majority to the Government Printing Office makes clear that I did indeed vote ''no'' on that motion. But because GPO made an error and recorded me as an ''aye'' vote, the Committee on Rules majority has asked for a star print of the committee report which will correct the record. However, since this report is now available publicly, I wanted to state for the record that I voted ''no'' on the motion to report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment will give Members an opportunity to vote on the Obey substitute which will help the troops, would require accountability, and will pay for that bill.

Last night, the Republican leadership instructed Republicans on the Committee on Rules to vote against allowing the House to consider this substantive alternative to the committee bill. Voting for the previous question will deny the whole House the opportunity to debate important questions that the Republican leadership in the House do not want to air.

Mr. Speaker, the Obey amendment provides desperately needed funding for the many overlooked and severely underfunded areas that threaten our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. The amendment will reduce total reconstruction funds by $4.6 billion and use it instead to provide desperately needed protection for our soldiers in the field and to help ease the difficulties these brave men and women face every day.

It will provide funds to repair and replace military equipment. It will allow the Army to increase the number of active duty troops to ease the burden on those currently deployed. It will provide funds for water purification, predeployment health and dental screening, and extension of Guard and Reserve health benefits.

That is not all this amendment will do. It will also pay for this bill so our children will not be burdened with its staggering costs for years to come. We can pay off this enormous IOU simply by eliminating the Bush tax break for the wealthy 1 percent of Americans with annual incomes in excess of $350,000. Our troops make huge sacrifices every day; I think the wealthy can do their part too.

It is very disturbing that the Republican leadership of the House would deny Members an opportunity to vote on an amendment to improve the conditions faced daily by our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make something very clear. A ''no'' vote will not, I repeat will not, prevent us from voting on this supplemental. But a ''no'' vote will allow Members to vote to better protect our troops who are risking their lives every day in Iraq and Afghanistan. A ''no'' vote on the previous question is a vote for our troops, and I urge each and every Member of this body to stand up and do the right thing by these men and women who are on the front lines.

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

Vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can have an opportunity to vote on the Obey substitute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of our time to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 9½ minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just said that I am not planning to use the 9½ minutes.

First of all, let me thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for ably managing this measure; and I am glad we were able to correct the record for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) on his vote last night. But I am proud of the fact that he did indicate and he does plan at the end of the day to vote in support of this measure.

The reason is because it struck me, a friend of mine the other day stopped me and said, how in the world can you be supportive of our troops and not be supportive of this package, which my friend from Mississippi and my friend from Georgia earlier both said is very important to defend and protect our troops. So at the end of the day, it is my hope that we will be able to continue this strong bipartisan spirit in passing this measure, which is so, so critical, not only for the protection of our troops, but for the stabilization of the region.

The President has, I think, made a very strong and effective case that if we look at neighboring countries in that very troubled region of the world, bringing about a free, democratically elected leadership in Iraq will go a long way towards encouraging the kind of positive moves that we need throughout that part of the world and, frankly, in other parts of the world. The President, the other night, reminded a group of us to look at Kim Jong-il in North Korea and realize that he poses a great threat. But the fact that he now knows

that behind diplomatic words from the United States of America stands strength is an important signal to him and any others who are not considered to be friendly towards the United States.

I urge strong support of this rule and, of course, before that, passage of the previous question.

My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, has, on a regular basis, come before the Committee on Rules on appropriations measures; and, in fact, on seven of the 10 measures which we have reported out of the Committee on Rules on appropriations, he has made a request similar to the one that he is making on this supplemental appropriations bill. I respect him for proceeding with it, and I admire his tenacity; but I think that he understands that it would require a waiver which would move into the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and so this is nongermane.

The structure around which we will be considering this is an open rule. It is an open amendment process; and it is what the Democrats, when they were in the majority, used as the normal consideration for appropriations, the structure for consideration on appropriations bills; and it is what we have done, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it is proper for us to do that.

Any amendment that any Member wants to offer that complies with the rules of the House will be in order, and that is why we are going to have a very full day ahead of us with, I am sure, a lot of different amendments offered. So we have provided protection for the bill and not made in order these other amendments which do, as I say, violate the rules of the House.

The proposal that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has, while an interesting one, as I said, would, I believe, have a very deleterious effect on the small business sector of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we are very, very gratified that the tax and economic growth package that we worked so hard on and passed out of this House was a bipartisan measure and passed the other body, and we got the President's signature on it; and we are already beginning to see the benefits of that. We have seen improvements take place in markets. We have seen a lot of very, very clear benefits. One of my colleagues earlier today was talking about increased earning reports from a number of large companies; and if we look at the proposal that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has that he would like to have made in order, if we were to, in fact, defeat the previous question, it would have a very negative effect on that important small business sector of our economy. I know we talk about people in upper income levels, but we have to realize the tremendous numbers of those who are small business men and women, the backbone of our economy, where 95 percent of the creativity emanates from.

So that is why I believe it is important for us to make sure that we pass the previous question, pass this rule, and then move ahead with what will be a very interesting debate; and at the end of the day, at the end of the day, I hope and pray that we will have strong bipartisan support, so that we can stand behind our troops, so that we will be able to do the kinds of things that can bring about the goals that we all, in a bipartisan way, share for the people of Iraq.

The amendment previously referred to by Mr. FROST is as follows:

At the end of the resolution add the following new sections:

''SEC. 2 Notwithstanding any other provision of this legislation, before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in section 3 of this resolution, which may be offered only by Representative Obey or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment are waived.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 of this resolution is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, namely:

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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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

(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. (a) DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND CLOSE-OUT AUTHORITY.—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) ACCOUNTS CHARGEABLE.—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 appropriation 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: *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. 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 our 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.

SEC. 1112. (a) PROVIDING MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCREENING FOR RESERVISTS CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY.—Section 1074a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) At any time after the Secretary concerned notifies members of the Ready Reserve that the members are to be called or ordered to active duty, the administering Secretaries may provide to each such member any medical and dental screening and care that is necessary to ensure that the member meets the applicable medical and dental standards for deployment.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall promptly transmit to each member of the Ready Reserve eligible for screening and care under this subsection a notification of eligibility for such screening and care.

''(3) A member provided medical or dental screening or care under paragraph (1) may not be charged for the screening or care.

''(4) Screening and care may not be provided under this section after September 30, 2004.''.

(b) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $40,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Defense Health Program'' only for covering the costs of reservists medical and dental screening and care. Such 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. 1113. (a) EXTENDING TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR RESERVISTS.—Subject to subsection (b), during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2004, section 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be administered by substituting for paragraph (3) the following:

''(3) Transitional health care for a member under subsection (a) shall be available for 180 days beginning on the date on which the member is separated from active duty.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—(1) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to separations from active duty that take effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Beginning on October 1, 2004, the period for which a member is provided transitional health care benefits under section 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be adjusted as necessary to comply with the limits provided under paragraph (3) of such section.

(c) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $60,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Defense Health Program'' only for covering the costs of extending transitional health care benefits for reservists. Such 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. 1114. (a) INCREASE IN SUPPORT FOR RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD FAMILY ASSISTANCE CENTERS.—In addition to any other amounts appropriated in this or any other Act for fiscal year 2004, $50,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 2004, as follows:

(1) For the Army Reserve, $4,000,000.

(2) For the Army National Guard, $42,000,000.

(3) For the Air National Guard, $2,000,000.

The 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.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available only for family assistance centers.

SEC. 1115. PERMANENT ELIMINATION OF SUBSISTENCE FEE FOR MEMBERS HOSPITALIZED FOR WOUNDS RECEIVED WHILE IN COMBAT OR TRAINING.—Subsection (c) of section 1075 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 8146(a)(2) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87)), is repealed.

SEC. 1116. (a) PREPAID PHONE CARDS FOR MEMBERS DEPLOYED IN COMBAT ZONE.—Beginning on the first day of the first month following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a program to provide prepaid phone cards to members of the Armed Forces

stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in a combat zone. The value of the benefit shall be at least $50 per month per person.

(b) TELEPHONE AND INTERNET SERVICE FOR MEMBERS DEPLOYED IN COMBAT ZONE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary should seek to provide free telephone and Internet access to members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in a combat zone.

(c) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $65,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for covering the costs of providing telephone and Internet service to members of the United States Armed Services in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such 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. 1117. (a) GOVERNMENT-PAID TRAVEL UNDER REST AND RECUPERATION LEAVE PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS SERVING ONE YEAR OR MORE IN-THEATRE.—In the case of a member of the Armed Forces serving outside of the United States for a period of one year or more who is granted rest and recuperative leave, and provided the travel and transportation allowances authorized by section 411c(a) of title 37, United States Code, in connection with that leave, the Secretary of Defense shall also pay the member for transportation, or provide transportation for the member, between—

(1) the locations specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of such section; and

(2) the permanent duty station of the member, the home of record of the member, or other location in the United States or overseas approved by the Secretary.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to travel beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act in connection with rest and recuperative leave described in subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $50,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for covering the costs of providing transportation for service to members of the United States Armed Services in Iraq and Afghanistan on rest and recuperation leave. Such 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. 1118. PROVIDING ESSENTIAL GOODS AND SERVICES FOR TROOPS.—Of amounts appropriated under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' in this Act, $40,500,000 shall be made available only for providing essential goods and services to the military exchange services.

SEC. 1119. (a) MILITARY CAMPAIGN MEDALS TO RECOGNIZE SERVICE IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM AND OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.—The President shall establish a campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and a separate campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by the President, eligibility for a campaign medal established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be set forth in uniform regulations to be prescribed by the Secretaries of the military departments and approved by the Secretary of Defense or in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 1120. (a) ENHANCED TRANSITION ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED SERVICEMEMBERS RETURNING TO CIVILIAN LIFE.—In addition to amounts appropriated in this or any other Act, $50,000,000 is appropriated for the Disabled Transition Assistance Program, in addition to any other amounts available for that program. Such 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.

(b) USE OF APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be used to increase the number of personnel within the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense assigned as case managers and discharge planners with responsibility for managing the case of a member of the Armed Forces who is very seriously ill, or seriously ill.

SEC. 1121. INCREASE FOR RECONSTITUTING THE MILITARY FORCES.—In addition to amounts appropriated in this or any other Act, the sum of $3,126,400,000 is appropriated only for the maintenance, repair, replacement, or reconstitution of weapon systems and equipment used in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, to be distributed to the following accounts and in the following amounts:

(1) ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $323,700,000;

(2) ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $861,000,000;

(3) ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $467,100,000;

(4) ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $129,200,000;

(5) ''Other Procurement, Army'', $329,700,000;

(6) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $61,000,000;

(7) ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $220,400,000;

(8) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $146,300,000;

(9) ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $33,000,000; and

(10) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $555,000,000:

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.

SEC. 1122. INCREASE IN ARMY MANPOWER END-STRENGTH LEVEL.—Notwithstanding the limitations set forth in Section 691 of title 10 United States Code, as amended by Public Law 107-314 (116 Stat. 2524), the number of members of the Army on active duty at the end of fiscal year 2004 shall not be less than 500,000: *Provided*, That in addition to amounts appropriated in this or any other Act, $1,000,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to be allocated as follows:

(1) ''Military Personnel, Army'', $600,000,000; and

(2) ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $400,000,000:

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

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Army'', $364,100,000, 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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. 1201. (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.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

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 such 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.

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 such 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. Each such 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

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance'', $43,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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, $14,031,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, to be allocated as follows: $2,104,000,000 for security and law enforcement; $1,081,000,000 for justice, public safety infrastructure, and civil society; $3,735,000,000 for the electric sector; $1,800,000,000 for oil infrastructure; $3,507,000,000 for water resources and sanitation; $500,000,000 for transportation and telecommunications; $185,000,000 for roads, bridges, and construction; $793,000,000 for health care; $73,000,000 for private sector development; and $253,000,000 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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. (a) COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN IRAQ.—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.

(d) GAO REPORT ON NONCOMPETITIVE CONTRACTING.—The Comptroller General shall submit a report to the appropriate committees on a quarterly basis on the contracts awarded under procedures other than competitive procedures that were subject to the

notification requirements of paragraph (a). Such review shall include an evaluation of the reasons for using other than competitive procedures and an evaluation of the selection procedures used to make final contract awards.

SEC. 2203. (a) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF NON-COMPETITIVE CONTRACTING FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN IRAQ.—

(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 5 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 an 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 relates.

(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.

SEC. 2212. (a) REPORT ON MILITARY OPERATIONS AND RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN.—The President shall prepare and transmit to Congress on a quarterly basis, beginning January 15, 2004, 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 detailed and complete accounting of amounts appropriated under any previous Acts used to support military or reconstruction activities in and around Iraq and Afghanistan; a detailed and complete accounting of funds appropriated in this Act that were expended during the preceding quarter for military operations and reconstruction efforts in and around Iraq and Afghanistan; and, an estimate of the remaining total cost to the United States of military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan for fiscal year 2004 and subsequent fiscal years.

(2) A description of activities undertaken and findings made in the search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

(3) 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, sewage systems, road construction and other public works, transportation and telecommunications infrastructure, medical and hospital services, and private sector development.

(4) A description of progress made to reduce attacks against members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq; a detailed listing of the casualties suffered by United States Armed Forces personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan during the preceding quarter and cumulatively; a listing of equipment, weapons, and spare parts shortfalls (compared to stated military service requirements) and a description of the actions taken to address the shortfalls; and a timeframe for the withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

(5) An analysis of the impact that military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have had on overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(6) An analysis of the impact the 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.

(7) An estimate of the remaining 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.

(8) A description of progress made toward holding of free and fair elections in Iraq.

(9) A description of the extent of international participation (including financial and other) in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq.

(10) A detailed accounting of the number of United States Armed Forces currently deployed in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(11) A detailed accounting on the use of private contractors for contracts over $10,000,000, including the costs of salaries, insurance payments, oversight plans, costs of security provided by coalition troops to contractors, performance schedules, plans to train Iraqi national to assume functions of the contract, and the extent of the use of local procurement and local management.

(c) LIMITATION.—Beginning on January 15, 2004, none of the funds made available by this Act that remain for obligation may be obligated unless and until the President has submitted to Congress the report described in subsections (a) and (b) of this provision.

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.

SEC. 2214. (a) TRANSPARENCY IN CONTRACTING: NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—(1) The head of an executive agency that enters into a contract, or task or delivery order under a task or delivery order contract, in excess of $5,000,000 relating to activities in Iraq shall, within 7 days after entering into the contract or order, notify the chairman and ranking member of the committees described in subsection (b) that the contract or order has been entered into.

(2) Upon request of the chairman or ranking member of a committee described in subsection (b), the head of an executive agency shall provide, within 14 days after receipt of the request, unredacted copies of any documents required to be maintained in the contracting office contract file, the contract administration office contract file, and the paying office contract file pursuant to subpart 4.8 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including—

(A) copies of the contract and all modifications;

(B) orders issued under the contract;

(C) justifications and approvals;

(D) any government estimate of contract price;

(E) source selection documentation;

(F) cost or price analysis;

(G) audit reports;

(H) justification for type of contract;

(I) authority for deviations from regulations, statutory requirements, or other restrictions;

(J) bills, invoices, vouchers, and supporting documents; and

(K) records of payments or receipts.

(b) COMMITTEES.—The committees referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(3) Each committee that the head of the executive agency determines has legislative jurisdiction for the operations of the department or agency to which the contract, task or delivery order, or documents referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) relates.

SEC. 2215. (a) IRAQI INVOLVEMENT PLAN.—The head of each executive agency entering into a contract relating to activities in Iraq shall develop a plan for minimizing costs to the Federal Government through the use of Iraqi firms.

(b) COMPONENTS OF PLAN.—(1) The plan shall require the head of each executive agency to assess, before entering into a contract relating to activities in Iraq, whether the use of Iraqi firms to carry out the contract could reduce the costs of such contract to the Federal Government.

(2) The plan may provide for the waiver of otherwise applicable Federal procurement laws or regulations with respect to the contract if the head of the executive agency determines that such laws or regulations impede the ability of the executive agency to reduce the costs of such contract to the Federal Government through the use of Iraqi firms.

(3) The plan shall ensure that all contracts with respect to which laws or regulations are waived pursuant to paragraph (2) are entered into using contracting procedures that are open, fair, accountable, and, to the maximum extent practicable, competitive.

SEC. 2216. (a) LEGAL STATUS OF COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY FOR IRAQ.—For purposes of the following provisions of law, the Coalition Provisional Authority for Iraq shall be considered to be an executive agency within the meaning of the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code:

(1) Procurement statutes, including chapters 137 and 141 of title 10, United States Code, title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.), and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.).

(2) Section 552 of title 5, United States Code (known as the Freedom of Information Act).

(3) Financial management statutes requiring the preparation of audited financial statements, including section 3535 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''Coalition Provisional Authority for Iraq'' means the entity charged by the President with directing reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

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 of 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.

TITLE IV—IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION TRUST FUND

SEC. 4001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Iraq Reconstruction Trust Fund Act''.

SEC. 4002. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY.—The term ''Coalition Provisional Authority'' means the entity charged by the President with directing reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

(3) GOVERNING COUNCIL IN IRAQ.—The term ''Governing Council in Iraq'' means the Governing Council established in Iraq on July 13, 2003, or any successor governing authority in Iraq.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of State.

(5) TRUST FUND.—The term ''Trust Fund'' means the Iraq Reconstruction Fund .

(6) WORLD BANK.—The term ''World Bank'' means the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

SEC. 4003. LIMITATION OF USE OF FUNDS.

Of the funds appropriated in title II under the subheading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' under the heading ''Other Bilateral Economic Assistance Funds Appropriated to the President'' other than amounts appropriated under such subheading for security and. for refugees, human rights, democracy, and civil society, $7,000,000,000 may not be obligated or expended before the Secretary negotiates with the World Bank, in consultation with the Coalition Provisional Authority, the member nations of the World Bank, and other interested parties, for the establishment within the World Bank of the Iraq Reconstruction Trust Fund in accordance with the provisions of this title.

SEC. 4004. DESCRIPTION OF THE TRUST FUND.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Trust Fund shall be to use contribute funds to—

(1) assist in restoration of infrastructure and essential services in Iraq;

(2) assist in the creation of civil society in Iraq; and

(3) ensure a secure environment for the people of Iraq.

(b) IN GENERAL.—As part of the negotiations required by section 4003, the Secretary shall negotiate with the World Bank to establish conditions under which the Trust Fund will be terminated.

(c) REPAYMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—If the Trust Fund is terminated, any amounts contributed, to the Fund that have not been expended shall be returned to the countries that contributed funds to the Trust Fund, on basis proportionate to their contribution.

SEC. 4005. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—In carrying out the purposes set out in section 4004(a), the Trust Fund shall be used to provide loans and loan guarantees under terms that will facilitate economic development in Iraq.

(b) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—The funds in the Trust Fund shall be used to provide loans and loan guarantees that carry out the purposes of the Trust Fund, including projects to—

(1) create or repair infrastructure to—

(A) produce and distribute electricity;

(B) extract, refine, and distribute oil;

(C) provide drinking water;

(D) treat and dispose of wastewater;

(E) provide transportation; and

(F) facilitate communications;

(2) promote public health;

(3) provide housing;

(4) ensure public safety; and

(5) develop a private sector economy.

SEC. 4006. CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO SOLICIT AND ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Trust Fund shall be authorized to solicit and accept contributions from governments, the private sector, and nongovernmental entities of all kinds.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY OF FUNDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall, consistent with subsection (c)—

(1) take such actions as are necessary to ensure that adequate procedures and standards are in place to account for and monitor the use of funds contributed to the Trust Fund, including the cost of administering the Trust Fund; and

(2) seek agreement with the World Bank on the criteria to be used to determine the programs and activities to be assisted by the Trust Fund.

(c) SELECTION OF PROJECTS AND RECIPIENTS.—The Trust Fund and its contributors shall establish—

(1) criteria for the selection of projects to receive support from the Trust Fund;

(2) standards and criteria regarding qualifications of recipients of such support;

(3) such rules and procedures as may be necessary for cost-effective management of the Trust Fund; and

(4) such rules and procedures as may be necessary to ensure transparency and accountability in the making of loans and loan guarantees.

(d) TRANSPARENCY OF OPERATIONS.—The Trust Fund shall establish procedures to ensure full and prompt public disclosure of the proposed objectives, financial organization, and operations of the Trust Fund.

(e) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—The Comptroller or any duly authorized representatives of the Comptroller shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and. records of the Trust Fund for the purpose of preparing the reports required in section 4007(b).

SEC. 4007. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the duration of the Trust Fund, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the Trust Fund.

(b) REPORT ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

(1) the goals of the Trust Fund;

(2) the programs, projects, and activities supported by the Trust Fund;

(3) private and governmental, contributions to the Trust Fund; and

(4) the criteria that have been established that would be used to determine the programs and activities to be assisted by the Trust Fund.

SEC. 4008. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other funds available for multilateral or bilateral programs related to the purposes of the Trust Fund, of the amounts appropriated in title II under the subheading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' under the heading ''Other Bilateral Economic Assistance Funds Appropriated to the President'', other than amounts appropriated under such subheading for security, and for refugees, human rights, democracy, and civil society, $7,000,000,000 shall be made available for the fiscal year 2004 for contribution to the Trust Fund. Such 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.

(b) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—Subject to the maximum amount available for contributions to the Trust Fund under this Act, the United States shall contribute to the Trust Fund out of the additional amount made available under subsection (a), the amount that equals the total amount contributed by foreign countries to the Trust Fund during the 180-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—On the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, any amount made available for the Trust Fund under subsection (a) that exceeds the amount required to be contributed to the Trust Fund under subsection (b) shall cease to be available for transfer to the Trust Fund and shall be transferred to an account to be available to the Coalition Provisional Authority for use as loans to, or to guarantee loans made by the Governing Council in Iraq.

SEC. 4009. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

Not later than 15 days prior to the initial obligation or expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to section 4009, the Secretary shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the Trust Fund has been created in accordance with the provisions of this title; and

(2) adequate procedures and standards have been established to ensure accountability for and monitoring of the use of funds contributed to the Trust Fund, including the cost of administering the Trust Fund.

TITLE V—REVENUE PROVISION

SEC. 5001. TOP MARGINAL RATE INCREASED TO 39.6 PERCENT BEGINNING IN 2005.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The table contained in paragraph (2) of section 1(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to reductions in rates after June 30, 2001) is amended to read as follows:

"In the case of taxable years beginning during calendar year:	The corresponding percentages shall be substituted for the following percentages:			
	28%	31%	36%	39.6%
2001	27.5%	30.5%	35.5%	39.1%
2002	27.0%	30.0%	35.0%	38.6%
2003 or 2004	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	35.0%
2005 and thereafter	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	39.6%.''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2004.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004''.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our 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.

Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and on adopting House Resolution 198, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 202, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Boehner	Calvert
Akin	Bonilla	Camp
Bachus	Bonner	Cannon
Baker	Bono	Cantor
Barrett (SC)	Boozman	Capito
Barton (TX)	Bradley (NH)	Carter
Bass	Brady (TX)	Castle
Beauprez	Brown (SC)	Chabot
Bereuter	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Chocola
Biggert	Burgess	Coble
Bilirakis	Burns	Cole
Bishop (UT)	Burr	Collins
Blackburn	Burton (IN)	Cox
Blunt	Buyer	Crane
Boehlert		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
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
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)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
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—202

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
Capps
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
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
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—10

Ballenger
Bartlett (MD)
Clay
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McCrery
Mollohan
Saxton
Souder
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1217

Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT FRANCE, GERMANY, AND RUSSIA CAN BEST CONTRIBUTE TO RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ BY FORGIVENESS OF OUTSTANDING DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 198, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 31, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
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
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering

Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—31

Baird
Boucher
Capuano
Conyers
DeFazio
DeGette
Dingell
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Jackson (IL)
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
Miller, George
Olver
Pastor
Paul
Rodriguez
Serrano
Stark
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Waters
Watt
Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Ballenger
Clay
Jones (OH)
Marshall
Mollohan
Radanovich
Saxton
Souder
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1225

Ms. LEE, Mr. DINGELL and Mr. WYNN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HONDA and Mr. MARKEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the preamble offered by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

Strike the preamble insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations have expressed an interest in assisting in the reconstruction of Iraq;

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations have previously encouraged and provided debt relief as a way to assist other nations;

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations had extensive trade relationships with Iraq;

Whereas loans and other support from France, Germany, Russia, and other nations were use by the Saddam Hussein regime to support the development of its weapons of mass destruction programs, the expansion of the Iraqi Army that the regime used to invade its neighbors, and the building of palaces, monuments, and other means of aggrandizing Saddam Hussein;

Whereas the United States has already provided approximately $3,000,000,000 in the form of grants to provide for the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people and to rebuild Iraq's crumbling infrastructure; and

Whereas France, Germany, Russia, and other nations are capable of making generous pledges for the reconstruction of Iraq at the International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq to be held in Madrid: Now, therefore, be it

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on amendment to the preamble offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, Russia, and other nations can contribute to Iraq's reconstruction by forgiving debts owed by Iraq to those nations and by making generous pledges for Iraq's reconstruction at the International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq to be held in Madrid''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privileges of the House and I offer a resolution, which I will send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) should read the resolution.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution correcting the RECORD of Tuesday, January 28, 2003.

Resolved, That an asterisk be placed in the permanent RECORD of Tuesday, January 28, 2003, noting that the following statements contained in the State of the Union Address by the President of the United States are inaccurate:

One, ''The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.''

Two, ''Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.''

Three, ''From intelligence sources, we know, for instance, that thousands of Iraqi security personnel are at work hiding documents and materials from the U.N. inspectors, sanitizing inspections sites, and monitoring the inspectors themselves.''

Four, ''Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda.''.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than Majority Leader or the Minority Leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within two legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Washington will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 14, 2003, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for a further period of debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004.

□ 1231

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 a further period of debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, October 15, two hours and nine minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 53 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 1 hour and 16 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. What I was going to do was just announce the time remaining.

In addition, I would announce that once we have completed this time of general debate under the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, we

would then rise and reconvene under the rule for an additional 1 hour of general debate as provided by the rule on the bill.

At this point then, I will begin the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes 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. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time to me, and I rise just to make one point to my colleagues and friends, and that is, to compare what we are being asked to do today with what we have done since I have been in this Congress for 17 years.

Mr. Chairman, President Bush, with the strong support of both parties and both bodies, agreed to commit us to end the reign of Saddam Hussein in Iraq and to aid in removing the Taliban in Afghanistan, and we committed to that effort with a great vote in both bodies. This is much like what happened during the previous 8 years under President Clinton when he requested us to deploy our troops 38 times in 8 years.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in the previous 40 years, from 1950 to 1990, all the Presidents combined deployed our troops 10 times. In the 8 years from 1991 until 1999, 2000, largely under President Clinton, our troops were deployed 38 times. One of those deployments, actually under President Bush, Senior, in Desert Storm, was actually reimbursed $51 billion from our allies. In the other 37 deployments, Mr. Speaker, this Congress, largely controlled by the Republican party, gave President Clinton the money that he needed for every deployment.

Let us look at some of those deployments. They were in Somalia, East Timor, Macedonia, Cambodia, Colombia, Bosnia. In fact, Mr. Speaker, here is the irony of what we are debating today. Eleven times we have approved supplementals in the 1990s for President Clinton, after the fact, to reimburse our military for the costs that we spent for the deployments that he got us into, 11 supplementals.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we cut our Defense budget so bad that Democrats and Republicans on this floor restored $43 billion over 6 years that had to be put in because those moneys went from our military budget to subsidize the deployments.

What did we deploy in the 1990s? Let us see, Mr. Chairman. We subsidized troops from other countries and Kosovo and Bosnia and Macedonia. We paid for OSCE inspectors. We built hundreds of schools. Mr. Chairman, during the 1990s, under President Clinton, this Congress built hundreds of schools. In fact, we did more than build hundreds of schools. We trained police forces. We trained and equipped local police forces. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we used taxpayer money to send fire trucks to Sarajevo. We paid for fire equipment. We rebuilt countries. In fact, in addition, we started small business loans.

All of these things were done with 11 supplementals for the 37 deployments that President Clinton got us into, but Mr. Chairman, there is one difference. President Clinton never came up to us in advance and said this is what it is going to cost. He simply put the troops in harm's way. He started the process of building the schools, training the police departments and doing all the other nation-building work, and then came to us and said to the Congress, you find the money. So $43 billion of that money came out of our Defense budget and we had to replace it.

In addition to that, we spent 10s of billions of dollars of supplemental money through 11 supplemental bills which were supported with the Republican party in control.

Mr. Chairman, there is an inconsistency here. I did not hear my colleagues saying back in Bosnia we were told we would be out in December 1996, that it should be a loan. We have now spent $25 billion in Bosnia. We are still there. Where is the loan request? Where was the loan request from the Bosnian government? Where was the loan request from Kosovo? Where was the loan request from Macedonia, from East Timor, from Colombia?

This Congress supported Democratic President Bill Clinton, and I think this Congress has an obligation. I think this Congress has an obligation to be consistent. We as Republicans supported the funding through 11 supplementals to pay for those same items that President Bush has asked for here, and if we total up the amount of money of these 37 supplementals, it is far in excess of what we are talking about with this bill. The difference is we have been asked to approve it in advance. In every other case, in the 1990s, it was done after the fact.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). I probably will vote the way he is going to vote on this, but does my colleague recall, I think it was 1999, the sense of congress resolution supporting the troops in Kosovo, if I am not mistaken, my good friend voted no on that. So as my colleague thinks about my colleagues on this side expressing reservation, I hope we are not labeled anything other than patriots that he and I am.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague I was the one who took 11 Members of Congress, including five from his side, to Vienna, and the reason was, we did not disagree with the actions against Milosevic. We felt we had not put enough pressure on Russia, and in going to Vienna, and my colleague can ask the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the gentleman can ask the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), we wrote the plan that became the basis of the G–8 agreement to end the war. If we had brought Russia in earlier, we could have avoided much of that.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further yield, did the gentleman vote against that resolution?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, I supported removing Milosevic.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¾ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the $87 billion supplemental request, in its present form, is profoundly flawed, and if it is not improved by responsible amendments, among them one I have proposed, I will reluctantly oppose it.

I take a backseat to no one when it comes to support of our Nation's defense and our intelligence community, but I believe there are better options to support our troops and rebuild Iraq, while respecting the American taxpayer in the process.

Simply put, the plan that Congress is being asked to fund is not ready for prime time. Our troops, our veterans and America's families deserve better.

Among my concerns are deficiencies in prewar intelligence that have not been acknowledged by the administration, let alone fixed. If our intelligence is flawed, our forces presently in Iraq are at risk, and our predictions about threats posed by other hot spots like Iran and North Korea will lack credibility.

Second, we have only belatedly reached out to those with extensive experience in stabilization and reconstruction. Iraq is the sixth such rebuilding effort in a decade; yet lessons learned from earlier experiences have been largely ignored.

Third, we are at best limping along in our quest for an international reconstruction strategy, one that restores wealth to the Iraqi people and enjoys the support of the United Nations and other countries capable of contributing to a successful result.

Fourth, by sending forward a second emergency funding request, the President has again bypassed the annual budgeting process and its critical constraints.

Fifth, we owe it to our veterans to fully fund their needs. My amendment would do this in the context of a balanced budget framework.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has a moral obligation to finish the job in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere, and I

support finishing the job, but we must not provide this administration or any other with a blank check.

Mr. Chairman, the $87 billion supplemental request in its present form is profoundly flawed—and if it is not improved by amendment on the House floor, I intend to oppose it.

I take a back seat to no one when it comes to my support of our Nation's defense and our intelligence community. But I believe there are better ways to support our troops and rebuild Iraq while respecting the American taxpayer in the process.

Simply put, the plan that Congress is being asked to fund is not ready for prime time. Our troops, our veterans and America's families deserve better.

Members of this body rightly have complained about the Bush administration's lack of a sustainable strategy for Iraq and the lack of a sincere attempt to explain the supplemental's details.

The failure to spend funds wisely in Iraq and Afghanistan is already having a profound effect on our fighting men and women there. Earlier this week newspapers reported that ceramic inserts for soldiers' flak jackets—to be paid for with $300 million already appropriated—still have not been delivered and might not arrive until December. This is irresponsible. U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan are targets of daily attacks; wearing the inserts is literally a matter of life and death should they be hit by assault rifle fire.

I also have serious concerns about our policy going forward.

First, deficiencies in pre-war intelligence have not been acknowledged by the Administration, let alone fixed. If our intelligence is flawed, our forces are at risk. And our predictions about threats posed by other hot spots like Iran and North Korea will lack credibility. This supplemental does nothing to fix these problems.

Second, we have only belatedly reached out for those Americans with extensive experience in stabilization and reconstruction. Iraq is the sixth such rebuilding effort in a decade. Yet, lessons learned from earlier experiences have been largely ignored.

Third, we are at best limping along in our quest for an international reconstruction strategy—one that restores wealth to the Iraqi people and enjoys the support of the United Nations and other countries capable of contributing to a successful result.

Fourth, by sending forward a second emergency funding request and demanding that the crisis requires its immediate passage, the President has bypassed the annual budgeting process and its fiscal constraints. It is even more troubling in this case since the Administration resisted for months the call for openness and honesty about the true costs of managing post-war Iraq.

Fifth, we owe it to our veterans and those soldiers returning from the war on terrorism to fully fund the benefits to which they are entitled—and to make up the $1.8 billion shortfall in health care funding in the fiscal year 2004 VA-HUD bill.

Since 9/11, I have called for a wartime budget that would fully fund the war on terror as well as reconstruction and stabilization in Iraq within a balanced budget framework. Americans are prepared to make hard and responsible choices. Every previous war has been paid for by the generation that fought it, and not by saddling our children and grandchildren with mountains of debt.

The United States has a moral obligation to finish the job in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere—and I support finishing that job.

To this end, I would support, as I believe many other Members would, an incremental approach to the supplemental package—one that provides funding in installments and only after certain benchmarks and milestones are met.

But I am not prepared to provide this Administration with another blank check.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, at this time my next speaker is detained, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 74¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 48 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I stand behind our men and women in uniform who are sacrificing so much for their country in Iraq. Most importantly, I want to ensure that our troops receive the resources they need. In my view, this bill underfunds the immediate needs of the military, leaving the men and women serving there in a vulnerable position.

This bill is a belated and a poorly-planned attempt to provide resources for a thinly-sketched occupation force and a laundry list of economic development projects that seem well beyond the scope of reconstruction. The administration needs to provide Congress with a more detailed and comprehensive reconstruction plan before we authorize an explosive increase in taxpayer dollars in Iraq.

The military phase of the campaign has been over since May; yet the agencies formally charged with delivering foreign aid have taken a backseat to the Pentagon. Foreign aid is and should be the responsibility of the State Department. Their people are trained for it. It is time we let our men and women in the military focus on the security side of the effort and let them hand off efforts like getting water and electricity to the Iraqi people to the experts at the State Department and USAID.

The Congress should not give the President a blank check. Congress needs specifics on important questions, the projected duration of the U.S. military occupation in Iraq, the estimate of the total cost of military operations and reconstruction, the schedule to restore basic services to the Iraqi people, the plan for withdrawal of American forces, and when will we begin to significantly share the burden with our allies.

I am worried that greed may trump patriotism in Iraq. The President has chosen to conduct this process behind closed doors and by awarding no-bid contracts to friendly companies, with so much room for corporate abuse. I believe this process should mirror the historic Marshall Plan, which was conducted in a transparent way, under the authority of foreign aid experts at the State Department, with open bidding for contracts.

The President and others have compared our efforts in Iraq to the Marshall Plan. I believe we should aspire to that historic reconstruction effort. Let us be clear; this is not the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan was not an unconditional grant from America's taxpayers, nor was it a blank check.

This plan is packed with a laundry list of projects that lack accountability. We can do better. We owe it to the Iraqi people. Most importantly, we owe it to those young men and women who are putting their lives on the line every single day.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin has substantially more time, I wonder if he would be willing to go ahead with additional speakers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, when President Bush told the American people he was against nation-building, no one, including myself, thought he was talking about America.

Let me begin at the outset by making very clear my support for our valiant soldiers who are pursuing our enemies in Afghanistan and other parts of the world and are securing the peace in Iraq.

□ 1245

The bill before us today, just as it ignites the Iraqi economy and keeps Iraqi kids out of more debt, it costs our American grandchildren and great, great grandchildren more long-term debt while America herself crumbles.

This bill's priorities are wrong, Mr. Chairman. There is plenty of money in here for Iraqi health care but not one dime of the $1.8 billion American veterans need for their health care, which the majority in this Congress seem hell bent on ignoring. Why is that?

The White House will not fund the No Child Left Behind education initiative, but we are supposed to pay Iraqi teachers' salaries. Why is that?

The President wants $856 million to upgrade three Iraqi airports, a seaport, and rail lines, while Amtrak is starved for funds in this country, and our ports remain vulnerable to attack. Why is that?

The White House has a paltry underfunded proposal for road building here at home, but wants to spend millions building roads and bridges elsewhere. Why is that?

The President wiped out the COPS program here at home, and now he wants to pay more than $3 billion for Iraqi law enforcement. Why is that?

The priorities are all skewed. Let us support our troops, but not with this $87 billion Iraqi economy rebuilding measure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, one of the most relevant facts about this debate was in The New York Times a couple of days ago. The Republicans, who are putting together a prescription drug bill, plan to institute a copayment for people receiving home health care. The frailest and the poorest in our society, elderly people who are unable to perform basic functions and stay in their own homes, and who get help from very low-paid workers, will now, according to the Republican plan, if it becomes law, be forced to pay out of their meager incomes hundreds of dollars a year for this basic service.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania who spoke before said that during the Clinton administration, he made a rather partisan speech, but he said during the Clinton administration we also had to make some payments. Yes, but at that time we were not trying to cut taxes for millionaires.

When the Committee on Rules refused to allow the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, which would have paid for this by undoing the great tax relief that is coming to a handful of very wealthy people in this country, they posed a very stark choice to this House: vote the $87 billion and have it come out of home health care for the elderly; have it come out of the Environmental Protection Administration.

I have a Superfund site in the district I represent where EPA has shut down the work because they cannot afford it. So, yes, there are plenty of us prepared to meet our obligations, but not by either adding to the hundreds of billions of debt we already face or by cutting back on basic needs.

So if this leadership in the House would allow this House to vote to assess a fair taxation on the richest people in this country instead of promising them additional hundreds of billions of tax relief, we would avoid the terrible choices they have forced the House to make.

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

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we are not exporting to Iraq the kind of democracy which would allow a minute and a half only for a Representative of more than 650,000 people to speak. We need more time to excuse how we are going to spend $87 billion. We have enough money for our troops to last until next spring. What is the hurry?

Sixty percent of the American people are against this $87 billion blank check to an administration that has mismanaged the war against terrorism. Sixty percent. I speak for the majority here. The American people want us to issue a mandated RFP to Secretary Rumsfeld and the White House: give a proposal that makes more sense. We have better proposals that we can put on the table for the expenditure of $87 billion.

What could this Nation do with the energy, the brainpower, and the billions of dollars being invested in the great deadly blunder in Iraq? That is what it is, a great deadly blunder. That is what we have done in Iraq. We have put all of our energy, all of our money, all of our effort into a place where we will not increase the safety of the American people; we will not fight terrorism appropriately.

With this kind of huge giveaway package, the American people could have more effective initiatives to eliminate terrorism. We could have more money going to Pakistan, for instance, where we have a battle in that country for the hearts and minds of people. We have half the population on our side, half not; but we are not giving them billions of dollars to win the war for democracy in Pakistan.

With this kind of package, how can we strengthen the homeland defenses, our ports and the number of areas that are still vulnerable? This is a great waste, and the American people know it. The majority say no, and I am with the majority.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the war on terror and the President's $87 billion supplemental request in funding this war.

Mr. Chairman, while the previous administration chose to often treatment the acts of terrorism foisted against the American people as mere criminal proceedings, President Bush has taken strong action in fully addressing these acts for what they are. They are acts of war against the American Nation, not simply a crime, but acts of terror which demand full and swift and final military action.

It is unfortunate that the $20 billion in this budget request appropriated for rebuilding Iraq has been shamelessly and unnecessarily politicized by those seeking political gain at the expense of true and lasting peace. The stability of Iraq is directly related to America's long-term security interests. If we fail to establish a safe and secure Iraq, then we allow Iraq to possibly return to a country that serves the purposes of terror, and we enable it to become an incubator for future terrorist acts.

Some may wonder why U.S. taxpayers should be asked to pay for water projects, health care facilities, and public schools. We have heard repeatedly from commanders in the field that this type of funding is critical if we are going to be able to achieve stability in this region. We must not allow Iraq to revert to becoming a homeland for terrorists.

Another important point is the simple fact that we have spent over $14 billion over the last 10 years containing Iraq. It is not a choice of spending the money or not spending the money; it is a choice of whether we do the right thing or the wrong thing here.

Not 2 years ago, a terrorist group inflicted terrible damage on the American people through the acts of 9–11. This was a huge humanitarian tragedy, but as well a $2 trillion impact on our economy. This $87 billion funding request is dwarfed by the negative economic impact of the toll of 9–11.

Some may argue that the $20 billion should be loaned to Iraq. Sending this money as a loan rather than as a grant, I feel very strongly, would be very shortsighted. Did we not learn anything from World War I? The Treaty of Versailles saddled Germany with a significant debt, eventually setting the stage for the rise of an authoritarian regime under Adolf Hitler and ultimately ushering in World War II. Conversely, at the end of World War II, America's leaders established the Marshall Plan, a plan that ushered in decades of economic prosperity and peace for the region of Europe.

Ambassador Bremer testified on September 22 that Iraq has almost $200 billion in debt and reparations hanging over its head right now. This idea of saddling them with additional debt, I think, is wrong and very misguided; and we should support the President's request and support this motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in good conscience I cannot and will not support President Bush's misled, failed policy.

I did not vote for going to war, I did not vote to put our young people in harm's way, and I will not be a party to financing this war. This administration has been hell bent from day one to have a war with Iraq, and they have stopped at nothing to get it. Their record on Iraq is one of secrecy, deceit, and fear-mongering.

They deceived Members of Congress, the American people, and the community of nations. They told us that Saddam had ties to al Qaeda, that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, that oil from Iraq would pay to rebuild Iraq. I am sick and tired of lies, and I am sick and tired of war and killing and hatred and violence.

People are dying. For what? And while our troops and their families sacrifice, corporate America is getting rich. These war profiteers are making

money off the blood and toil of our soldiers and the people of Iraq. Halliburton. Bechtel Jacobs.

It is time to stop the madness. It is time to hold President Bush accountable for his words and his deeds. I cannot and will not be a party to this war. I will not vote for $87 billion for more violence, for more killing, for more war.

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

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of the supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the case for support of this supplemental can be made any better than by a young woman I met in Iraq recently. Recently, I was in the town of Tikrit, Saddam Hussein's hometown; and I met a young woman who is a private in the Marines. I asked her, as we were having dinner with several other soldiers, what would you like me to tell people when I go back home?

And she said what I want the people at home to understand is that I am here in harm's way. I am here because I want to protect my family at home and my country at home. She went on to explain that if we are successful in this effort, Iraq will become a free, democratic, prosperous society that will be a model for the Middle East; and it will have ripple effects of stability and peace and security not only through the Middle East but all over the world. And she said if we do not succeed, Iraq will become the home of terrorists and radical Islamists and jihadists that will export hate, murder, and violence all over the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is an issue that is much bigger than $87 billion; it is much bigger than the people of Iraq. It is about the future of the Middle East; it is about the future of our globe and having the opportunity to bring much stronger stability all over the world, which will protect every single American at home. So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage every Member of this body to support the supplemental of $87 billion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

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

Some would have us believe that today's vote is just about supporting our troops, about promoting democracy, and about helping the people of Iraq. Look, I voted for the use of force in Iraq. I support the troops, and I believe we should rebuild Iraq. But it is not quite that simple. We need to do this in the right way.

The real issue is the credibility of the Bush administration, the accountability of this administration; but most importantly, the real issue is protecting the American people.

We went to war on bad intelligence without our allies. We were either deliberately misled, misled by ineptness, or we have had a massive intelligence failure. We did the right thing, but we did it for the wrong reasons.

Secretary Rumsfeld tell us, oh, we will be greeted as heroes and liberators to mask the fact they had no plan. Secretary Wolfowitz said, do not worry about reconstruction, Iraq is a country rich in natural resources and oil reserves, and they can pay for their own reconstruction, which brings us to today's debate.

□ 1300

This grant should be a loan to the Iraqi people. We should not be giving this money away. Interestingly, despite the Halliburton controversy, the Republican administration has refused to unbundle these contracts so small businesses could participate, so that women and minority businesses could participate. Then they say, we're going to give this money away. The fact of the matter is while we are giving money to Iraq, Iraq will be paying back grants to Russia and Germany for loans that they got from those countries. This smells.

Other countries know that America has contributed both in cash and in blood. The fact of the matter is if the problem is debt in Iraq, what about the debt in the United States, the $500 billion that this administration has put on the American people? Our schools are crumbling, our streets are crumbling, and we do not have prescription drug benefits for our seniors. We need to protect the American public. This program should be a loan. Enough is enough. Let us vote ''no'' on this ill-conceived proposal.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I listened intently to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) yesterday in his opening remarks. Many of the things he said were true. And then I listened to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) on the Defense appropriations committee and many of the things he said were true and I agree with. One of those things is it is time to get our kids home.

Many of us have served in combat and away from our families. I was critical of President Clinton, 216 deployments, and our kids were tired. Our equipment was getting worn out. And it was time to get our kids home to be with their families. But now it is also approaching the same thing under President Bush in the amount of time that our people are gone. The only way to get them home is to stabilize Iraq and Afghanistan and that is what the President's goal is. I have been with the President. I have seen him get teary when he talks about the losses that we have of our men and women overseas and the principles that he is guided upon that my mother and dad, who were Democrats, talked about the reach for freedom and outreach to the rest of the world. I believe those words, not just from my mother and father, but fought for them.

When you talk about the loans, if you want to end up going through the World Bank, we only have an 18 percent vote. Do we want France and Germany and Russia controlling where our dollars go? If you have a grant, it is going to be harder for them to ask us to forgive our loan. Instead, they will have to forgive their loans of billions of dollars. That also includes Kuwait. I think we need to give freedom a chance there.

And if you do not think that this does not affect our economy, I wanted to look at loans. I said, why can't Iraq, after they get reconstructed and stable, sell the United States oil at two bucks a barrel less? It sounded like a good idea. But I have heard many from the left talk about the only reason we went there was the oil, and you know that many of the Arabs feel that that is why we went there as well. But if you do take a look, if we have a steady flow of oil coming into the United States, look at the gas pumps today. When you talk about the low- and middle-income folks, how are they affected negatively with energy costs, getting in their cars? We saw the truckers that were here in this Capitol protesting because they were going out of business because of energy costs. By stabilizing that part of the world, when they do become solvent, we have got a steady flow of oil. And they are part of OPEC, but when OPEC starts messing around with the United States like they have in the past, I think we are going to have a loud voice in support of the United States, so I think it will affect our economy. I rise in support.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. Mr. Chairman, my remarks are directed to the staffers of all of those Members on the Democratic side of the aisle who have asked us for time on this bill. Our dilemma is we now have about 40 people on the list. Only two of them are in the Chamber. If they do not want to lose their time, I would suggest that some of them come to the Chamber now or they are going to lose their time forever.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am here to vote ''no'' on a blank check for Mr. Bush. This is only the latest funding request. We heard earlier it is going to take another $120 billion. They are already putting the figure out here. They are floating it. Nothing has changed. The same Secretary of War, the same Secretary of State, the same Security Council, the same plan, the same viceroy. It is all the same. The President is still going alone. And as he goes alone, he is excluding the Congress. But now he has put out a PR push, and he is saying if we just had some better stories, why, it would not look so bad over there.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by Maureen Dowd called ''Bewitched, Bothered, Billy-Goated'' and the article ''War Without End'' from The Guardian of October 13.

[From the New York Times, October 16, 2003]

BEWITCHED, BOTHERED, BILLY-GOATED

(By Maureen Dowd)

WASHINGTON—I'm not sure I should use the poor schlub's name. ESPN has used it, and The Chicago Sun-Times. but given all the Cubs fans who hurled beer and debris and bleeped epithets at the guy and screamed, ''Kill him!'' and, ''You can tell we're better than Boston or he'd be dead already!'' it might be as dangerous to print the name of the accursed 26-year-old who fouled up with that foul ball as it would be to print the name of a C.I.A. spy.

You had to feel sorry for the terrified persona-non-Cubbie when his own dad refused to confirm that he was related to him.

On the cusp of Halloween, we are possessed with curses, hexes and jinxes. Superstitions about a black cat, a billy goat, a bambino and now, a Cub fan's mano morto. It is also the season of the witch in politics. America's First Baseball Fans, the former and current Presidents Bush, have their own historical jinx with the land of Nebuchadnezzar: you might call it the curse of Nebuchabunkport.

As soon as the Bushes think they've got Iraq subdued, it flares up and foils them—turning victory sour and sending saintly poll numbers wobbly. Every time the Bushes think they've licked Saddam—who modeled himself on Nebuchadnezzar, the dictator who built palaces and stored arms in the Iraqi desert 2,600 years ago—he comes back to haunt them.

The president has tried to shake off the curse with a P.R. push to circumvent the national media and get smaller news outlets to do sunny stories about Iraq.

The P.R. campaign shamelessly included bogus cheerful form letters sent to newspapers, supposedly written by soldiers in Iraq. It also entailed sweetening up the official Web site of the United States Central Command. Until recently, the site offered a mix of upbeat stories and accounts of casualties and setbacks. Now it's a litany of smiley postings, like ''Soldiers host orphans in Mosul'' and ''Ninevah Province schools benefit from seized Iraqi assets.'' You have to go to a different page for casualty reports.

Mr. Bush said in interviews that he wanted to ''go over the heads of the filter and speak directly with the people'' because there was a ''sense that people in America aren't getting the truth.''

He is right that there has been a filter that has made it hard for Americans—and even Congress—to get the truth on Iraq, but it isn't the press. It's an administration that comically thinks when it hauls out Dick Cheney to say in his condescending high school principal voice that 2 + 2 = 5 we'll buy it.

The vice president hasn't come up with W.M.D., Osama or Saddam. But he says we have uncovered a video of Saddam letting two Doberman pinchers eat one of his generals alive because he didn't trust him. Oh, that's worth $87 billion, the Iraqi version of ''When Good Pets Go Bad.''

On Monday, Representative George Nethercutt Jr., a Republican from Washington State who visited Iraq, chimed in to help the White House: ''The story of what we've done in the postwar period is remarkable. It is a better and more important story than losing a couple of soldiers every day.'' The congressman puts the casual back in casualty.

It would be a lot easier to heed good news as well as bad if Bush officials hadn't assured us before we invaded Iraq that there would be no bad.

First they sold the war to trusting Americans with spin, and now they are trying to sell the occupation to skeptical Americans with more spin.

Greg Thielmann, the retired State Department official who was a top analyst for Colin Powell on Iraq's W.M.D., told ''60 Minutes II'' last night that Iraq had been so far from being an imminent threat that Mr. Powell's speech making that case at the U.N. was ''probably one of the low points in his long, distinguished service to the nation.''

The Bush team prepared the ground for American doubt; they told us to expect a fairy tale and now resent the fact that we refuse to treat it like one.

The fundamental problem for the Bush administration is that it is endlessly propounding a contradiction: Wanting us to worry that we are battling for our lives against the terrorists, and wanting us to stop worrying about the state of the battle.

Everything is wrong, and nothing is wrong. We are trapped in the Bush illogic. Call It our curse.

[From the Guardian, October 13, 2003]

WAR WITHOUT END; A CATALOGUE OF KILLINGS IN IRAQ

May 8, US soldier short dead by unknown assailant while directing traffic in Baghdad.

May 13, US soldier killed when convoy ambushed near Diwaniya.

May 26, vehicle hits landmine in Baghdad killing one soldier and injuring three.

May 26, soldier killed and another wounded as convoy comes under enemy fire near Haditha.

May 27, Two US soldiers killed and nine wounded in attack on army unit in Falluja. Two attackers killed, six captured.

May 29, US soldier killed travelling on supply route.

June 3, US soldier killed at checkpoint south of Balad.

June 5, US soldier killed and five injured in rocket-propelled grenade attack in Falluja.

June 7, US soldier killed and four injured in attack near Tikrit involving rocket-propelled grenade and small arms fire.

June 8, US soldier shot dead at checkpoint in al-Qaim, near Syrian border, by men who had approached vehicle asking for medical help. One assailant killed and one captured, but others escape.

June 10, US paratrooper killed and another injured in rocket-propelled grenade attack in south-west Baghdad. They were manning trash collection point when assailants got out of a van and opened fire. One attacker killed.

June 17, US soldier on patrol in Baghdad killed by sniper.

June 18, One US soldier dies and one wounded in drive-by shooting at petrol station in Baghdad.

June 19, US soldier killed and two injured in grenade attack on military ambulance in Al Iskandariya.

June 22, One US marine killed and eight other US service members injured in explosion that may have been caused by bomb dropped from B–52 Stratofortress that landed near forces at Godoria Range, along northern coast of Djibouti.

June 22, US soldier killed and another injured in grenade attack on military convoy south of Baghdad in Khan Azad.

June 24, Six British military personnel killed and eight wounded in two incidents in southern Iraq, both near town of Amara, 125 miles north-west of Basra.

June 26, U.S. soldier attached to 1st Marine Expeditionary Force killed in ambush near Najaf while investigating car theft.

June 26, One special operations force service member killed and eight injured in hostile fire incident in south-west Baghdad.

June 28, Two soldiers assigned to 3rd Battalion, 18th Field Artillery Regiment, deployed from Fort Sill, Oklahoma, reported missing three days earlier, found dead west of Al Taji.

June 30, Nine Iraqis, including imam, killed after explosion beside mosque in Falluja. U.S. later claim it was caused by a bomb-making class inside mosque.

July 2, U.S. Army 352nd Civil Affairs Command soldier dies of wounds received on previous day, after Baghdad convoy hit by explosive device.

July 3, Sniper kills U.S. soldier in Baghdad, while mortar attack on American military base to north-west injures at least 10.

July 3, U.S. marine killed and three others injured during mine-clearing operations in Kerbala, south of Baghdad.

July 5, Blast kills seven Iraqi police recruits at graduation ceremony in Ramadi, 60 miles west of Baghdad.

July 6, U.S. soldier from 1st Armored Division dies of gunshot wound, while guarding Baghdad University.

July 6, Soldier of 1st Armored Division dies after platoon patrolling Baghdad's Ad Hamiya neighbourhood ambushed by two Iraqi gunmen.

July 7, U.S. soldier killed when explosive device blasts vehicle during routine patrol in Kadhimya neighbourhood of Baghdad.

July 13, One person killed and another injured after bomb explodes near police station in Baghdad suburb.

July 14, U.S. military convoy attacked by rocket-propelled grenades and machine guns in Baghdad. One soldier killed and 10 others injured.

July 16, Bomb explodes near highway west of Baghdad killing U.S. soldier and injuring two others.

July 18, Bomb attack on U.S. convoy in Falluja kills soldier.

June 19, 1st Armored Division soldier dies after small arms and rocket-propelled grenade attack in Abu Ghureib neighbourhood of Baghdad.

July 20, Two U.S. soldiers killed during ambush by guerrillas firing funs and rocket-propelled grenades near northern city of Mosul.

July 21, Soldier of 1st Armored Division killed and three wounded after vehicle hits explosive device in As Sulaykh district of Baghdad.

July 22, U.S. soldier killed and another wounded when convoy hit by rocket-propelled grenade and small arms fire north-west of Baghdad.

July 23, Soldier of 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) killed and seven soldiers wounded when explosive device strikes two military vehicles outside Mosul.

July 23, Soldier of 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment killed and another soldier and contractor wounded when convoy attacked by explosive device on Highway 1 in Ar Ramadi.

July 24, Three U.S. soldiers from 101st Airborne Division killed in rifle and grenade attack while travelling to Qayarra West outside Mosul.

July 26, Three U.S. soldiers guarding Ba'qubah children's hospital killed and four others wounded in grenade attack.

July 26, One U.S. soldiers killed and two wounded when convoy attacked with small arms, rocket-propelled grenades and possibly an explosive device on Highway 10 near Abu Ghureib. Three Iraqis wounded.

July 27, U.S. soldier killed and another wounded when rocket-propelled grenade hits patrol in northern Babil province near village of Al Haswa.

July 28, Explosive device dropped from overpass on to U.S. convoy travelling

through Al Rashid district of Baghdad, killing soldier of 1st Armored Division and injuring three others.

July 30, Soldier of 4th Infantry Division killed and two wounded in small arms attack at tactical operation centre 26 miles east of Ba'qubah.

July 31, U.S. soldier killed and two wounded after vehicle hits landmine on road to Baghdad airport.

August 1, Soldier of 4th Infantry Division killed and three injured after rocket-propelled grenade attack on convoy south of Shumayt. In separate incident, soldier of 1st Armored Division dies of gunshot wound received previous day in Baghdad.

August 6, Two 1st Armored Division soldiers killed and one wounded in firefight in Al Rashid district of Baghdad.

August 7, At least 17 people killed and 60 wounded when truck bomb explodes outside Jordanian embassy compound in Baghdad. In separate incident, 82nd Airborne Division soldier shot dead on guard duty in Al Mansor district of Baghdad.

August 10, Soldier of 4th Infantry Division killed and two wounded in improvised explosive attack near police station in Tikrit.

August 12, U.S. soldier killed and two wounded in bomb attack in Sunni Muslim town of Ramadi, 60 miles west of Baghdad.

August 13, Bomb attack on four-vehicle convoy south-east of Tikrit kills U.S. soldier and wounds another. A further U.S. soldier killed when M–113 armored personnel carrier strikes explosive device near town of Ad Dwar.

August 14, Bomb blast hits military ambulance in Basra killing one British soldier and wounding two others.

August 16, Mortar attack on Abu Ghraib prison on outskirts of Baghdad kills six Iraqis and injures 59.

August 17, Danish soldier killed in gun battle between troops and group of looters in southern Iraq. Two Iraqis also die. Dane is first non-U.S. or British soldier to die in conflict.

August 18, Soldier of 1st U.S. Armored Division killed by explosive device in central Baghdad.

August 19, Twenty-two people killed, including Sergio Vieira de Mello, top UN envoy to Iraq, after truck bomb devastates UN headquarters in Baghdad in worst attack on UN civilian complex ever.

August 20, U.S. citizen working as interpreter killed and two U.S. soldiers wounded in small arms fire and rocket-propelled grenade attack in Tikrit. Soldiers of 1st Armored Division killed and two wounded by improvised explosive device in Karkah district of Baghdad.

August 21, U.S. marine shot dead in Al Hilla by unidentified gunman.

August 23, Three British servicemen killed and another wounded in Basra.

August 26, Soldier of 3rd Corps Support Command killed and two wounded after convoy blasted by explosive device near town of Hamariya.

August 27, Soldier of 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment soldier killed and three wounded by explosive device on Falluja. 205th Military Intelligence Brigade soldier killed in attack on military convoy in Baghdad.

August 28, British soldier killed and another wounded during attack by a crowd of Iraqis armed with rocket-propelled grenades and small arms in Ali al-Sharqi, 120 miles northwest of Basra.

August 29, Car bomb at Imam Ali mosque in Najaf kills at least 83 people, including top Shi'ite Muslim leader, Ayatollah Mohammed Baqer al-Hakim, and wounds around 175. In separate rocket-propelled grenade and small arms fire attack just north of As Suaydat soldier of 4th Infantry Division killed and three wounded.

August 31, Two U.S. soldiers killed and one wounded in firefight five miles northeast of Shkin in Paktika province.

September 1, Two 220th Military Police Brigade soldiers killed and one wounded when vehicle strikes explosive device along main supply route south of Baghdad.

September 2, Car bomb blasts Rasafa police headquarters in east Baghdad, killing one and wounding 15.

September 3, Suicide bombing in town of Ramadi kills Iraqi civilian and injures two U.S. soldiers.

September 9, Car bomb kills one Iraqi and wounds 53, including six American military personnel, in Arbil, northern Iraq. In a separate incident, U.S. soldier killed and another wounded after vehicle hits improvised explosive device on supply route northeast of Baghdad.

September 10, Explosive device kills soldier in 1st Armored Division in Baghdad.

September 12, Two U.S. soldiers killed and seven wounded during pre-dawn raid in Ramadi, 60 miles west of Baghdad.

September 14, U.S. soldier killed and three wounded as convoy runs over bomb planted on road in Falluja.

September 15, U.S. soldier on patrol in Baghdad killed in rocket-propelled grenade attack.

September 18, Iraqi guerrillas kill three and wound two U.S. soldiers inspecting suspected weapons site near Tikrit.

September 20, Two U.S. soldiers die and 13 are injured in mortar attack on U.S.-run Abu Ghreib prison complex. Elsewhere, U.S. soldier killed by roadside bomb near Ramadi.

September 22, Suicide bomber at car park next to U.N. headquarters in Baghdad kills Iraqi security guard.

September 24, Bomb apparently aimed at U.S. troops tears two buses in Baghdad, killing an Iraqi and wounding about 20. Elsewhere, several injured after bomb blast in cinema in Mosul.

September 25, Bomb explodes at Baghdad's Aike hotel housing journalists from U.S. television network NBC, killing a Somali guard. Separately, a rocket-propelled grenade attack kills U.S. soldier and wounds two others in Kirkuk.

September 29, U.S. soldier killed in bomb and gunfire attack in town of Habbaniya, about 42 miles from Baghdad.

October 1, Bomb blast near U.S. military base in Tikrit kills woman soldier and wounds three others. Elsewhere, U.S. soldier killed in rocket-propelled grenade attack near town of Samarra, north of Baghdad.

October 4, Rocket-propelled grenade and gun attack on American patrol in Baghdad kills one U.S. soldier and wounds another.

October 6, U.S. soldier killed and another wounded by bomb attack west of Baghdad. Separately, two more U.S. soldiers and Iraqi interpreter killed and two U.S. soldiers wounded in bomb blast south of Baghdad.

October 7, No casualties after blast hits compound of Iraqi Foreign Ministry in Baghdad.

October 9, Two suicide bombers kill eight Iraqis at police station in Shi'ite Muslim district of Sadr City, northeast Baghdad. In same area two U.S. soldiers killed and four wounded in ambush. Another U.S. soldier killed in separate rocket-propelled grenade attack on military convoy northeast of Iraqi capital.

October 12, At least six people killed in blast outside Baghdad Hotel in city centre.

On the article by Ms. Dowd, a Member from my State is quoted as saying, ''The story of what we've done in the postwar period is remarkable. It is a better and more important story than losing a couple of soldiers every day.'' The article from The Guardian is five pages of the names of people who continue to die in this foolish process. The premise was wrong of this war. The tactics were wrong in this war. The urgency was wrong in this war. The reasons given on the floor of this House for doing it were not correct. And now the President says, throw some more good money after bad. The answer from my district is ''no,'' and it ought to be from the entire Congress, until we have some changes in this whole plan and we have some explanation for what he did with the last amount.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as I was listening to the debate on the other side in support of this $87 billion throwaway, I was reminded of a fact that a head of household would have wife and children and probably a grandmother in need of prescription drugs, but instead they would take all of their earnings and give it to their mistress. In this particular situation, it seems as though we have some mistress out there that we are going to support and not support our own family. When you travel back and forth by air, you hear the speaker come on and the lady tells you that in the event of a problem, to be sure you secure yourself and then if you have any opportunity, secure others.

I have no doubt that this bill will pass, Mr. Chairman, but I am concerned about what happens to our troops. This bill, on its face, is purportedly supporting our troops when, in fact, we sent thousands of troops into Iraq unprepared, unguarded, without the proper equipment, without bullet vests, without food, without weapons that they needed. We just rushed and went to Iraq for whatever reason which still remains a mystery to me. The $87 billion in my opinion does not have any accountability or responsibility. What happened to the money that the Bush administration has already expended? Where is the report on that? We ask those with earned income tax credit to be audited. Why can we not audit these people who want to spend more money for this conflict that I could not understand why we initiated in the first place? $87 billion is going to cost my State $1.4 billion. It is going to cost us $246.3 million for local and State roads and bridges which would have created 6,672 new jobs, 5,955 new firefighters, and health care coverage for 88,000 people.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, sometimes great nations are called on to assume great responsibilities. As the greatest Nation on earth and as the target of fundamentalist terror on 9/11, we have been obliged to assume the mantle of leadership in a global war on terrorism. That conflict for better or

for worse has brought us and brought our allies to Iraq and Afghanistan. We now have a fundamental obligation to support the aspiration of those peoples for a free society and a free economy. Unfortunately, the regimes that have been removed in both countries have left their people in such a wretched position that it requires an active intervention by the U.S. to restore their economic potential. It is our responsibility to help these peoples as much as we helped western Europe after World War II in the hope that they will join us eventually in the community of free nations.

The part of this appropriation measure that I wish to speak to is not the one dealing with military expenditures. There are many of my colleagues who are better equipped, better qualified, to speak to that. Today I rise in support of the social investments and economic assistance which we are offering Iraq and Afghanistan, $20 billion for two countries devastated by decades of dictatorship.

This appropriation finances the improvement of water resources and sanitation, including drinking water for millions of Iraqis. This appropriation measure would allow Iraq to restore much of their budget for the critical transportation infrastructure destroyed by the war and allowed to deteriorate by a rogue regime. This measure would provide for critical investments in civil society necessary to allow Iraqis to restore order. It would also rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure and put its oil economy back on course.

And, for the record, America did not go to Iraq for oil, but Iraq's vast oil reserves are key to its economic resurrection and a keystone to stability in the region. If these countries are to become bulwarks of freedom, resistant to the influence of Islamic fundamentalism, we need to give the peoples of Iraq and Afghanistan the tools they need to put themselves on a sound footing. Iraq, in particular, has been devastated by decades of dictatorship and U.N. sanctions.

Frankly, I would have preferred to be in a position of being a lender, extending to Iraq credits rather than direct loans in order to allow the use of their natural economic strengths and huge mineral resources to put themselves on a sound footing. Yet, so large are the dictator's debts against the limited revenues available, I believe what Iraq needs now is direct assistance, not the weight of additional IOUs. I hope that our allies will see their way to write down those Iraqi debts that they hold. Until then, we have to accept the obligation that springs from being a great Nation, a good neighbor and a global defender of freedom to support a prostrate people to give them an opportunity to revive their nation's fortunes.

This vote will be one of the most important that I ever cast. It certainly is going to be among the most controversial. But if America is to truly lead by example, adhere to its principles and to assume the responsibility that comes with national greatness and national interests in every corner of the world, then we must make this contribution now for their sake, for ours, and for the sake of future generations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the supplemental, and I voted for the Defense appropriations and the Defense authorization. My support for the troops is well-documented, and I have shown that I support them. But I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that this administration misinformed the American people and misinformed this Congress for the reasons to go to Iraq. Weapons of mass destruction, the nuclear plan, the chemicals, the biological, we have yet to see any of that. Yet, he continues to tell us a story that is not true. This administration miscalculated what we would do in Iraq. He said that we would be seen as liberators and, in fact, to date, Mr. Chairman, they see us as invaders. I believe that this administration and the policy it has towards Iraq and its construction is misguided. The plan right now, if there is a plan, is not working. The ghosts of Vietnam are around this Congress and this city. For those that talk about the loans, I just want to remind them that we forced the Arabian states, we forced Russia, France and England to give loans to the regime when they were in a battle with Iran.

□ 1315

It was because of our encouragement that this debt is carried by Iraq today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. And certainly I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) as this most important investment in Iraq worked its way through the full Committee on Appropriations. Our committee scrubbed this bill down and reduced it, streamlined it, built in much more accountability; and I think collectively Republicans and Democrats came together to do an important work to bring this bill to the floor, and I certainly rise in support of making this necessary investment.

I also want to say over the last 3 weeks it has been an interesting experience for me because I began to ask questions and look at ways to propose an amendment to make a portion of this investment, this reconstruction investment, a loan as opposed to a grant. That is a long story that I will not try to go back through except to say that when I met last week face to face with the President of the United States about whether this investment in Iraq should be a loan or a grant and he explained to me that negotiations were under way, I have to say that today at the United Nations with the resolution that our country achieved, what he told us last week is coming true, and that is support is building among other nations for making this necessary investment and for liberating on a permanent basis an Arab country.

And Iraq is a true test for freedom and opportunity for our allies and this great Nation, and I just want to come to the floor today to say, while I had differences of opinion about how to go about it, we need to come together as a Nation, as a people, and as a Congress on the fact that we must succeed in Iraq. At this point we have no choice but to go forward and finish what we have started. We cannot afford to fail; and the world must see us in a bold, successful move at this point in the history of the world to open up freedom in the Arab world, and what better place to do it than where tyranny and oppression were rampant.

Years ago I was a Member of this body and came to the floor with concerns about President Clinton's efforts in Eastern Europe, but I have also said in recent weeks that I was wrong and that that investment that our country made in resources and danger and peril for our troops to remove a genocidal murderer named Slobodan Milosevic was a very successful and necessary effort to promote freedom and better secure our country and so is this mission in Iraq, and we must not flinch.

We must invest the full amount. While I would love to see a portion of this made into a loan and I made my case and presented that argument; at the end of the day, those leaders in the executive branch in negotiations with the G–7 nations, our allies, others in the region from the Saudis to the Kuwaitis to the Qatars, they are talking about ways to write down this so-called debt; I call it bankruptcy debt. That debt that Saddam Hussein built up should not be payable, and I believe that the pressure is mounting for Germany and France and Russia and others to write that debt down dramatically. Ambassador Bremer told me that that is the goal, to have that debt written down or written off. And I do not want the U.S. taxpayer to invest a dime that might go to those other countries; and we built in conditions in this bill that would not allow that to happen.

But at the end of the day the bottom line, after we weigh in and have this debate and make our case and stand our ground and carry out our constitutional responsibility, is we need to do this. Whether one supported it from

the start or not, here is where we are today, and we have got to finish what we started and make the necessary investments. We cannot afford not to, and freedom comes with a huge price. For some brave Americans it is the loss of life, it is their limbs, it is going into harm's way on our behalf. For taxpayers, it is investments. We thank everyone for these investments; but the cost of freedom is high, very high today, but we cannot afford not to do it or invest it. We must finish what we started, and we must preserve our country with some preemptive action on the other end of the world. And I see it that way. I see Saddam Hussein as a threat, and terrorism is looking for a place to take root; and we cannot let it take root. We took decisive action, and now we have got to win the peace. And it is expensive, but we do not have any choice but to do this. And I hope everybody comes together to make this necessary investment.

We are all Americans, and we are at the waterfront. Democrats and Republicans, we are all patriots and we are standing with our country. Make one's case. At end of the day, support this necessary investment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I represent San Diego, California, a place from which thousands and thousands of our troops have been sent to the war in Iraq. My constituents' families are personally involved in this effort every day, and I say to them that those who are going to vote against this blank check for the President are thinking about their brave sons and daughters. It is we who are thinking about their safety.

This administration, with $79 billion that we gave them, cannot equip our troops with the body armor they need to survive. We have killed dozens of soldiers. We have maimed dozens of them because they did not have that body armor. What kind of an administration would do that and then say they support the troops? We have no accountability for what they did before. We have no accountability for this $87 billion that they are asking us to give them now. This is not what a legislative branch's duty is. A legislative branch is to exert co-equal control, co-equal influence with the executive branch; and the only way we can do that is through the purse strings.

The gentleman before me said we have to keep going with what we are doing. Even if it is wrong, even if we have thrown in so much money, even if we have no plan to get out, let us keep going. I heard those arguments with Vietnam, and we were in a quagmire then. We are in an ''Iraqmire'' now. And we need to turn those troops' responsibilities over to an international body. We need to make sure that our troops come home alive. We are going to have the accountability that this body deserves only if we vote ''no'' on this matter. And I say to my friends, to my families in San Diego, it is time to turn this matter over to the United Nations. It is time that we internationalize this force. It is time that we bring our troops home; and we can spend that $87 billion on education, on health, on our veterans here at home. Vote ''no'' on the supplemental.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I announce to the gentleman who just spoke that the United Nations has now voted unanimously to agree to the resolution offered by the United States of America on the issue of Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this $87 billion is a little bit steep for my wallet, and it is a little bit steep for probably the wallets of most Americans. So I will be voting against it.

But I understand this is called a supplemental. It is interesting that it is a supplemental because we have not passed a budget; so I have to suggest maybe we ought to call this a preemptive budget rather than a supplemental. But it is the largest, and to have it before the regular budget is pretty astounding that we are going to spend this type of money.

But I want to take this minute I have to quote from a book, ''A World Transformed,'' and this was written about 5 years ago talking about Iraq. And I think this is a very serious quote and something worth listening to:

''Trying to eliminate Saddam Hussein . . . 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 available '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 world. Going in and occupying Iraq, thus unilaterally exceeding the United Nations' mandate, would have destroyed the precedent of international response to aggression that we hoped to establish. Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land.''

That was written 5 years ago, very perceptive. It was written by President Bush, Sr. So I think we are here now in a very hostile land with a very difficult situation.

I was a strong opponent of the war for two reasons: one, I sincerely believed our national security was not threatened, and I also was convinced that it had no relationship to 9–11; and I think those two concerns have been proven to be correct. Many who had voted against the war now suggest that they might vote for this appropriation because they feel it is necessary to vote to support the troops. I think that is a red herring argument because if we take a poll, and there have been some recent polls of the troops in Iraq, we find out that probably all of them would love to come home next week. So I do not see how a vote against this appropriation can be construed. As a matter of fact, that is challenging the motivation of those of us who will oppose the legislation, that we do not support the troops. So I am in support of voting against this appropriation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that all of us know is one and one equals two, and I think a very good question for all of us to ask is why are the two parts of this supplemental one part? Why are the military and the reconstruction parts of this bill together?

Let me give the Members the answer, which is not very complicated: one and one plus two, is that if they were separate, the supplemental part dealing with reconstruction would fail. Every Member knows that. Why would it fail? Because my Republican colleagues would vote against it and it would fail. So they have leveraged to put the two things together and said if we vote against the bill, we are against the troops. That is not why this bill is in one bill. The reason it is in one bill is because if the two things were separate, the reconstruction effort would fail.

Let me tell the Members why it would fail. Because it is crazy. Because it is crazy. Because it is indefensible from policy grounds to have American taxpayers, literally American taxpayers, pay for the reconstruction of a country, 27 million people, that has trillions, trillions of dollars in oil reserves, the second largest oil reserves in the world. At the same time, this country, Iraq, is part of OPEC today, will be part of OPEC when the middle class, lower class people in America take their hard-earned tax dollars and their hard-earned wages taxed by the monopoly power of OPEC, which is exactly what Iraq is going to do, some of that monopoly tax, hundreds of billions of dollars of taxes that we are paying as Americans, see some of that money going to terrorists. Some of that money is going to terrorists; and the terrorists, in fact, are trying to kill us. Vote down the whole amendment, and let us send it back as separate bills.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I do rise in support of the emergency spending measure that we have before

us, and I do thank the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman for their great work on this.

I appreciate the scrutiny of the reconstruction request to fund the priority projects to continue the development of a stable and self-sufficient Iraq and to eliminate those which may not be necessary. The sooner we accomplish this, the sooner our brave troops can return home.

A few days ago, several of my colleagues and I returned from a trip to Iraq where we gained firsthand knowledge of the challenges we face and the responsibilities we have. While there, we met with many American servicemen and -women representing us in Iraq.

□ 1330

I felt their passion for the mission at hand and the pride they felt for making a difference in the lives of Iraqis. I met military men and women from Delaware who described building schools, developing access to water and electricity and talking with Iraqis who are discovering, for the first time, the opportunities that only come from being free.

This trip also exposed me to the pain of this conflict, the senseless loss of life. While we were there, three U.S. servicemen were attacked and killed. Our troops in Iraq face serious danger every second of every day, but they remain committed to establishing a stable Iraq so we are not forced to send a future generation to deal with another Saddam Hussein.

We can all agree that we want our troops home safe and as soon as possible. I believe the best way to do that is by sending them the funding necessary to hand Iraq over to a democratically-elected body that represents a thriving, multiethnic, self-sufficient nation.

To prevent future vulnerability to terrorist attacks, the international community must be united. I have a great deal of pride in the leadership the United States currently provides in our stand against terror, but I support an immediate increase of involvement by the United Nations on the ground in Iraq and feel their leadership has long been overdue. The resolution just passed by the Security Council was altered in good faith for Russia, France and U.N. Secretary Annan, to include a loose time line for Iraqi sovereignty.

A time line should be a goal, but real progress in Iraq depends on the drafting of an Iraqi constitution, free and fair elections and the establishment of an elected governing body. Access to water and electricity, police protection, judicial accountability, secured borders, an internationally recognized monetary system, viable economic structure and making sure Iraqis are getting paid for the work they are doing are all necessities for moving forward and continue to be priorities for the Americans in Iraq.

In response to amendments attempting to shift grants to loans, I share their concern for our growing deficit. The fact is that we are the leaders of the governing body in Iraq. There is no government structure to guarantee repayment. Next week at the International Donors Conference in Spain, we will call upon France and Russia to forgive tens of billions of dollars in debt, request billions in aid and ask that other nations send their soldiers to join ours.

I believe that all of us would prefer that the United States focus our attention wholly on our domestic priorities, but we do not have that luxury. Our responsibility is to make our world safer for generations to come and finish the job we started.

I would encourage all of us to support the supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today we consider providing additional funding for military and reconstruction activities. I am frustrated that we are paying for this request through increased deficit spending, without even considering the options of international loans 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 responsibility to follow through on our international commitments.

We must not forget the majority of this bill's funding goes toward ensuring the safety and success of our troops, and they should have all the resources they need to get the job done. Last week, I visited Walter Reed Medical Center and spoke with soldiers whose injuries might have been prevented if they had been driving the armored vehicles funded in this bill.

With regard to the reconstruction component, I am pleased that some of the more controversial requests have been deemed unworthy of emergency funding. The remaining items will improve the safety and self-sufficiency of the Iraqi people.

Unfortunately, in meeting our commitments, we will add $87 billion to an already historic deficit, which translates into larger interest payments on the national debt and less funding for important domestic priorities.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents are fully aware of the impact on our budget. The costs of this package fall unfairly on the American taxpayers, and we must rectify this problem. I know that some of my colleagues share my reservations, and I look forward to the upcoming amendment process as an opportunity to address some of these concerns.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

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

Mr. Chairman, my trip to Iraq last week convinced me of the need to support this bill, to provide to our troops with the tools and protection they need to do their job. In addition, I am convinced if we do not adopt this bill, Iraq will descend into chaos and ultimately violence.

However, while I support the bill, I want to take the opportunity to urge President Bush to abandon the unilateral approach we have taken over the last few months in Iraq and begin to share more of the burden with our allies. For months, Democrats and Republicans in Congress have been urging the President to do exactly that.

In my trip to Iraq, I was remarkably struck by the resistance in the office of the CPA, the authority running Iraq, to bring our allies in. The stakes are too high, the challenges are too great, for us to try to do this by ourselves. We need to bring in allies, particularly from some of the Muslim countries, to help our soldiers work on a side-by-side basis.

I understand we have had a coalition in Iraq. That includes our good friends, the Canadians. How many troops do the Canadians have in Iraq? One troop. We need to get beyond symbolism. We need people on the ground that speak Arabic, that are equipped to work side-by-side with our soldiers.

The CPA, the Coalition Provisional Authority, is overwhelmed. I talked to soldiers who told me they have been counting on the Iraqi people to help them deal with the threats they face every day. They cannot even communicate with them, so few of our soldiers speak Arabic, so few of the Iraqis speak English.

Many of our troops are involved in jobs they were not trained to do. We have troops that are being policemen, that are training police. We need to call upon allies like the Germans and the Italians to train our police.

We are not in Iraq to do business. We are in Iraq to help the Iraqi people take control of their country. We need to bring our allies in to help us succeed in this monumental task.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

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

Mr. Chairman, there is a glaring omission in this emergency bill. We have once again neglected to provide resources for our veterans. I sought to add an amendment of $1.8 billion from the Iraqi Relief and Reconstruction Fund to the Veterans Health Administration.

Today, as we move forward, each day over 10 to 11 people come in that have been injured in Iraq, over 1,500 to this day. We need to make sure that we have additional resources for our veterans. That $1.8 billion does not begin to even address additional programs. It is to make sure we keep existing services as it is.

This administration has chosen to come forward and disallow Priority 7

and Priority 8 veterans. Now, they have also come forward with a lot of fuzzy math when they came with a proposal for $3 billion for veterans, when that $3 billion consisted of $1.8 billion from copayments of veterans alone, and an additional $1.2 billion when there were copayments from prescription drug payments from themselves. The other was supposed to be efficiencies.

The money is not there. There is a need for us to concentrate and provide resources for our veterans.

Let me also add that the previous time that we dished money for Iraq, a little bit over $79 billion that has gone out for the war on terrorism, there was $2 billion in there for health care for Iraqis. Well, I am only asking for $1.8 billion for our own veterans right here. As they come home, and as we have over 1,500 that have been identified as needing services, we need to be there for them. I ask that we take that into consideration.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor for me to be here today on the bipartisan effort to support the President on the supplemental. I was particularly pleased to hear a moment ago the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS). He and I are both graduates of Washington and Lee University, so we have a kinship there, and I am delighted to hear of his support for the supplemental.

Today is a significant day with the support that has been received on the international stage. We began this morning hearing that Japan is going to contribute $1.5 billion, up to $5 billion, for the reconstruction and redevelopment of Iraq. We also had today the unanimous vote of the U.N. Security Council to support the proposals that the United States put forward today to bring order to Iraq and protect the American people.

Additionally, I had the opportunity today to be present with the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), meeting for the first time in history with Speaker Ognyan Gerdjikov, the Speaker of the Bulgarian National Assembly. He, of course, indicated, as their government has done on the Security Council and by providing troops to Iraq, that Bulgaria is standing very strong with its ally, the United States.

I had the opportunity 3 weeks ago to visit with General David Petraeus and with General Ricardo Sanchez in Iraq. I saw the progress being made.

Another indication of progress was in the New York Times today, and that is that the currency of Iraq is being exchanged. It began yesterday. This is a 90-day proposal or project to turn in the currency which has the dictator's face on it, Saddam Hussein. Yesterday, on the very first day, nearly one-third of all the currency in Iraq was turned in. This is an extraordinary indication of progress, support by the people of Iraq, for the changes that are needed to be made.

Just as after World War II, we helped reconstruct Germany so it would not be a breeding ground for communists, we can now have a reconstruction of Iraq so it is not a breeding ground for terrorism. We defeated communism. I believe in the war on terrorism, with our wonderful troops, with our President, that we can make progress today supporting the supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I say to the chairman, ranking member, men of good conscience, everyone is of good conscience, I believe, on this floor, but Iraq is too important to pull up our stakes now.

We saw in Somalia, with the withdrawal of the United States, it soon reverted to its precolonial past consisting of a mosaic of independent clans with different laws and rulers, each with its own militia.

We pulled out of Afghanistan in 1989, we pulled out of Iraq in 1991, and what happened? I imagine that somewhere right now, Mr. Chairman, former Presidential economic adviser, Larry Lindsey, is enjoying the resurgence of his reputation. After he predicted that we would have to spend $100 billion to $200 billion in Iraq, on September 15, 2002 he made that statement, he was dismissed from the White House.

If this latest supplemental is enacted, the United States will have spent close to $157 billion on military operations. Excluding that one moment of candor from Mr. Lindsey, this is indeed a far cry from the talking points. And this is more than talking points, these are faces of American soldiers. Every other administration official presented to Congress these talking points, these scripts, these spins, and to the American people, before we even went to Iraq.

Iraq is important, Mr. Chairman. The attitude of the administration must change regardless of how this vote comes out today. It must be more transparent, it must be more open, and it must allow for debate, instead of moving to secrecy. Let us not forget Somalia in our vote today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not vote for the original war resolution. I thought it was ill-advised to delegate to the President authority that the Congress had, and I thought it was ill-advised for the President to proceed to war without world support and support from the U.N. in the absence of an imminent threat to the United States.

I had some reservations, because people were saying that there was an imminent threat. The President was saying that. But I did not think we should rush into this war in the first place. I have seen nothing since then to change my mind about that.

I think we were ill-advised to proceed to this war in a hasty fashion without the support of the U.N., and I think our policies continue to be flawed to stay there and to pursue this war without world support.

The only reason that I have vexed about this vote is that our soldiers are there, and they are in harm's way. But I think to support this resolution would be to sanction the flawed policies of this administration. Consequently, my intention is to vote no on this proposed appropriation.

□ 1345

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform who has done considerable work on the need for accountability in contracting on this issue.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Bush administration has made it impossible for me and others to do what we would otherwise want to do. Under normal circumstances, I would support the President's request for $87 billion in additional spending for Iraq and Afghanistan, but I cannot do that today. The Bush administration's Iraq policy has been grounded in secrecy, deceit, and politics. Some suspected that a year ago. I refused to believe it. But now, it is inescapable.

The intolerable reality is that they blatantly twisted intelligence information to fit preconceived policies. They lied to promote public relations, from the Jessica Lynch ordeal to the President's campaign landing on the USS *Abraham Lincoln* and on what the war would cost our country. And through all of it, they have refused to answer questions, provide honest information, and accept any oversight or accountability for their actions. It is an abysmal and, at times, inexcusable record.

I voted for the Iraq resolution last year. I relied on the President's representations about the imminent threat Iraq posed to the United States. And I relied on the statements that other senior administration officials, including the Vice President, made regarding Iraq's nuclear capability. I will not make that same mistake again. They have squandered their credibility and the normal deference we give to any administration, Democratic or Republican.

I say all of this knowing full well we must finish what we started in Iraq. I feel that as strongly as any member of the House. And as one who voted for the resolution, I feel a responsibility to make sure we honor the sacrifice so many have already made by achieving a democratic and safe Iraq. And I feel a special obligation to our troops to make sure they have everything they need to be as safe and effective as possible. But before I agree to the President's request, I want to be confident

that those running the war are doing their job and that the reconstruction effort is effective, not wasteful, spending.

Some say the easy political vote is to support the President's request and defend it by saying we are supporting the troops. But if we really want to support the troops, we will first make sure that the people running the war know what they are doing. No American soldier should die because of mistakes up the line.

This administration must put aside its stubbornness and make the world community a serious and active part of this process. Then we could vote for the President's request in good conscience.

Mr. Chairman, the Bush administration has made a series of terrible mistakes in formulating its Iraq policy. But even in the face of those mistakes, the administration insists on going it alone. No help from other countries. No oversight by the Congress. No accountability to the American people. That will never change if we give them an automatic ''yes'' vote on today's bill. Instead, voting ''yes'' will encourage them to continue the policies that do not work and tactics that deserve condemnation. Our troops deserve better than that. We should oppose the President's request until this administration demonstrates that it puts our troops before politics and honesty before pride.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), a ranking member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I returned from Iraq last night, and every American can be very proud of the work that our men and women in uniform are doing there for our country. The sacrifice they are making and the danger they face demand that we provide them with the best in equipment, supplies, and quality of life that we possibly can as they continue the effort to bring stability to Iraq.

I commend our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for the efforts he has made to move more of the $87 billion to protect our troops. Irrespective of one's views about the wisdom of preemptive action against Saddam Hussein and concerns about the intelligence analysis upon which that action was based, we are now confronted as a Nation with a challenge and a responsibility where failure is not an option. The future of Iraq and the success there will depend upon the willingness that we have to stay the course. This will require sacrifice on the part of the American people, and I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for calling upon the top 1 percent of Americans measured by income to share in the sacrifice being made by our troops in Iraq.

The future stability of the region demands stability in Iraq. I found the Iraqi people to be capable, intelligent, and determined to provide a better way of life for their people. And in the eyes of Iraqi teachers, in the eyes of the Iraqi policemen and firefighters that we are training, and in the eyes of members of the Iraqi governing council, I found hope. We have assumed a stake in the success of their future, and we must not fail; and I hope that we will be joined by others in the world community in assisting us in achieving success in Iraq.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me this time and for his willingness to engage in this colloquy regarding an issue of tremendous importance. I am concerned, as are many of our colleagues, about the out-of-pocket costs to U.S. soldiers participating in the Rest and Recuperation program for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

As my colleague from Florida knows, soldiers granted leave through the R&R program are flown by the Department of Defense to Baltimore, Washington International Airport for a 2-week leave from arduous duties on the front lines of freedom. The Pentagon restarted the R&R program, which had been dormant since Vietnam, to boost morale of soldiers who are being deployed for over a year. Once soldiers arrive at BWI, it is up to them to pay for the rest of their travel costs to see their families. Often, airlines have provided discounted rates, but some soldiers have reported paying in excess of $1,000. Now, we should not be causing an additional burden on soldiers or their families during this comparatively short stay in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate adopted an amendment during floor consideration offered by Mr. COLEMAN of Minnesota to alleviate this burden on our Armed Forces. Several Members of this House, including myself, have introduced legislation to correct this issue. I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he would consider supporting the Senate provision in the conference committee.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the gentleman from Arizona that I understand the importance of this issue. At a time when we are spending nearly $90 billion to support the mission of our Nation and our troops, we should be willing to ease the strain on our soldiers and their families.

The gentleman from Arizona is a cosponsor of a bill, H.R. 2998, that I introduced to help ease the financial burden on returning troops and, in this case, troops who are charged a subsistence fee for their stay in military hospitals. So I am supportive of the gentleman's goal.

I would also like to mention that the Department of Defense has plans to expand the R&R program to include airports beyond BWI, which should help some. Airports in Los Angeles, Atlanta, and Dallas-Fort Worth should become part of the program before the end of the year.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I agree that it is an issue of great importance, and I can give the gentleman assurance that the Senate provision will be given every consideration by this chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

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

Today we are debating the administration's request for an $87 billion bailout occasioned by its failed planning, or rather, its failure to plan, its lack of planning for postwar Iraq. We are asked to pass this $87 billion bailout despite the fact that the Bush administration has not yet articulated a coherent or workable underlying strategy to accomplish our mission and to bring our troops home safely and soon. It is either unwilling or incapable of doing so.

The only way this Congress can ensure for the American people that such a strategy exists and that it has a reasonable chance of success is by using its power of the purse. We are dealing with an administration that has already had over $400 billion in its Department of Defense budget, and it has already received one supplemental appropriation of $63 billion. Yet it fails to explain how and why our forces had tens of thousands of men and women unprotected with the proper Kevlar breast plates, Humvees without proper armor, and rancid water for 80 percent of the troops, or how those conditions continued, even after they knew in June that people were dying and being injured.

In addition, the administration, in its zeal to get all of the money now so it will not have to come back in 2004's election year to report to the American people, insinuates that a vote against this bailout is a vote against our troops and a vote to cut and run. Nothing could be further from the truth. The administration's own figures show that this is just another dissembling of the facts. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the Pentagon can stay in Iraq another 6 months without an additional penny in funds. But we have been prevented from seeking accountability from this administration as it asserts a need for emergency funds.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has a moral and practical responsibility to modify and condition these funds, and it is time to reject this rubber stamp

blank check and insist on an alternative that the Democrats want to put forward, but the majority and the administration have prohibited it from seeing the light of day.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who can speak in this Chamber, even though, unfortunately, she is not allowed to vote.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. The President himself woke up the American people with his September 7, $87 billion sticker-shock speech. People have already voted. Choose the poll: 59 percent in one, 66 percent in another. The vote is ''no.''

The reason is the President failed to seize the issue, the one issue that could have changed people's minds, that is paying for the war with a tax cut from the top 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans. Instead, he persists in making sacrifice a one-way street, sacrifice for the troops, while the rest of us remain untouched. The President has really touched the American people this time, though, with his $87 billion request. Having almost wrecked the economy with a crippling deficit, this $87 billion will prove our economic denouement.

First, the wreck of our relations with the very allies necessary for our own protection in the war against terrorism. Then, the wreck of the volunteer Army, particularly the loss of many of our weekend warriors from the National Guard and Reserve who never signed up for an indefinite duty in a preemptive war. Every amendment before this body must be paid for except this one.

Mr. Chairman, if we approve this request, the final wreck will be the appropriation power meant to check Presidential power. Our appropriation responsibility in time of war, never a tiger, will become a pussy cat that delivers to the cat in the White House, even without getting its proverbial cup of milk.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

I rise today to join every Member of this Chamber in supporting the American men and women serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the globe. We are indebted to their service, to their courage, to what they do to preserve the American Dream and freedom.

However, let us not confuse support for our troops with support for any half-baked plan, or lack of a plan, for securing our troops and rebuilding Iraq. Let us not fool ourselves into believing that our shared patriotism somehow absolves us, Members of Congress, from the responsibility to stand up and criticize a flawed policy.

On September 7, President Bush addressed the Nation and called upon this body to pass $87 billion in supplemental appropriations. Within minutes after the President's address and every day since, my constituents have been telling me that they are alarmed by this request. Some tell me that $1,000 per family is a lot of money when they think the President is just throwing money at a problem without having a plan to fix it. Some tell me that we should be spending the money to address obligations here at home, like paying for the adequate health care for our veterans from previous wars, as well as the veterans from this war.

Others tell me that the President should not ask Congress for more money until he secures more international support, or that we should not have to bear the cost alone. Some tell me that when the government is borrowing money to give tax cuts to the wealthy, we should not be borrowing this $87 billion from our children.

□ 1400

And like my constituents, I have all of these reservations and more.

I had hoped the President would send Congress a detailed, long-term plan for the reconstruction of Iraq. I had hoped the President would come with a plan for help from our allies. He has failed to do that.

I would support the Obey substitute if it were allowed, but without significant changes, I cannot support the President's request at this time.

I had hoped that by now the President would have secured the significant financial support of our allies. I had hoped that by now thousands of our men and women serving in Iraq would see international troops coming to relieve them so that some of them might return home.

Instead, the President has sent his request to Congress before developing a clear plan for reconstruction. He has sent his request before he has secured hardly any international financial support. And he has sent his request before he has convinced our allies to provide multinational forces to internationalize the troop presence in Iraq. In effect, he is asking the American people to subsidize his failed diplomacy and poor post-war planning.

Nevertheless, a Member of Congress should not vote no on this request out of spite. I believe that Congress can and should pass a supplemental bill that will adequately support our troops in Iraq. The President has committed us to helping to stabilize and rebuild Iraq and we must live up to that commitment. However, we cannot blindly approve whatever the President requests, especially when his request is not well thought-out and when it includes wasteful spending.

There are two parts to this $87 billion request. About two-thirds is to support military operations and our troops, while the other third is for reconstruction. There are serious problems with both. First, the military portion gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to reprogram almost $40 billion. In other words, the President is so unsure of what programs need support that he has given the Secretary the power to change how $40 billion worth of this bill will be spent. Forty billion dollars is a large petty cash fund. Why don't we just write the Secretary a personal check and send him on his way?

There are problems with the reconstruction portion of the bill, too. Imagine; the bill calls for $900,000,000 to import oil to Iraq. We spend money we don't have so that we can import oil to the country with the world's second largest oil reserves. I am pleased that my colleague Rep. DAVID OBEY and the other members of the Appropriations Committee were able to eliminate some of the $1.7 billion worth of the most wasteful portions of the President's request, including hundreds of millions of dollars to build luxury prisons in Iraq, hundreds of millions to buy state-of-the-art garbage trucks, and millions to send Iraqis to business school.

I am also pleased that they were able to guarantee that the Pentagon will have no flexibility when it comes to procuring bulletproof body armor and other critical need safety equipment for our troops. We must keep our troops safe. Unfortunately, these changes only scratch the surface of what is necessary to fix this request.

How can Americans be asked to spend a billion dollars to import oil into one of the largest oil producing countries in the world? Another amendment would make sure that this Administration is adopting competitive practices when awarding contracts to companies that are hired to help with Iraq's construction. Still, another would invest in making sure we have trained linguists who can speak the languages employed by terrorists.

I also would vote for the Obey substitute, if the Chair would allow a vote. It would help pay for the reconstruction of Iraq by eliminating the tax cut currently enjoyed by the top one percent of Americans. We cannot afford to go any deeper into debt that this Administration has taken us and we cannot saddle middle class Americans with a financial burden that they cannot afford and should not be asked to bear.

A year ago I stood here on the House floor and I voted against the resolution authorizing the President to launch a unilateral, preventive war against Iraq. At the time, I defended my vote, arguing that it was ''at the least premature, and more likely contrary to our national interest,'' for Congress to authorize military action against Iraq. Today, our troops are in Iraq and we have made a commitment as a nation to make sure they complete their mission. But as I stand here again, I cannot help but ask whether voting for this $87 billion request right now is at the least premature, and most likely, contrary to our national interest.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I just returned after leading a bipartisan trip to Iraq this last Friday. We had Members from all over the country, Republicans and Democrats, and we had Members on our trip that both had supported the war resolution last year, as well as those that opposed it.

I have to say all of us were very proud of every American we met from the USAID, workers at the schools, to the hospitals, and Ambassador Bremer,

the generals, the leaders of our troops, and every man and woman in our Armed Services. I wish I could have taken all of us here in this Chamber, as well as across the country, to see how proud we are of every person that we met with.

Whether you opposed the war resolution or not this last year, we are there now. We need this mission to succeed. I would have to say that nobody here would be against the money for our troops. Yes, we need armored Humvees. Yes, we need more body armor for our vehicles. I would hope that no one here would be opposed to the money to help those that are serving our great land. But we also need the money for reconstruction. It will expedite our troops' withdrawal to come home from that region of the world. It will help promote democracy by birthing democracy where it can flourish.

Now, there will be a dispute here that we will resolve, whether it should be a grant or a loan. We will decide that perhaps later today or tomorrow in the House, in the other body, or certainly in the conference between the House and the other body. But we need the money for reconstruction. Because without those security funds, without seeing those dollars come to help that land begin to prosper, our troops will be there a lot longer. And we will fail in our mission to achieve democracy in that important region of the world.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution that we are dealing with later on tonight and tomorrow. We need to encourage it in every way, freedom and democracy to flourish.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the supplemental and support the Obey amendment. This is a question of accountability. I continue to abide by the principles set forth by the Congressional Black Caucus last month to determine whether we, as Members of Congress, would support the President's request for more aid in Iraq.

I believe that the President should provide the Congress with the full details of the information relied upon by him to go to war. He has not done that. I asked that the President provide full details about how the efforts will be paid for, including full accounting of how and to what extent Iraqi resources could be used to reduce the U.S. costs. He has not done that.

He should provide us with full details about the future obligations of the United States and about how responsibility and authority for these obligations will be shared with the United Nations and other nations. He has not done that.

Congress should ask for a detailed accounting from the administration as to all funds expended to date, including details about all contractors for work in or related to Iraq.

Lastly, the President should set forth criteria he expects will be necessary to meet before we bring our troops home. In other words, what is considered victory? He has not done that.

No more blank checks. People in my district want better schools. They want better health care. They care about the Iraqi people, but they ask are we spending our money effectively and efficiently. And what they have concluded is because this President will not tell us what has been done with the money we already spent, we question what will be done with this money.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, the commander of the Army's 101st Airborne Division in Iraq, Major General Petraeus, likes to remind Congressional visitors that money is ammunition in the battle to stabilize Iraq: money to reopen the cement factory outside Mosul, money to buy ice and food from local merchants, money to productively employ the now-idle hands of former Iraqi Army officers, money for 1,000 other local projects that capitalize on the boundless potential of the Iraqi people and arm them to defeat their most entrenched, insidious enemies, powerlessness and despair.

This bill provides the ammunition needed to wage and win the next critical battle in the war against terrorism and oppression in Iraq. Building on the administration's original request, the committee has met our first obligation, to arm and equip U.S. warfighters to prevail in this complex mission while fueling construction of a viable, sustainable civil society in Iraq.

During two trips to Iraq since April, I saw the strength and courage of our forces as they worked alongside Iraqis rebuilding schools by day and risking their lives patrolling those same streets by night. The dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces know their quickest route home goes through as many markets as minefields, and that their victory over tyranny will be secured as soon as Iraqis are running their own democratic nation.

We are stewards of Iraqi sovereignty. With the reconstruction, economic development, and public diplomacy funds in this bill, we make wise investments to preserve and grow the precious assets in our trust. But the deed of trust is not indefinite. The window of opportunity to build on an oasis of hope in that troubled region will close. This bill reflects our national commitment to meet history's challenge and set Iraq on an inevitable course toward democracy and economic vitality.

Fiscal pressures here at home cannot change the harsher fact that Iraq faces its new future encumbered with a crushing debt burden estimated to be as high as $220 billion. Adding to that debt would be wrong morally and politically. Imposing debt without consent of the governed is the way despots and conquerors build monuments to themselves and past glories. That was how Saddam Hussein built his palaces. Liberators leave behind memorials to generosity and investments in a better future. That is what this bill will buy. Our investment will be returned manyfold by a free and prosperous Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman and Members, Thomas Friedman, a columnist for the New York Times, back in February of this year indicated in a column, ''You do not take the country to war on the wings of a lie.'' My friends, that is exactly what has happened. We were told that we have to attack Iraq because they have weapons of mass destruction. We have to attack Iraq because the United States was in imminent danger of attack by this country. And also we were told that Iraq and Saddam Hussein were involved in the terrorist attack of 9/11.

My friends, all those rationale have been proved wrong. We have not found any weapons of mass destruction. We know that there is no way in God's green earth that Saddam had any missile or any other armament that could come near to attacking this country. And over and over again we have been told, including by the CIA, that Saddam and Iraq was not involved in 9/11. So why are we there? Why did we attack this country?

My colleagues, I did not vote for the War Powers Resolution, and I am not going to vote today for this supplemental bill which will, in effect, continue the war and the killing of our troops. Now, we are told that if we do not pass this bill, our troops will not get the bullets they need and the food and supplies. That is all wrong, and it is not true.

The President signed the Department of Defense appropriation bill, and so funding is available until May or June of next year. So what we are left with is supplying reconstruction dollars to Iraq to build the things that we blew up in the first place.

But it is more than that. This bill also provides things like school buildings and books for Iraqi children. Now how nice. But why do not we do the same for our kids? It provides health care and medical facilities, free medical care for Iraqis, as we have 42 million Americans with no health care whatsoever.

My friends, those who support this bill should at least have the intestinal fortitude to pay for it. For if it passes, which will happen later today, $87 billion will be borrowed. We are broke. We do not have the money. And that $87 billion will be put on the $500 billion deficit that already exists. When are we going to stop the insanity around here?

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, during the lead-up to this war in Iraq, this body had great assurances from the President and his staff that in the aftermath, the United States would not be tagged with the bill. Here we are debating to commit $87 billion to this war.

And this war has been described to us as fighting terrorists. Not a single terrorist has come from this area. And this really could not come at a worse time because we have no money. Our economy is the worst we have seen in 70 years. We have lost many, many jobs. Just in my area, 105,000 jobs have been lost in Dallas.

Protecting our troops in Iraq, or anywhere they are, is important and necessary. But I have been to Iraq, and they are not protected. I have been to Germany to look at those who have been injured, and here. Where is the money going? There is no accountability. No accountability for the first money that has been appropriated. Now, we are asking for more.

And we are financing this war in Iraq with deficit spending. We are borrowing money to pay for this war. We are not cutting spending, we are not raising taxes. If anything, we are going to see another tax break coming soon. We are endangering Social Security.

Vote against this spending. We do not need another blank check being handed to the President.

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

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Iraq supplemental legislation before this Congress and commend the careful deliberation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and all the members of the Committee on Appropriations for this outstanding legislative work in every respect, save one. On the issue of whether reconstruction costs in Iraq should take the form of a grant or a loan, I have considered the arguments of the administration and the opinions of my constituents with much deliberation and prayer. On this question, I have decided it is appropriate for me to stand firm in my belief that a portion of the reconstruction costs should eventually be repaid by the Iraqi people to the people of the United States.

□ 1415

Accordingly, today I will offer the Pence amendment which provides, Mr. Chairman, a middle ground between the challenges of extending a loan to a nation, Iraq, and the desire of the American people to see this oil-rich nation bear the cost at some point in the future of building a civil society.

It is not appropriate, as some will argue on this floor today and tonight, to make all of the reconstruction funding in the form of a loan. As the administration has argued, and as has the chairman, the possibility of extending a loan from the United States to a nation not yet formed is problematic. In recognition of this reality, the Pence amendment makes the first 50 percent of the funding available immediately as a grant, giving priority consideration emergency purposes of security, electricity, oil infrastructure, and the like. Once the administration informs the Congress that a democratically elected government in Iraq has been established, the balance of the funds would be made available under the Pence amendment in the form of loans from the United States Government under terms determined by the President.

Having addressed the logistical concerns raised by the administration and others, I believe it is appropriate that the Congress defer to the consent of the governed, especially in matters of foreign aid. Many Americans, even in my conservative district, overwhelmingly support some repayment of reconstruction costs. Most Americans know that Iraq is an oil-rich nation, possessing the second largest oil reserves on the planet, and will eventually be able to bear the burden of repaying some of the costs of rebuilding its own infrastructure.

At a time of mounting Federal deficits, making a portion of the reconstruction a loan also reassures the American people that there is a financial end-game strategy in Iraq.

Finally, Congress today in adopting the Pence amendment would set an important precedent as we partner with the Iraqi people in establishing the elements of a free and just society.

In the end, Mr. Chairman, I would state firmly that I will support the final version of the Iraq supplemental bill because I am anxious to support the leadership and the Congress and the President and, of course, our military and civilian personnel in Iraq. But nonetheless, I am offering the Pence amendment today with the first belief that the United States should provide for the liberty and security of Iraq, but improvements in civil society in Iraq should ultimately be borne by the Iraqi people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, once again I would attempt to notify any Members who are watching that if they are on the Democratic list for speaking on this matter, they need to get to the House floor pronto or they will lose their opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the Congressional Black Caucus for standing up for the troops and voting against this appalling supplemental bill.

Just yesterday I visited Walter Reed Medical Center and was very impressed by our brave troops. They have done their part in fighting and risking their lives for our Nation. In addition, I talked to our men and women stationed in bases in the Caspian Sea last summer, and I was appalled to see that the female soldiers were not supplied with enough personal items and they were not even given access to showers nearby.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support our troops; and for that reason I would like to know why after Congress appropriated $79 billion for Iraq just 6 months ago, we are going to vote for another $87 billion appropriations. By the way, the largest supplemental that ever passed this House.

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 need many necessary items, for example, enough drinking water, showers, tennis shoes, proper chemical attack suits, quality boots, and even simple toothpaste.

Once again, I want to know, where is the beef? Where is the first $79 billion? Our troops are doing their job. It is the Members in this body that are not doing what we were elected to do.

I want to also point out to the media, you are not doing your job. You have given this administration a blank check. We have not seen one shred of evidence that links 9–11 to Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, our troops are doing their job. It is up to the Members of this body to do theirs.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak about my recent trip to Iraq and to answer some of the questions millions of Americans have been asking every day since the President first announced that he would seek another $87 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan.

Just this Friday I returned from a 5-day trip with eight of my Republican and Democratic colleagues as part of a delegation. We toured the south, the north of Iraq, as well as Bagdad; and I was able to see firsthand the schools that have been rebuilt, the teachers we have retrained, and the hospitals, universities and newspapers that we have helped open. I saw Iraqi police in training; and most importantly, I talked to our young men and women, many of them still teenagers or just in their early twenties, who have continued to risk their lives to bring democracy and the comforts of life we enjoy here in the U.S. to Iraq.

I came back, like so many of my colleagues, believing that there is no question that this should be about us providing for and supporting our troops, and that we do need to assist in reconstructing Iraq and to ensure the safety of Americans here in the United

States and those working abroad in our embassies or even simply traveling abroad.

However, it is just as clear to me that we cannot really afford to stay in Iraq, nor can we leave at this time. We cannot stay because the basis upon which we invaded and now occupy that country, in my opinion, was false. Our preparations and understanding of what occupation would require were faulty. Yet, if we were to pull out now, our mistake could subject the region, the world, and especially our country and our people, to grave dangers of terrorism. Iraq under Saddam Hussein was not a haven for terrorists, but the porous borders of post-Saddam and even the failure of the administration to plan for such an eventuality may be making Iraq such a haven now.

The President has put us in a terrible fix. We cannot afford to stay, yet we cannot leave. Meanwhile, we cannot even afford the initial down payment on his flawed policy of preemption. The country cannot afford the $87 billion the President is asking the Congress to appropriate. Indeed, experts say that Iraq this year could only absorb $6 billion. So why is Mr. Bush demanding three times that amount?

America cannot afford the price tag that the President has put on this Iraqi misadventure unless he agrees to rescind the tax cuts to the top 1 percent of Americans, unless he understands that we have got to work in a multilateral situation and brings in a true form other nations to share in the cost of this. Because otherwise, the money that we will be spending will be money that we will be taking from the middle class and working class people of this great Nation and the poor who are already paying for this war, especially with their sons and their daughters.

Let us make it so this is a shared sacrifice by all Americans. Most of all, our men and women in uniform in Iraq need a change in policy.

Mr. Chairman, I vote against this measure. This is a perpetuation of a failed policy and misguided priorities. Even so, the President can turn this around once he makes a choice between troop strength and tax cuts to the wealthiest of Americans. The President can turn this around once he makes a choice between international cooperation and stuffing the pockets of partisan cronies. Mr. Chairman, we know this is just the first installment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, last fall we were told that Congress needed to authorize military force against Iraq in order to convince the U.N. to send the inspectors back into Iraq. But as soon as we did so, the Bush administration pulled the rug out from under the U.N. inspectors and decided it would use the authority Congress granted them to fight a unilateral war.

Now we are learning that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Congress and the American people were deceived, misled, and manipulated with false and misleading intelligence and political spin from the Bush White House.

Now the Bush administration cannot find any weapons of mass destruction. It cannot find Saddam Hussein. It cannot find Osama bin Laden. It cannot find Taliban leader Mullah Omar, and it cannot even find out who within the White House staff leaked the name of that covert CIA operative.

What does the Bush administration now ask the Congress for? They ask us to trust them and to grant their request for another $87 billion going into Iraq, a blank check with no clear vision of how we are going to extricate ourselves from this morass.

Now, I hear a lot of talk from the administration and its supporters about how we are crafting with this legislation a new Marshall Plan for Iraq. Well, let me tell you, when George Marshall was crafting a plan for Harry Truman to reconstruct Europe after the devastation of World War II, he was not setting up a sweetheart, no-bid contract system for companies associated with the old Pendergast Machine in Kansas City.

That is what we are seeing today with the contracts being given to Halliburton and other favored companies. We are providing broad transfer and reallocation authority to the executive branch that gives the Bush administration virtually unfettered discretion to spend the monies we appropriate in any way they wish. At the same time the President asks us to spend $87 billion in Iraq, he is also going around the country giving speeches calling for additional tax cuts for the top 1 percent wealthiest people in the United States of America.

So if you are wealthy in this country, you get tax cuts and fat government contracts. But if you are an ordinary working American, you get Social Security and Medicare trust funds raided, the 50 percent who are in nursing homes, the elderly dependent upon Medicaid, payments for their nursing home care, they are cut; and meanwhile it is all raided for the reconstruction of Iraq, while at the same time tax cuts of the same amounts are being given to the wealthiest 1 percent in our country.

So the Republicans are busy at work coming up with new schemes to increase your Medicare co-pays, means test your benefits, increase payments for seniors with home health care visits. All of it is wrong, just plain wrong. It is a blank check. It gives the President and Secretary Rumsfeld too much authority. And it fails to do what is needed to build international support for peacekeeping and reconstruction in Iraq or craft an appropriate exit strategy to get our troops back home. And that can only happen if we have multilateral support for this effort, if we have a real vision for what is going on.

As long as this administration believes that it is going to bring Jeffersonian democracy at the point of a gun to an occupied country, then we are operating with one of the most naive political schemes ever put together in the history of this world. And it is time for us to be ensuring that the Congress makes this administration accountable, rather than handing over a blank check with no accountability with at least 60 to 70 percent of this money capable of being reprogrammed by the administration at its own whim without Congress voting upon it again, all of it a mistake of historic proportions.

This is where Congress must check in. It did so after World War II. Today it is just providing a blank check.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3289, which provides supplemental appropriations to our national defense and the reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I would like to commend President Bush for his strong leadership during the war on terrorism. Under his leadership, our homeland has been free from terrorist acts since the attacks of September 11, 2001.

For the past 2 years we, as Americans, have come together in an effort to protect ourselves from all aspects of terrorism in both the United States and abroad. Patriotism has soared as Americans have supported the war on terrorism and our troops who are fighting it.

During these difficult times, we have managed to liberate millions of Afghanis and Iraqis while improving their way of life and allowing them to experience the benefit of democratic rule. We must not stop at this critical juncture.

□ 1430

We must push forward in our efforts in these countries and pass this necessary funding measure.

The $87 billion Supplemental Appropriations Act for 2004 provides the essential funding which is the step toward expanding democracy abroad and is an investment in America's safety. The $19.8 billion provided for reconstruction in both Iraq and Afghanistan will be used to rehabilitate critical infrastructure so their citizens will have safe drinking water, roads, bridges, adequate sanitation, electricity in their homes and an increase in public safety overall. The $64.7 billion provided for our national defense will give our troops the necessary equipment to continue the war on terrorism and protect our shores from anyone who seeks to do us harm.

This debate should focus on providing the necessary resources to complete this phase of the war on terrorism and providing adequate tools for our troops to complete their mission. Now, more than ever, we need to rally behind our troops, and providing adequate tools

for them to complete their mission is the best way to show our support. A vote in favor of this bill is a vote in support of our troops.

Finally, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work and dedication in the crafting of this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 23¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, because we are in search of absent speakers, I will yield myself 5 minutes until some of them arrive.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to address one issue that I have seen appear in the newspapers on almost a daily basis. There is somehow an impression on the part of a number of Members of this House and a number of members of the press that somehow we will endanger our ability to provide a responsible reconstruction package in Iraq if we scale back the reconstruction package now before us. I would like to suggest why that is not true, and to do so, I am simply going to read several paragraphs from the dissenting views that I filed with the committee in the report accompanying this bill, and here is what I wrote for that purpose.

''While the Committee wisely pared back some of the more outlandish projects proposed by the Coalition Provisional Authority, the bill the committee is sending to the House does little to alter the underlying approach to reconstruction envisaged by the CPA. That approach relies on huge contracts with large, multinational corporations to provide high tech and capital-intensive construction, training and services to Iraq requiring the importation of heavy equipment, highly-paid consultants and the payment of corporate overhead and profits.

''The consequence of this approach is that the American taxpayer will pay much more than he or she should; the amount of construction or reconstruction that can be performed within available funds will be significantly less than might otherwise be accomplished; the development of Iraqi businesses and institutions to deal with such problems will be negligible and the number of Iraqis who will be employed will be far fewer than could be productively used if less capital-intensive and lower-tech approaches were followed. In short, we will be paying more for smaller results and particularly smaller results with respect to employment and other economic changes necessary to bring about greater political stability.''

Then I go on to cite one example. After U.S. engineers had told Major General Patraeus that it would cost $15 million to bring a concrete factory up to Western standards, the commander of the 101st Airborne Division gave the contract to local Iraqis who were able to get that cement plant running for just $80,000.

It seems to me that the message that Congress ought to be sending the administration is that we need to focus more on low tech, indigenous strategies for development rather than simply getting in the old habit of going to the big multinationals like Halliburton and others and saying, okay, boys, what can you do for us with your high-paid consultants and high fees.

So that is why it seems to me that the responsible thing to do is to scale back this package until the administration revisits its approach. In the end, if they do that, we will provide better benefits to Iraq and better benefits to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, it has been over a year since the President began pressing to invade Iraq. At the time, many of us pressed the President to fully account for the cost of his planned war. Most Americans would agree that if the issue of Iraq was important enough to start a war over, it was important enough to pay for it.

For a year, Congress has asked for hard numbers on the cost of occupying and rebuilding Iraq, and for a year, the President gave us nothing but blandishments and pie-in-the-sky forecasts. At the time, experts, including the President's own chief economist, predicted the war and reconstruction would cost as much as $200 billion, but the President and his aides actively downplayed those numbers, saying it would only cost around $50 billion.

Well, guess what. Last month, the President finally admitted that he had lowballed the cost of the war when selling it to Congress a year earlier. The President is now asking for an additional $87 billion to extricate our troops from what is beginning to look like a quagmire. This additional $87 billion comes on top of $78.5 billion Congress gave the President just 5 months ago, bringing the grand total so far to $165 billion, and a recent analysis of House Committee on the Budget staffers showed that the entire costs for rebuilding Iraq could rise to as much as $400 billion over the next 5 years. If the numbers we received last year were intentionally lowballed, it would almost seem as the President had decided to rebuild with pinstripe patronage.

The amount we are now being asked to provide almost looks as though it has been inflated to line the pockets of others. Just listen to some of the price tags in this bill: $950 million for recruiting, training and equipping police forces in Iraq, including a police training center with international trainers. This seems to me to be a bit exorbitant. $209 million for prison and detention facilities. Could we not save money if the facilities were built by Iraqis?

A hundred million for a witness protection program? This amount is way too high. Do we really need to spend this money to ensure the lives of Iraqis who are assisting the U.S.? How many could there possibly be? Our own witness protection plan has nowhere near that amount. Are we going to put them up in Taj Mahals?

A hundred million dollars to investigate crimes against humanity? Again, this amount is absurd. We have plenty of evidence of Saddam's crimes against humanity. The parents, the families of loved ones missing have come forward to volunteer that information. It will not cost us $100 million to find victims willing to come forward and document his crimes.

Then there is $2.1 billion to rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure. This is on top of the $948 million and counting already given to Halliburton and to Bechtel to refurbish Iraqi's oil fields.

Then there is $697 million to improve the sewage system. This, when the administration is fighting to prevent Congress from passing a highway and transit bill? This is absurd.

Please, Mr. President, do not insult our intelligence.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the yielding time to me and my friend from Wisconsin for his leadership on this issue.

In April, almost every Member of the House, myself included, voted $60 billion for our effort in Iraq. Unfortunately, since April that $60 billion has simply not been used well. We failed to protect and supply our troops adequately. We hear stories. I met last week with 25 families of people who had loved ones in Iraq. We are not supplying them with safe drinking water. We are not supplying them with antibiotics. In some cases we are not supplying them with body armor, and we are told in committee that body armor will not be available for every one of our soldiers there until December. What was the administration thinking?

We appropriated $60 billion. The administration has failed to submit any plan to the American people, to this Congress, to tell them how this is going to work, to tell all of us when there will be an exit strategy. This administration has failed to show any evidence that the United Nations is cooperating. We cannot get other governments, other countries to send money, to send troops, to send resources, and we failed in terms of accountability.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are spending about $1 billion a week in Iraq. Three hundred million of that billion dollars is going to private contractors, and most of those private contracts are unbid contracts. So we are giving hundreds of millions of dollars to Halliburton and Bechtel and other friends of the President. Yet, we cannot protect

and we cannot fully and adequately supply our troops. We do not have enough body armor. We do not have enough safe drinking water for our troops. We cannot send our troops home on leave. We are making them pay for it. We are charging our troops for food when they are in the hospital in some cases. Yet, we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars that are going to private contractors, Halliburton, Bechtel and other friends of the President.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, Vice President CHENEY still is receiving $13,000 every month from the Halliburton Corporation on the one hand, and we are giving them hundreds of millions of dollars in unbid contracts on the other. Vote no on the $87 billion. Do not give President Bush a blank check to continue the incompetence and the corruption and the ineptness in Iraq.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding time to me and for his continued leadership on so many important issues.

Mr. Chairman, I will be offering an amendment later along with my colleague and very good friend the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT). It will discourage the ongoing violence against women in Afghanistan and the deplorable attacks on girls schools in that country.

The legislation before us appropriates more than $230 million over the administration's request for Afghanistan, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY) for making this increase possible.

While the country has made progress in the last 2 years since the fall of the Taliban, warlords and reactionary Islamic forces continue to wage a campaign of hatred against their own women. According to recent press reports, more than 30 schools for Afghan girls were burned to the ground, depriving hundreds of girls of a chance to receive a basic education. This amendment designates $60 million of the $672 million in the supplemental bill to help women and girls.

□ 1445

It also provides $5 million in support to the National Human Rights Commission in Afghanistan, which is doing critical work in bringing to light human rights abuses against women and men throughout the country. Without human rights, the Afghan Project and the efforts to create a constitution are seriously threatened. If we are to succeed in Afghanistan, these issues must be addressed and addressed now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) to be offered later this afternoon.

The conditions for women and young girls in Afghanistan are still worsening. Further assistance to the Afghan women and girls for education, protection of human rights is crucial, it is necessary, and it is the right thing to do. So I support the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 11¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the rule. I know that most Americans want to see us do everything possible to support our troops in the field and in harm's way, but there is $20 billion in this request that is full of fat and pork and is intended to construct, not reconstruct, infrastructure in Iraq.

I asked for an amendment yesterday that was not made in order to make this in the form of a loan. We have this notion in Tennessee that people who receive the proceeds of the loan ought to be the ones borrowing the money. I take the position, Mr. Chairman, that Americans have paid with the blood of young American soldiers. And the people who are going to benefit from this $20 billion largess are going to be the Iraqis, not Americans.

Let me say one further thing about this matter. Somebody has to borrow this money. Do my colleagues not think it ought to be the people who benefit from the proceeds of the loan? We are borrowing $20 billion, some of which comes from China. We had a $400 billion deficit this year. That is $16 billion in additional mandatory spending next year and every year thereafter on interest.

This leadership in Washington, D.C. is spending more money than has ever been spent before in the history of the country. They are not spending it today, they are spending it tomorrow, and it is called interest and it is going to wreck our economy and wreck this country's future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think at least for now, with the blood of American soldiers being spilled, the least we can expect is that the people who get the proceeds of the borrowing ought to borrow it, not the American taxpayer.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 9¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for allowing for a very serious debate.

I thank all of our service men and women and their families who really are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice. Tragically, this means sometimes their lives, but certainly the sacrifices of their families.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to visit on a number of occasions our wounded in our hospitals here in Washington, D.C. I have never seen such a group of valiant and strong-hearted, wonderful individuals who are still committed to this Nation. That is why I believe this debate is one of the most important, historic debates and occasions we will have ever in our congressional careers.

Mr. Chairman, I have determined that I am going to stand up on behalf of these troops that I had a chance to talk to over the weekend in Doha, Qatar; these troops who have said that there is no exit strategy; that they, in fact, do not know when they are going to return home. Mr. Chairman, the equipment that they have is riddled with inadequacies, so that if they are in a Humvee, it does not meet the test of avoiding explosion and great injury.

This is the largest supplemental in the history of this Nation, so I ask the leaders of this Congress, let us delay this vote, let us vote only for the finite amount of money that will provide for our troops. Let us hold off on this $20 billion or $30 billion or $36 billion.

Look at what Secretary Rumsfeld has said. He told us in the fall of 2002 not to worry about the cost, that Iraq is a very different situation from Afghanistan because they have oil. But now they are coming to us and asking for $20 billion, and we do not have any accountability for the $79 billion that we gave just 6 months ago. And our troops are in need. What about the Reserves and the National Guard that told me that they have problems in getting paid? And that is why I have an amendment.

We do not need to go to the donor conference in Madrid with a check. What we need to go with is a collaborative spirit, where we can sit down with France and Germany and Russia and our allies and develop a resolution that talks about troops and money.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to stand on behalf of these troops. Until they get paid, until there is an exit strategy, until there are mental health benefits for those that are returning, they will not get a vote out of me. Because we need to stand on behalf of the American people, and we need to find the right solution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I just heard somebody mention Halliburton. This $87 billion is not about loans or grants; it is not about Halliburton or Bechtel. This is about a war that we are committed to. We voted for this war. Whether individuals voted for it or not, the Congress committed ourselves to this war.

This is about a commitment to our troops thousands of miles away and a mission that we have had trouble getting them trained for, that they are not used to, about the lack of MOSes, people in specialties that are not in the jobs they should be in. This is about finishing a war as quickly as possible and allowing our men and women of the Armed Forces to come home victorious; to, indeed, march into the sunlight. This is about keeping our troops safe and not coming home in body bags so that they can again be with their mothers, fathers, wives, husbands, and children. In order to do that, they not only need the money for the military side, they need the reconstruction money.

The administration sometimes refers to this significant effort of our troops in Iraq as a low-intensity conflict. This minimizes the effort of our 150,000 troops still in the theater and around Iraq. This is not a low-intensity conflict when you cannot tell the activated Reserves and Guards, who have been active duty for 2 out of 6 years, what time they are coming home. This is not a low-intensity conflict when we are wearing out our equipment, when we have a third of our Bradleys that are deadlined because of lack of tracks or when we have people short of body armor. This is not a low-intensity conflict when I find a 67-year-old Reservist calling the office because the Army called him and said we would like you to volunteer to come back because your specialty is short, and if you do not volunteer, we are liable to call you back.

I called the Army, and it turns out they said, no, we are not going to call anybody back involuntary. But it shows the shortages. We have a shortage of MOSes. Those are the specialties, important military specialties. We have 6,300 that are not in the jobs that they should be in. We have the number of people there, but we do not have the trained personnel because the shortages are starting to come up in the replacement area.

Now, I have been to the hospitals, and I have talked to the troops in Iraq. They are not complaining about incidentals. They are complaining about what would save their lives, things that are essential to their lives. They complain about the lack of potable water. They complain about equipment that will save them, if they run over a land mine; equipment that will stop bombs from detonating in their path; equipment that will save them from shrapnel and fragments that penetrate the body armor or penetrate their bodies.

I saw a poll in ''Stars and Stripes,'' and the general said, well, these polls, we always have people complain. The military always complains. But these are not the same kind of complaints I have heard in the past. These are serious complaints. These are complaints which are life-saving, essential to their life. This is about giving the resources needed to stabilize and secure Iraq as quickly as possible to bring our troops home as whole human beings to live out their lives in the sunlight.

Every time I go to the hospitals, every time I talk to them, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has been there, his wife has been there, and many of my colleagues have been there to the hospitals, and they appreciate us coming, and they talk about how the body armor saved their lives. The inserts in the body armor were the key. When our subcommittee, and most of us have been on that subcommittee 15 to 20 years, for most of us our entire career, and everything we do is to try to protect the troops, try to make sure they have what they need, and when bureaucrats stop the money from getting out to them, that is almost criminal.

Let me say this. The reconstruction money is just as important as the money that we are putting in for the combat. We have to win what I call the ''X factor.'' The X factor is winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. We have seen polls that show they are in favor of us. We have sent people over there, and they say they are all happy with us. Well, let me tell you this. If they were happy with us, if they were for us, they would not allow people to fire RPGs, which are missile-guided weapons, at our Humvees and then disappear into the crowd. We have a lot of work to do.

I urge the people to vote for this entire supplemental. It is absolutely essential to the troops' security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I just want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement.

History has an uncanny way of reminding us of our motivation. General Marshall outlined a program to help war-torn Europe without knowing that 30 years later the United States would face a similar crossroad. 400,000 Americans were killed in World War II, paying the ultimate price for mistakes made after World War I. And following the second European war, the continent ran out of food and suffered from runaway inflation and turned to communism.

Learning the lessons of World War I and its failed peace, the U.S. Congress backed the Marshall Plan. The plan went far beyond feeding the hungry to laying the foundation for the postwar recovery. This plan, the Marshall Plan, was very expensive. In today's dollars it cost $105 billion. And as we face a similar crossroad, we have the benefit of history.

We know that President Truman's decision to back the Marshall Plan helped to prevent World War III. A third generation of Americans did not return to the killing fields of Europe. Today, we face a similar challenge of rebuilding Iraq and preventing a third Middle Eastern war.

This week, the House debates the Iraq supplemental. In considering $19 billion to rebuild Iraq, we face the same question that President Truman faced. Truman asked: How much should we pay to help avoid World War III? And the American people of 1947 answered: $105 billion, as approved by Congress and the Marshall Plan.

□ 1500

Today, we see the unfinished work of Desert Storm and we ask, how much should Congress pay to help avoid a third war in Iraq?

Let us look at the costs of these wars to bring things into perspective. We know that in current dollars, World War II cost $4.7 trillion and remains the most expensive conflict in U.S. history. So far, the war on terror costing $193 billion, including this Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental, is more costly than Desert Storm at $82 billion but less costly than other major conflicts, including Korea at $400 billion and Vietnam at $600 billion. We know the Marshall Plan's cost of $105 billion is roughly five times the $19 billion cost for Iraq proposed here.

Cost is also relative to income. Today's U.S. economy is larger than it was in 1947. The Marshall Plan imposed a heavy financial burden on the American people, 5 percent of our national income. This plan is a much lighter burden; .02 percent of America's income finances this plan. In such terms, the Marshall Plan was over 200 times more expensive than this Iraqi plan.

Under this plan, the reconstruction of Iraq has already begun. Chairman LEWIS and I returned from Baghdad where we saw the main power plant returning to prewar capacity. We saw firsthand a budding democracy taking root on the front pages of no less than 120 new newspapers founded since May 1 in Iraq. Under Saddam, only half of schoolchildren attended class. Last week, 90 percent of schoolkids attended class, many with some of the 1.5 million book bags provided by the U.S. They also returned to class with 5 million new textbooks, but these textbooks were absent the pictures of Saddam and the rhetoric of hate that undermined the future of this region.

We need to work with our allies, and as oil begins to flow, a well-educated

people will return to work, but like their predecessors in Europe, our troops need to finish this mission, earning a ticket home with no future Middle Eastern war forcing a return to the killing fields of Iraq. The stakes are high. I think we should finish the job so that there is no third war in Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of our troops in Iraq. Thousands of young men and women, my neighbors and yours, remain in harm's way. They are suffering casualties daily and fatalities every week. We must do all we can to provide for their protection. We are indebted to our troops for their service and sacrifice. The men and women of the Armed Forces make all Americans proud. My vote for this bill is for one reason only, to give our troops the resources they need to carry out their mission. But my vote should not be interpreted as supporting this administration's postwar policy in Iraq or the lack of one.

As I cast a ''yes'' vote, I will supply the troops with the resources they need. My hope is that the President and the administration will finally supply a policy the Nation deserves. Because the absence of a policy has never measured up to the valor and patriotism of our troops. As we will do our part in Congress, now it is long overdue for the administration to do theirs, enunciating a policy. Our troops will get the Humvees and the Kevlar vests they need, but the policy is as important for their protection as the equipment.

Just over 2 years have passed since the September 11 attacks when the world reached out and expressed sympathy and solidarity with America and Americans. Because of our arrogance, we have turned the world's sympathy into antipathy. This administration lacks a policy that is coherent, that spells out a clear vision for Iraq's mission, invites support from our allies and provides an exit strategy that will bring our troops home and reunite American families. I supported the war. I still believe getting rid of Saddam Hussein was the right thing to do. But the administration has made a legitimate war illegitimate through its actions. While it sold the war on a set of claims that were never true, the administration never leveled with the American people.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. It is my understanding that after this leg, we will still have an hour of general debate remaining under the rule that was adopted; is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Committee will rise for some business in the House and then go to an hour of debate on the bill back in Committee.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the supplemental and support the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill. While I support the funds allotted for our courageous troops, I cannot support the bill in its current form.

The lack of information we have received from the Administration on operations in Iraq and future costs is embarrassing, especially as we hear daily about new casualties on the ground. We have seen no timeline estimating when elections will be held to allow the Iraqi people to choose their own government. We have heard no estimated date from this Administration for sending our troops home. We still have seen no estimate of the total cost of operations in Iraq.

While we must work toward quelling the attacks and stabilizing Iraq, passing this bill is not the answer. If Congress approves this request, the amount spent on Iraq will exceed $150 billion. But we still don't know how the Administration spent the first $70 billion the Congress approved for Iraq and Afghanistan, a funding request I supported. American taxpayers deserve some accountability. American taxpayers deserve to know how their hard-earned money is being spent, and they deserve to know how much will be spent in the future.

When someone puts a down payment on a house, that person does so knowing not just the amount of the first payment, but also the full cost of the mortgage. We need to know what the mortgage on Iraq is—we deserve that, and the President has a responsibility to tell us. Its that simple.

It is unfortunate that the Majority would not allow us to consider the funds for the troops separately from the reconstruction funds. I don't know of one colleague in this House that does not support the troops, and to say that a no vote on this bill is a vote against them is offensive.

This past August, I was able to visit troops in my district in New Mexico who had recently returned from Iraq. In fact, just this week, I met with veterans in my district, and the overwhelming majority do not support this effort. I also visited troops on active duty in Germany and closer to home in Bethesda Medical Center during the war. I heard their stories, all of them heroic, and expressed my gratitude for their service to our country. I voted in favor of the resolution to support the troops in this war, and I am proud of that vote.

What I am not proud of, however, is the process we have seen in considering this funding bill. I submitted an amendment to pay for this funding bill by modifying the President's irresponsible tax cut so that the rate of the top one percent of the taxpayers would change to 38.2 percent—still less than the percentage before the tax cuts—for 2005 through 2010. Unfortunately I was not permitted to offer the amendment, so we will not have a vote. A similar provision was also included in Mr. OBEY's amendment which was also not allowed a vote on the floor.

The new cost of the war—$150 million—if fifty percent more than Administration officials estimated a few months ago. This year the Federal Government has the largest deficit in its history—over $400 billion—and this does not include this new request. Because of poor decisionmaking, poor planning, and plain old bad math, our grandchildren will be paying for this war.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. I hope that as this vote proceeds, Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that some of us who are struggling with this, please refrain in your press statements and releases from referring to anybody on this side of the aisle as being unpatriotic. I think there are legitimate questions about how this was brought to the floor, about the specificity associated with it, about the term of our stay there. I have been on the ground, as I know many of my colleagues on the other side have there in the region, so I would hope that we can all refrain from referring to anyone in this body, anyone in this Chamber, Democrat or Republican, as being unpatriotic.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I know that that 15 seconds has been bugging you all day. I am going to yield it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, once again, to briefly explain that when we have concluded this phase of the debate, then the Committee will rise, and we will officially then take up the bill. We will go through the regular process of calling up the bill under the rule.

Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this supplemental appropriation.

This is one of the most important votes we will cast this year. For the future of peace in the Middle East and the promise of a better future for the children of Iraq—this vote should be one vote you will remember for the rest of your life.

Without question, we will have concerns about the amount of money the reconstruction of Iraq will cost the American public. Eighty-six billion dollars . . . it's a lot of money.

Like you, I have received many letters from my constituents asking ''why?'' I have been

peppered during town hall meetings. ''Why is it that Americans are always the ones who have to pay?''

Why? Because we are Americans.

Because, when ruthless dictators take innocent lives, when people—like Saddam Hussein—terrorize their own people, when evil people conduct unspeakably evil acts against their own—we must ask ourselves, ''Who else will act?''

''Who else will?''

Time and again, America has given its blood, its strength and its money to promote and protect freedom overseas.

As the world's standard bearer for democracy and freedom we have inherited this duty. We are America—This is what we do.

Some will say that we cannot afford to support Iraq. I say we can't afford not to.

We are committed—like it or not—to the rebuilding efforts in Iraq. It is incumbent upon us to lay the foundation of a free economy for a country now free from oppression.

The Iraqi people are looking to us to uphold our responsibility for security and reconstruction. We must follow through on our commitments to the Iraqi people and the local population must understand that we have their true interests at heart.

We should never again come to the floor of this House and make speeches about mass graves, malnutrition, environmental devastation and WMD. Neither should we again detail to our constituents the horrors of state-sponsored rape, murder and torture in Iraq.

Can it happen again? You bet.

Saddam's minions want us to leave, they want Americans dead—because they will use the same forces of terror they are using today, to kill innocent Iraqis and American soldiers, as a path to power tomorrow.

If we abandon Iraq, we are back to square one. We dishonor the men and women who have given their lives for us and the Iraqi people during this necessary mission. Our Nation's fight for freedom in Iraq.

Our job will have been left undone and for what?

This Congress should be committed to assisting Iraq in becoming an independent, self-governing and economically viable nation. We must finish the work and honor the sacrifice of so many dedicated soldiers.

To abandon our efforts would be inhumane to the people of Iraq and dangerous to our national security.

The world has changed. Many of us—especially those of us on the Appropriations Committee—sensed a new insecurity after the 1998 embassy bombings in Tanzania and Kenya and the attack on the USS *Cole* in Yemen.

The United Stated did not act appropriately then.

The events in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania forced us into this new role because we must protect ourselves and the free world.

Why? Once again. Because who else will?

So here we are today, setting the course for a free Iraq.

We have all been sent to Washington by our constituents to make difficult and honest choices. You will make a choice today.

This package reflects a vision and a hope that America can be a catalyst for freedom and peace in the Middle East—freedom that generations of Iraqis have not yet experienced and the kind of freedom we take for granted every day.

Be a catalyst for freedom and security. Vote in favor of this appropriations bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, under the balance of the debate time, I have a series of thoughts that I would like to present, but I am going to wait until we actually have the bill before us.

In the meantime, I just want to make this one closing thought before yielding to the majority leader. We have talked so often about what our constituents have told us, this week, last week, the week before. After Desert Storm, over a decade ago, one complaint was we went to war against Saddam Hussein, but we never finished the job. This finishes the job. I still hear that complaint today. We got rid of Saddam Hussein and most of his henchmen, and now we are finishing the job to get our troops back home. We cannot do that until we have established, as the United Nations agreed today to help expedite the establishment, a government in Iraq, to establish a form of constitution and to provide those things that a government would provide for their people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the very distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I really appreciate the gentleman bringing this to the floor and conducting what I think is one of the most important debates in the country and in our careers. It has been a good debate.

I hope Members of this House would pay attention to the statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). As I sat in this Chamber listening to the gentleman from Pennsylvania speak, I was looking at a gentleman that I have the utmost respect for but mostly because he knows what he is talking about. If the Members back in their offices did not see the gentleman from Pennsylvania's comments, I would hope that they would get the transcript and read it. Because when he says that the reconstruction money is as important as the money to go to the troops, he is absolutely right, and it is part of the war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, this debate, for all the time and energy that it has consumed, really comes down to one question: Are we at war with international terrorism or are we not? And with this vote, every Member of the House will tell the world how seriously they take the war on terror. Let us put an end to the sleight-of-hand rhetoric some of the war's opponents have used of late. To those who have feigned offense about their patriotism being questioned, this is not about your patriotism. It is about your judgment. While I am on it, let me just say that that old debating tactic of ''I support the troops, but'' is just not going to cut it this time. If you support the war and you support the troops, you must vote for this bill. The war that we are fighting cannot be won without a safe and secure Iraq. It cannot be won without the reconstruction funding in this bill. It is just that simple.

Everyone in this building and everyone in this country has the right to oppose this war and oppose this war supplemental, but that opposition and the weak and indecisive foreign policy that it represents has consequences. A ''no'' vote on this bill is a ''no'' vote on the war on terror and will serve to undermine our coalition. If you oppose the war, feel free to vote ''no.'' But at that moment, the American people will know for sure who is working to win the war on terror. This bill does not just fund the war, it funds the overall strategy of the war on terror. That means, Mr. Chairman, that the reconstruction money is defense spending; it is war spending; and it is homeland security spending. These priorities are one and the same, because they serve the same strategy and combat the same enemy. And that enemy, I would remind my colleagues, is not each other but the enemy is the terrorists.

This is life and death, Mr. Chairman, not politics. And if we are serious about winning this war, we must pass this bill. Since we took on this fight 2 years ago, two oppressed nations have been liberated. Terrorist networks around the world have been destroyed or forced into hiding. And the brotherhood of human freedom has been expanded by 50 million Iraqis and Afghanis. This is all because the American people have once again decided, Mr. Chairman, in the face of an unthinkable evil to stand and fight.

I urge my colleagues to stand and fight with them today and vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of October 14, 2003, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KIRK) 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 further debate the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1515

LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during

consideration of H.R. 3289 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 396, before consideration of any other amendment, except pro forma amendments by the chairman or ranking minority member 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 in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) regarding sustenance, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding quality of life, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) regarding loans, which shall be debatable for 1 hour;

and an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) regarding loans, which shall be debatable for 1 hour.

Each such amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by a Member designated or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman to make clear that the adoption of this unanimous consent request in no way changes the consideration of any other amendment, that Members who have other amendments will still be able to offer those amendments and they will be disposed of precisely in the same manner in which they would be disposed of under the rule.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Without any prejudice to any other Member or any other amendment that might be offered, this unanimous consent would not have any adverse or negative effect on the Members' opportunity to offer those amendments.

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

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 3289.

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

There was no objection.

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 3289.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1519

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 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 Mrs. BIGGERT (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

I do so to point out that we have debated this bill for a long time now, 6 hours on the general debate, 1 hour under the rule; and now we will have another hour's debate plus the amending process. The largest amount of dollars in this bill will go for our troops, for our national defense, for our soldiers and all of our military forces who are involved in the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. The second largest portion of the bill has to do with construction in Iraq, the development of creating a constitutional system where the Iraqis can control their own destiny and our troops can come home. And I want our troops to come home, and that is why I want to get this money appropriated so that we stabilize the country of Iraq to the point that our troops can come home.

Madam Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), who is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations' Defense Subcommittee, who has led a large delegation to Iraq and has covered the country very well, has returned with just a tremendous report on what is actually happening there without regard to any spin control by the media. He has done a really good job as chairman of this subcommittee. He did an outstanding job in leading his delegation to Iraq.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I doubt that I will take the entire 10 minutes at this moment; but it is very important, I think, for the Members of the House to join together and recognize the long-term impact that we may be about effecting today as we consider this very important supplemental.

In anybody's book, $87 billion is a lot of money. Indeed, it was not very long ago, 2 weeks ago, the President signed into law the appropriations for the 2004 national defense funding. Those dollars pay for the fiscal year that is ahead of us, for the expenses of housing, of training, of providing food and forage for the men and women who make up our forces. The moneys also involve paying for the assets that they use whether they be airplanes, ships at sea, or arms that they must carry. Those dollars also pay for the research and development that allow us to stay on the cutting edge for the wars that we may have to fight somewhere over the horizon. All of that is a piece of national security or the national defense, a total in that package in excess of $370 billion.

There is just not any question that defending America, being the strongest country in the world, is an expensive process. To say the least, our national defense is a priority for the country. Over half of our discretionary money goes into these pools because our people have long recognized that our freedom is critical to our future, and we know very well that maintaining that freedom is a price we must and we are willing to pay.

The one thing that is not often said, peace is one thing, maintaining our freedom is very critical, but war is an entirely different thing. War is really expensive. We remain strong as a country because we are peacemakers. From time to time we find ourselves in a circumstance where war is a requirement if we are going to stabilize our future in this shrinking world. We found ourselves in this circumstance in the Middle East. And the war on terrorism, which is a direct result of 9–11, and the President's taking head-on the challenge of terrorism throughout the world has put us on a track that suggests that America is the only remaining superpower, and we will lead the point insofar as not just maintaining the peace is concerned but also ferreting out terrorism wherever it might exist, wherever it may be harbored.

And today we find ourselves in the midst of Iraq, following a military incursion on our part that directly dealt, began to deal with the fact that in that country was one of the world's worst terrorists. Saddam Hussein and his regime absolutely will be remembered in history as one of the worst of all time. Indeed, what he has done to his people, the attitudes and view of the world that he has harbored in his country are among the worst that we have experienced. It rivals all that which Hitler was about and the Holocaust. It certainly rivals Stalin.

But to go to Iraq and see firsthand what a terrorist is all about when he runs a country, Saddam Hussein cared nothing about his people. Only those who were his closest supporters did he care about. But from there he did not shy away a moment for murdering by the thousands his own people.

To travel to Iraq and see what might happen or even be happening in other countries, to visit the killing fields where indeed we can see in some locations mounds of dirt dug up, we can see clothes sticking out of these mounds of dirt. People have gone there seeking to find the location of their loved ones who were murdered on the very spot. To be in a killing field where the farmer, the local killer designated by Saddam Hussein, chooses to bury people by the thousands under his fields where he grows his crops, it is an incredible scene, one that is impossible to believe almost unless one goes and visits Iraq today.

To look at the past, what Saddam Hussein and his regime have done to his people, and people like him threaten to do to the world, certainly is a very important awakening for those of us who have had the chance to visit.

We traveled not long ago to Iraq, 17 of us, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, some who supported the war, some who did not; and we came back together almost hand in hand. We spent time thinking through what we had learned and seen and, indeed, thinking through what our responsibilities were. There is little doubt that that trip is made up of people who now support our effort to fight the war on terror. Indeed, the support from that group, if it is reflected in the House, would suggest we are going to have a very solid bipartisan base of support for this supplemental.

Speaking for a moment to the supplemental itself, most of the money, the $87 billion we are talking about, most of the money is going to our forces, to secure and sustain our troops. Some $65 billion of the money goes to our troops. The balance, about $18.5 billion, is for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Let me speak to that piece of it for a moment for the Members have heard me talk about finances for our troops time and time again, but to that piece of it that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is responsible for, the reconstruction of Iraq. It is very important for all of us to know that that money is designed simply to jump-start this economy, to begin the work that is necessary, to make sure that we can put pressure on the world to help with Iraq's circumstance.

For once we relieve it of this huge burden of debt that Saddam Hussein created, really some mix that involves over $200 billion worth of debt. We then can apply some of the funding we are talking about in this bill to reconstructing some of their basic utilities, creating circumstances where decent water systems can go forward, where an industrial base is possible, where investment for the world economy makes sense. Once Iraq gets to that point, that engine will have begun to run, and I am confident if we follow through here, if we have the patience and the hope to follow through, Iraq will progressively come in among free nations. For the first time in their history, people will have a chance for freedom, and they will see the doorway and the promise of private economic opportunity.

Indeed, what we are about to do today is history-making. If we go forward here with hope and patience, there is little doubt that the bill we pass today will change the world that is the Middle East. We have the potential of adopting a model that will put pressure on the whole system there, and it is my view that then there truly will be real hope for democratic and free change in the countries in the Middle East, and, indeed, we will be back on the roadway to peace.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Chairman, my grandmother was a salty woman who originally came from Maine and settled in Wisconsin. She said once to my sister, ''Look, Kathy, just because you want to get married, doesn't mean you have to say yes to the first idiot who walks through the door.'' I think we all know that is true.

That is the same principle that we ought to apply when we review administration requests to spend money. Just because we want to do something, does not mean that the Congress has to just swallow willy-nilly the first slapdash, sloppy, naive package that is sent down to us. The Congress has the right and an obligation to use its judgment and to be selective.

It was suggested a couple of moments ago by one of the speakers that, in essence, whether you vote yes or no on this package is a measure of whether or not you want to oppose terrorism or not. Absolute baloney. There is not a Member of this House who does not want to fight terrorism.

Less than a week after 9/11, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I pushed through this House a $40 billion package to respond to terrorism, and, if I recall, that package passed virtually unanimously. We then went on to try to get the White House to increase its budget for homeland security items so we could strengthen protection in our ports, strengthen protection of the airways and strengthen protection afforded by our first responders in our local communities all across this country. The President threatened to veto that extra money. Nobody suggested he was soft on terrorism when he did that. He had a different view of how that money should be used than we did. He wanted to use it for tax cuts instead of homeland security. That is his right. I did not happen to agree with it.

We spent $60 billion on a package directed at our activities against Iraq just a few months ago, and yet, in spite of the maximum flexibility we gave the administration, we still find out today that there are 40,000 soldiers who were not given the Kevlar linings to their flak jackets. So, in other words, they did not have the body armor that they needed when they went into combat.

We also find out that the Pentagon, the civilian leadership of the Pentagon, in its infinite wisdom, did not manage affairs in such a way that would deliver all of the electronic jammers that were necessary so that our troops would stop being blown up by remotely detonated bombs.

We also discovered that, despite all of that money that we gave them, they did not provide the Kevlar blankets for the Humvees, so they were getting blown up on the roadbeds.

Now, we discover that 80 percent of American troops in Iraq still do not have access to anything but putrid water, so whole units get dysentery.

So with all due respect to one of the previous speakers, we have a right, and indeed an obligation, to exercise our judgment.

Every dollar that we spend on this request is a dollar that will not be spent on education, will not be spent on health care, will not be spent to modernize our own electrical grid, will not be spent on community development, will not be spent for any other domestic purpose. So if we are going to deny funding for those programs, we had doggone well better know that this money is going to be used for the best possible purpose, in the wisest and smartest possible way.

That is the issue here, not a measure of someone's patriotism or their judgment or their dedication to the antiterrorist fight. If someone were to suggest otherwise on this floor today, that would be demagoguery not worthy of institution. So I hope that does not happen.

What we have an obligation to do today is to ask whether this package, as presented, does as much as it should to support our troops and allow them to return home safely. I do not believe it does.

Does it do as much as it should to restore the readiness of U.S. military to respond to future crises in the Middle East, or any other part of the world? In my view, it does not.

Does it provide Iraq with the right kind of assistance, or will the principal beneficiaries be the large multinational corporations who charge an arm and a leg for services that can be delivered for a dime on the dollar in Iraq by other people? I do not think it does provide enough protections.

Does this package place a fair share of burden on American taxpayers vis-a-vis taxpayers from other countries? I do not believe it does.

Most of all, is it not gutless for this institution to refuse to pay for this package, rather than charging the bill to our kids?

Before we prattle on about ''shared sacrifice,'' I think we ought to see whether we are really willing to ask anybody to sacrifice, except the people in the military, who are stuck with discombobulated lives because of mixed up troop rotations, the Reserve and Guard being told they have to serve another year.

What is wrong with asking that at least we pay for this package, so that we can save $4 billion a year in interest payments that can be used on deserving and needy programs here at home? Nothing is wrong with that, and yet the majority will not grant us the right to even offer that amendment so we can get a vote on it.

That is what is wrong with this House, that is what is wrong with this package. And that is why I intend to vote no, until the administration does come to us and tell us two things: (1) Gives us an accounting of the $60 billion they have already spent, they have not done so; and (2) gives us a clear understanding of what their plans are for spending on this operation for the next 5 years. They have steadfastly refused to provide that, and, until they do, this Congress has a responsibility to exercise the only power that our Founding Fathers gave us that means a whit, the power of the purse.

We have an obligation to our taxpayers and our constituents to know what we are doing and to know what the government is going to be doing with their tax dollars. We do not know enough at this point to provide this money carte blanche. When we do, I will be happy to vote for it, but not until.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding me time, and I want to thank him for his leadership, as well as the Chairman of the Full Committee, for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the total amount of this supplemental appropriation bill is over $86 billion. The foreign operations chapter totals $21.071 billion. That is $221 million less than the President's request. My remarks today will be on that part of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I strongly support the objectives the President seeks to achieve with this supplemental request for Iraq and Afghanistan. This supplemental bill supports our men and women in uniform and it provides reconstruction resources to stabilize and improve conditions in those countries that will enable us to bring our troops home soon. These reconstruction funds are essential to achieving our national security and our foreign policy objectives and to defeating terrorism. This portion of the supplemental is essential to providing for a more stable and a more peaceful world.

I want to applaud Ambassador Bremer and the men and women in our Coalition Provisional Authority and various Federal agencies that are part of our U.S. team for their dedicated service under the most difficult of circumstances. The task they and their counterparts in Afghanistan have before them amounts to no less than the creation of an entire nation, with all its attendant institutions and infrastructure. This is a daunting task, and they deserve our bipartisan support to complete it.

I think my colleagues recognize that our objectives will not be achieved quickly, and the financial costs will be great. Even so, the costs of reconstruction efforts may seem large, but they are small compared to the costs of failure. We cannot, we must not, fail.

Mr. Chairman, we must learn from history, as several have already said on this floor. After the First World War, we retreated as our allies required reparations and we helped to create economic chaos in Germany.

After the Second World War, the Marshall Plan and our efforts in Japan led to stability and to global economic growth, a very different outcome. The investments made then and in our defense capabilities ultimately led to our victory over communism in the Cold War.

The Greatest Generation, as it is sometimes called, understood the importance of economic and political reconstruction in Europe and Japan. It shouldered the costs of the Marshall Plan, some $13 billion, or about 5 percent of our gross domestic product at that time. In this age of terrorism, the stakes could be just as great for our security. By way of comparison, this $21 billion for reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan represents less than one-fifth of one percent of our GDP today.

Mr. Chairman, we must get this right. We cannot allow Iraq to become a failed state, to disintegrate into several states that foment terrorism and instability. We must not repeat mistakes, such as were made in the last century, when within the space of a single generation, we sent the sons and younger brothers of First World War veterans to the same battlefields in Europe.

These funds must be considered an investment, an investment in security both in the region and on American soil, and a responsibility. We must not confront, a generation in the future, with the terrible knowledge that we removed two tyrants, only to leave vacuums into which their cousins in tyranny would return.

The needs are great. But, just as John Taber, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations in 1947, led Congressional scrutiny of the Truman administration's Marshall Plan request, our committee, led by the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and this House, has a responsibility to review the details of this reconstruction effort, and the Committee on Appropriations and this House also have a responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and in a process that is transparent. I know my colleagues take that responsibility seriously.

Since the Committee on Appropriations received the President's request, we have held several hearings and numerous meetings to examine it. The bill before the House represents reductions of almost $1.7 billion in programs in Iraq, and increases in programs for Afghanistan and Pakistan of almost $600 million. We also have some $858 million to support the Coalition Provisional Authority, or CPA, as it is called, that was not included in the foreign operations portion of this request.

We have assigned the highest priority for projects that can be implemented and executed during 2004, or that are not likely to be funded by others. The resulting bill is a balanced approach to supporting a complex, crucial mission in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it provides much-needed emergency appropriations to further the fight against terror in other countries.

Let me highlight a few of the parts of the bill before us.

There is $18.65 billion for Iraq. That is a reduction of $1.7 billion from the President's request. $3.2 billion is for security and law enforcement. The sooner we build strong security and police forces that have respect for the rule of law, the sooner we can bring our men and women home. But this job cannot be left half done. These funds will add thousands of Iraqi police and security personnel to keep peace on their streets, to bring their own criminals to justify, to control their own borders.

There is nearly $10 billion to provide reliable drinking water, sanitation and electricity service. I would note with considerable joy that Iraq's electricity levels have recently exceeded prewar levels for the first time, but this accomplishment is tenuous. Many plants rely more on improvisation than on fuel to keep running. Virtually all generating facilities are in desperate need of repair or replacement.

Improperly treated solid waste threatens drinking water, and waterborne illnesses continue to plague Iraq's population. Correcting these problems will entail costly, long-term investments, but they are investments that will contribute directly to development, to peace and stability.

Finally, this recommendation includes $2.1 billion for rebuilding and improving Iraq's oil infrastructure. These funds will not only repair the damage done by saboteurs and years of underinvestment and neglect, but will improve security for pipelines, refineries and drilling stations. The Iraqi Governing Council and its ministers will rely on oil sales for salaries and operations, including the funds required for thousands of security positions added by this supplemental. As the many acts of sabotage have already demonstrated, Iraq's reliance on the United States and the international community will continue as long as its oil production is hampered. The committee includes a specific account for the operating expenses of the Coalition Provisional Authority, as I mentioned earlier.

The CPA is overseeing one of the most costly and important foreign assistance programs in U.S. history. Its operating costs should be treated in the same manner as those of any other major implementing agency of foreign assistance such as USAID. This separate account does nothing to change or reduce the authority of the Secretary of Defense with regard to the CPA.

Not included in this bill, however, is $1.7 billion for a variety of programs which were requested by the administration. These include items that, in our view, cannot possibly be completed over the next 15 months, or that are not needed to meet an emergency, or that could better be completed by an international organization or other group. For instance, we have eliminated $400 million for two high-security prisons. We have left in $100 million for one prison, and $99 million for rehabilitating existing structures.

Also not included is a $150 million down payment on a $700 million state-of-the-art children's hospital in Basra. Children's health is very important, but we have put $100 million of that into rehabilitating some of the clinics in Iraq.

Let me turn for one moment to Afghanistan. It is a country at a critical stage. We have to root out the Taliban and these other criminals from the bordering region of Pakistan, and we have to have the support of the Afghan public to succeed. In this bill we include $1.24 billion for Afghanistan. That is $400 million over the President's request. The level includes an additional $297 million to support the development and outfitting of the Afghan National Army, $191 million for roads, $95 million for electricity, and $69 million for elections and improved governance.

I know there is much discussion about whether these funds for Iraq should be direct assistance or extended as credit to be repaid later as a loan. I believe it would be a huge mistake to make these funds as a loan instead of as direct assistance as the bill provides.

The greatest burden for all of us is the knowledge that decisions we make as Congressmen and Congresswomen directly put the lives of Americans at risk. Already, men and women from many of the districts represented in this body have died in Iraq and Afghanistan. I firmly believe the supplemental bill as reported will go a long way to rebuilding a stable, free Iraq and Afghanistan and will support other initiatives to make Americans safer at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we will hear from Members who say they support the military portions of this bill, but not the reconstruction. I do not agree that such a distinction can be made or should be made. During our first hearing on reconstruction, I asked our commander of CENTCOM, General John Abizaid that question, and to conclude, I would like to quote his answer. He said, ''There is no strictly military solution to the problems we face. It requires that we move together on the political front, the economic front, on the reconstruction front in a manner that is synchronized and coordinated. If we don't do that, I do not believe we can be successful. So you can pay the military to stay there, but you are only paying us to stay forever.''

Mr. Chairman, General Abizaid's remarks are right on the mark. We need to support the President in carrying out foreign policy initiatives just as firmly as we support our troops on the ground. We need to build a stable and a peaceful Iraq and Afghanistan, because it is the right thing to do and because it is in America's national security interests.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

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

I rise in support of this supplemental. We must give our troops in the field who have performed brilliantly in deposing the despotic Taliban and Hussein regimes the equipment and materiel they need to succeed in their mission. That tragically was not done with our previous appropriation. It must be done with this one. Failure in Iraq is not an option, and additional funding is vital to our efforts.

I also believe that the reconstruction grants in this bill are inextricably linked to our opportunity to achieve success. As The Washington Post stated yesterday, ''Rebuilding the electricity grid, fixing the water supply, getting the oil flowing, maintaining public safety, all of this is central to hopes for stability and representative government.''

However, Mr. Chairman, my support today does not come without reservations or deep concern about administration failures to date. American troops and American taxpayers are bearing a disproportionate share of the burden, and I believe the responsibility for that falls directly on the Bush administration and its failed diplomacy.

Virtually every assumption that the administration made going into Iraq has either been wrong or has yet to be proved correct. Administration officials disputed General Shinseki's prediction that we would need several hundred thousand troops to succeed in Iraq. He was right. Today, we do not have enough military personnel to secure Iraqi weapons caches. Assistant Defense Secretary Wolfowitz prior to the war assured us that ''we are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon.'' Consideration of this bill today demonstrates the falsity of that claim.

Furthermore, the administration's postwar planning has been abysmal. As Senator HAGEL, a Republican of Nebraska, stated in September, ''I think the Bush administration did a miserable job of planning for post-Saddam Iraq. They treated many in the Congress, most in the Congress, like a nuisance. To that extent our allies are treated like the people's elected representatives here. This Congress has a constitutional duty to hold the executive branch accountable.''

I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), have scrutinized this legislation last week and made modifications and adopted amendments I offered requiring the administration to provide quarterly reports on a range of issues and advanced review of no-bid contracts raising justifiable concerns of war profiteering.

Finally, I believe the international community must recognize that the interests of the civilized world coalesce in Iraq; and thus the law-supporting nations of the world have an obligation, yes, a duty, to assist in securing and reconstructing Iraq. I urge the international community to step up and meet its responsibility at the donor conference next week.

Mr. Chairman, I supported our policy to remove the Hussein regime from power. It was a dangerous, genocidal regime that threatened the security of the region and the world. Having undertaken this task, we must succeed. The American people expect it, and our security demands it. We must, therefore, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the brave young men and women who are bearing the risks and burdens of this endeavor, and our taxpayers who are bearing its costs, carefully and with conviction review the policies, plans, and actions being proposed and taken to accomplish this critical mission. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is correct in that.

The war on terrorism is a very different kind of war. There are no defined battlefields and no easily identifiable enemy. It is a global war, and it is, like all wars, dangerous and costly. But it is a war we must win if freedom and security are to be achieved in this

21st century. I will, therefore, support this effort to accomplish that victory.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this emergency supplemental appropriations bill providing $87 billion for our continuing efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We must give our troops in the field, who have performed brilliantly in deposing the despotic Taliban and Hussein regimes, the equipment and materiel that they need to succeed in their missions. That tragically was not done with our previous appropriation. It must be done with this one.

Failure in Iraq is not an option. And additional funding is vital to our efforts.

I also believe the reconstruction grants in this bill are inextricably linked to our opportunity to achieve success.

As the Washington Post stated yesterday: ''Rebuilding the electricity grid, fixing the water supply, getting the oil flowing, maintaining public safety—all this is central to hopes for stability and representative government.''

However, Mr. Chairman, my support today does not come without reservation or deep concern about administration failures to date.

American troops and American taxpayers are bearing a disproportionate share of the burden, and I believe the responsibility for that falls directly on the Bush administration and its failed diplomacy.

Virtually every assumption that this administration made going into Iraq has either been wrong or yet to be proved correct.

Administration officials disputed General Shinseki's prediction that we would need several hundred thousand troops to secure Iraq.

Today, we do not have enough military personnel to secure Iraqi weapons caches.

Assistant Defense Secretary Wolfowitz assured us that: ''We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon.''

Consideration of this bill today demonstrates the falsity of that claim.

Furthermore, the administration's post-war planning has been abysmal. As Senator HAGEL stated in September: ''I think [the Bush administration] did a miserable job of planning for a post-Saddam Iraq. They treated many in the Congress, most in the Congress, like a nuisance.''

To that extent, our allies are treated like the people's elected representatives here.

This Congress has a constitutional duty to hold the executive branch accountable.

I am pleased that the appropriations committee scrutinized this legislation last week, and made modifications and adopted amendments I offered requiring the administration to provide quarterly reports on a range of issues and advanced review of no-bid contracts, raising justifiable concern and outrage about war profiteering.

Finally, I believe the international community must recognize that the interests of the civilized world coalesce in Iraq.

And thus the law-supporting nations have an obligation to assist in securing and reconstructing Iraq.

I urge the international community to step up and meet its responsibility at the donor conference next week.

Mr. Chairman, I supported our policy to remove the Hussein regime from power. It was a dangerous, genocidal regime that threatened the security of the region and the world.

Having undertaken this task we must succeed. The American people expect it and our security demands it.

We must, therefore, on behalf of the brave young men and women who are bearing the risks and burdens of this endeavor and our taxpayers who are bearing its costs, carefully and with conviction review the policies, plans and actions being proposed and taken to accomplish this critical objective.

The war on terrorism is a very different kind of war. There are no defined battlefields and no easily identifiable enemy. It is a global war. And, it is, like all wars, dangerous and costly. But, it is a war we must win if freedom and security are to be achieved in this 21st century. I will support this further effort to accomplish that victory.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I welcome and applaud the gentleman's support. In the meantime, it is my privilege to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding me this time. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and others who have put together, I think, a very good resolution to help ensure that we are successful in our efforts in Iraq.

But as I listened to the discussion over the last several weeks and to the debate over the last 24 hours on this specific resolution, I think many of my colleagues are losing the perspective of just how big an issue this is. I think we need to remember what happened over the last several decades as the Middle East grew increasingly unstable: Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait in 1991, the Taliban movement during the 1990s in Afghanistan, the weapons of mass destruction that were being proliferated throughout the region and, certainly, the effects of 9–11 and our effort to rid the world of terrorism. All of this instability in the Middle East was threatening the world economy, and let us not kid ourselves.

I think President Bush did the right thing when he led the effort for us to go into Iraq. He could have done what Presidents have done over the decades, and that is gone to the U.N., trying to persuade the U.N., which he did, but they never really quite had the gall and the nerve or the courage to do what needed to be done in Iraq. So the President decided on his own, with his administration and the support of this Congress, to go to Iraq and do what needed to be done.

The American people ought to applaud his actions. It is the most dramatic shift in U.S. foreign policy in our 200-year history, to go in and preemptively take out a foreign leader and to try to bring some sort of democracy to a region of the world that has never known any type of democracy. All of this was made possible because of the men and women in uniform willing to go in and fight on our behalf and now willing to be there to try to secure the peace.

The President made his point very clear early on that peace was going to be more difficult than war, and certainly it has. But I would argue to all of my colleagues that we have no choice but to succeed. Our grandchildren and their children are the ones who will know whether decisions we have made over the last year were right or not, not us in our lifetime. And the $87 billion that we have on the table to help ensure success ought to be supported.

For those who want to make these loans rather than grants, just let me suggest there is not a Member of this body who does not know that none of this money is ever going to be repaid. We can call it what we want; but the fact is, these are grants, they are going to be grants, and we can play with the folks back home, we can make politics out of this. The people of Iraq cannot afford to pay this back. And if we are going to be successful and if we are going to help our troops get home as quickly as possible, let us play no games. Let us stand tall, let us stand proud, let us support the resolution and bring our troops home as soon as we can.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, before I comment on the supplemental, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY) for their very important work on the bill. I would like to recognize the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE), my very good friend and colleague on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operation, Export Financing and Related Programs. For 3 years, the gentleman and I have worked together to craft a foreign aid bill, always mindful that our work abroad has a direct impact on the stability and prosperity of those nations that we seek to assist and a direct impact on the national security of the United States. The gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) is as open to ideas and suggestions, as intelligent in his reasoning and responses, and as gracious in his manner as any Member of Congress that I have known. It has been a true pleasure to work with him, and I look forward to more years of partnership, trust, and accomplishment.

Mr. Chairman, this Iraq supplemental is enormous and complex and has provoked passionate and very different opinions among us and the public. Everyone has their own ideas about how it could be done. In my judgment, the request made by the President and the CPA was shaped by a series of miscalculations, miscalculations about how the international community would react to United States operations in Iraq, how we would be received by Iraqis, what would be required to rebuild, how generous other nations would be with donations. That is why this debate is so very important; and everyone should be heard for the sake of our constituents, our heroic

Armed Forces, and our democracy. We should not just rubber stamp the executive branch's request.

As I said, everyone might have their own ideas about how it could be done, but I think it is crucial that we remember why it should be done. At stake, in my judgment, is the reconstruction of Iraq, a country whose stability and growth is critical for our own national security. Failure in Iraq would create a dangerous vacuum in the heart of the Middle East, a vacuum with no order. It would be a place where hatred of the United States would thrive and where those who seek to plot against us would find another safe haven. That is why this supplemental is necessary and important, and I urge my colleagues to consider that as we debate today.

However, it is important to stress again that while the goal is clear, the execution has been, frankly, mediocre. We do not have a plan. We do not have clear priorities, strong safeguards, or a sustained diplomatic effort.

□ 1600

Taken separately, each is a serious shortcoming. Taken together, they have led to a reconstruction effort that appears haphazard and irresponsible.

However Members vote on this supplemental, we have a dual responsibility to national security and to fiscal stability. The effort in Iraq is crucial for our security, but we must be honest about the cost and about the tough choices we face.

I did hope that we would have a full and open debate that would allow us to consider the package drafted by the Ranking Member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I strongly supported the Obey amendment because it spoke to the needs in Iraq, the concerns of our military and their families, and the constraints of our Federal budget. It was a responsible approach that took much of the burden off the United States taxpayer. And I am truly disappointed that we were not able to vote on it.

If this were a true democratic House, we would have the opportunity not only to have a full debate, but to be able to take a position on an alternative that I think is really constructive and would be supported by a good deal, maybe even the majority, of the Members of this House.

I look forward to hearing from my colleagues as debate on amendments begin.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS), one of those Members who experienced our fabulous trip to Iraq recently.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very important legislation.

I was honored to join the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and 16 other Members of the House on our trip to Iraq just a few short weeks ago. I was honored to convey the sincere gratitude of my constituents and all Americans to our troops for the devoted service and immeasurable contributions to the safety and security of our Nation.

Our brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines have exhibited remarkable courage, skill, and ingenuity in defeating Saddam's Hussein's military. They are now exhibiting an equal level of courage, skill, and ingenuity in rooting out the remnants of regime loyalist, foreign terrorists, and common criminals who are determined to obstruct Iraq's transformation into a peaceful, democratic nation.

Much of our time in Iraq focused on getting a firsthand understanding of the status of stabilization and normalization efforts. Our delegation met extensively with United States Army General Ricardo Sanchez and Major General Raymond Odierno and other senior American and coalition nation military and civilian leaders. These individuals presented compelling arguments, emphasizing the importance of funding electrical, water, and security infrastructure improvements throughout Iraq to ensure that we win the peace just as we won the war.

Generals Sanchez and Odierno emphasized that infrastructure improvements will not only improve the quality of life for Iraqi citizens, but also the security of American troops in Iraq. General Sanchez stated that sustaining the existing level of troops in Iraq for the foreseeable future is critical for achieving and maintaining a safe and secure environment in all corners of Iraq.

The General emphasized, however, that we are not going to win the peace militarily. Rather, the peace will be won through Iraq's economic revitalization, political transformation, and the establishment of Iraq's own security forces.

Our delegation's visit to a mass grave site just outside of Al Hillah, in southern Iraq, and the newborn intensive care unit at Al Yarmuk Hospital in Baghdad were two of our more emotional and somber visits. What these visits told us, though, is we must finish the job and do right by our soldiers in Iraq.

The remains of approximately 3,000 men, women, and children were found in the Al Hillah grave site, one of countless mass grave sites throughout Iraq. These individuals, including infant children, were executed by Saddam Hussein's regime in the spring of 1991 as part of the regime's mass execution of at least 30,000 Iraqi Shiites.

The chief administrator at Al Yarmuk Hospital, an Iraqi physician, described Saddam Hussein's refusal to invest in Iraq's healthcare system over many years. The tragic death of one of the newborns in the intensive care unit during our visit emphasized Iraq's healthcare challenges, including a staggering infant mortality rate of over 100 infant deaths per 1,000 births.

While there is much work to be done and many challenges to be overcame, there were many signs that peace has gained a strong foothold throughout Iraq. Children cheering on the Coalition forces escorting our convoy, grateful and hopeful words of Iraqi civic leaders, civilian traffic congestion on the streets, children playing soccer, the return of power generation to pre-war levels, the training and deployment of 40,000 Iraqi police officers, and the existence of more than 150 free and independent newspapers in Iraq.

With the continued support and assistance of the United States and our allies, the people of Iraq are on the path to transforming their country into a peaceful, thriving democratic nation. The funds for civilian infrastructure projects contained in this legislation will help ensure that the years of despair, fear, and torture under Saddam Hussein's regime are successfully replaced with freedom, justice, and hope for a bright and promising future for all Iraqi citizens.

Finally, and more importantly, as Generals Sanchez and Odierno emphasized, these supplemental funds will help to ensure that our courageous men and women in uniform have the resources they need to fulfill their challenging mission in Iraq and in the broader War on Terrorism. I urge all members to support this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Last week I had the opportunity and the privilege to travel to Iraq. We met with troops on the ground, military command, the civilian administration with CPA. And nothing has made me more proud to be an American than the opportunity to visit our troops in the field, whether it has been in Bosnia, Kosovo or now in Iraq. They are doing a tremendously good job under very difficult and dangerous circumstances.

And I believe General Zinni was right when he said that the high level of sacrifice that our troops and their families have made for this mission has not been met by the high level of planning that was required for this mission.

But whether one agrees with the merits on the methodology of going into Iraq, now that we are there, I believe that we must succeed. Failure is not an option. We do not have the luxury of cutting and running right now. But what we do from this point on can make all the difference.

That is why I stand in support of the Obey substitute, which I think is a commonsense, practical approach of leveraging the limited funds that we have available to put in Iraq through the World Bank, but also diversifying the many resources for our troops and enhancing the quality of life issues that are so important to them in their performance, and also by asking another segment of our country to contribute something as well, the upper 1 percent of the wealthy in this Nation, who if they were to postpone or freeze their tax cut would pay for this entire supplemental along with additional

funds in the future which will be needed. It's the right thing to do for the sake of our children.

I believe we need to internationalize this. And, hopefully, the U.N. unanimous vote today will help bring us closer to sharing the burden and bringing legitimacy to the process with other lay nations who can contribute troops and resources in a meaningful way. Thus far, we are paying a very high price in both lives and money due to the unilateral action in Iraq.

But I also believe we must work simultaneously on empowering the Iraqi people themselves to take control of their own destiny and have control of their own fate. Because, at the end of the day, it is going to be the attitude of the Iraqi people themselves that will determine the future of their country.

So I beseech my colleagues to give it due consideration and to support the Obey substitute which addresses so many of these issues in a practical and commonsense fashion. We can support our troops and the goals in Iraq, but we can do it in a fiscally responsible manner or we will build upon the legacy of debt that our children and grandchildren will inherent.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) perhaps use some of his time? And I think the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) will want to close.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have said it many times, we need to restate it, though, apparently, again, there is no question between the debating sides here whether Saddam Hussein was a tyrant. The world is far better off without him. And we are glad he is gone. We certainly hope he is gone. There is no debate as to the priority that we want to place on our troops. Obviously, that is our highest priority. And we will do what we see as necessary to protect their lives and provide for their families.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is something else involved here that goes beyond the issue of Iraq. This is about the integrity of this institution, the role it has to play vis-a-vis the executive branch. It is about the precedent that we establish with such important votes.

We had a hearing today with the comptroller of the Department of Defense, the Committee on the Budget did. It was similar to the hearing we had last week with Secretary Rumsfeld. We were told again that there is no time frame for when we might be moving our troops out of Iraq. Remember when the time frame was imposed on President Clinton with regard to Bosnia? Pretty tight time frame, as I recall. Today, were told that there was no estimate as to how many troops might be required or what the composition might be between National Guard and Reserve versus enlisted personnel.

I remember when we put pretty tight controls in Bosnia and Kosovo, even though it was a multilateral effort, led by NATO. We were told today that there was no estimate as to the ultimate cost of this conflict or of the reconstruction.

Now, how many times do we have to be told that we are being taken for granted, that the power of the purse that we hold, which is really all that our constituents expect us to use as leverage, is not there if we continue to give a blank check? And that basically is what the administration is asking for in this supplemental.

I support the Obey amendment because, in fact, it does provide for the troops. Even more specifically, it will not let the administration get away again with getting $60 billion and not spending it on the most basic necessities of individual and collective protection for our troops on the battlefield. And Iraq still is a battlefield.

But it also requires some burden sharing, not as much as the first President Bush required, where he got most of the war paid for by other countries because we had taken the time to build a coalition. It is time we used our leverage to require that there be some burden sharing of this conflict, some considerations for the other needs of the American taxpayer.

The Obey amendment makes sure that we use the World Bank. Seven billion will collateralize another 35 billion. It will quadruple the amount of money that we put in, that the taxpayers put in. Because it is not our money, as we are continually reminded, it is the taxpayers we are talking about.

But, most importantly, we have to acknowledge that it is not acceptable to engage in conflict, putting our troops at risk with the use of a pattern of deception. I know we do not like to hear this, but how many times were we told there was a connection between 9/11 and Saddam Hussein? President Bush admitted just a short while ago, no, there was no connection. We were told by the Vice President that they had nuclear capability. Now, he admits he misspoke. That is not acceptable. This is a bad precedent.

I have tremendous respect for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, for the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). Their commitment to our troops, to our military superiority and to our military doing the right thing is unparalleled. No question. But, we have a responsibility. It is an institutional responsibility and a moral responsibility not just to do right by the taxpayer, but, to also do right by the troops, to do right by this institution, to demand answers to legitimate questions: How long? How many troops? What will be the cost? What is the commitment? We have not been given answers to those questions. And we should not approve this supplemental until we are given answers, straight answers.

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

Mr. Chairman, just recently I went to Walter Reed Hospital, and there I visited Chris Knapp, a constituent of mine from Yucca Valley, California. He had been driving a Bradley not so long before that that was struck by enemy fire. He was hit by shrapnel, was proud of the fact. He showed me the Purple Heart that the President presented him with the day before, as well as the President's personal coin.

He talked most, however, about Sergeant Ramirez, who had been so kind to him when he was injured. He did not talk about the fact that the night after he had been with the President, they had taken out his right eye.

He urged me to communicate that they need our support. They are there for a purpose called freedom. It was Chris Knapp and his buddies and Sergeant Ramirez who are fighting the good fight over there. All they are asking for today is our real support and not our lip service.

Mr. Chairman, I must say it is my privilege and pleasure to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of our committee who provides the endless base of support and provides the point for the fight for our people in Iraq that are defending freedom.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate yesterday, and today, and probably will listen late into the evening tonight. And I must say that while I have some strong disagreements with some of these statements made and some very strong support and endorsement of some of the speeches and statements that have been made, I believe that the Congress does itself proud today. I think the level of debate is very high, and I think the Congress should get good marks. At the end of the day, I am satisfied that we are going to pass this bill because it is important. And this bill is designed to help fix many of the things that have been complained about in the Iraqi operation.

We want an exit strategy. Everyone wants an exit strategy. I remember asking President Clinton years ago, what is our exit strategy for Bosnia?

□ 1615

Well, he said, it is not that easy to make that decision. It depends on how long it takes to stabilize the country.

Well, we are still in Bosnia. However, I will state that the United States Armed Forces have done a really good job there. Bosnia has been stabilized.

Bosnia is really coming back economically. It was worth the investment to stop the murder that was taking place in Bosnia.

What we are doing today is appropriating the money to provide the exit strategy for our American troops plus the equipment that they need in order to carry out their mission and in order to protect themselves to the best extent possible.

The large amount of the money, that is for our own Armed Forces, does not seem to have developed any controversy. I think we are all for that.

Where the controversy has developed is over the money to help to establish a government in Iraq and to support a government in Afghanistan. What we are talking about here is bringing our troops home as soon as we can. I want them out of there tomorrow, if possible. I do not want to go visit any more wounded soldiers and Marines in the hospitals. I want the killing to stop.

One of our colleagues on the other side said, stop the war; stop the killing. I agree. We did not start the war. We did not start the war. We did our very best as we prosecuted this war to make sure that we did it without targeting any nonmilitary targets and without attacking those who were not involved in Saddam's regime. By stabilizing this country, by helping to build a school system, by helping to build a monetary system, by helping to build a judicial system, by helping to build a police force, and by helping to build a security force, we can prevent any more tyrants like Saddam Hussein from taking control in Iraq. That is our exit strategy, to make those things happen; and that is what this money is for, to make those things happen.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 1 minute remaining.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1¼ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, once you fire the bullet, you do have an obligation to clean up the mess; and that is why I certainly agree with virtually every task in Iraq that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) just described.

I do not agree with those who believe that we should just provide a military package and not provide a reconstruction package. That would be, in my view, irresponsible. But having said that, I think the problem is that the package that is being proposed is insufficient in terms of what it does to help the troops; and it is wasteful in terms of what it does in Iraq, and badly through out to boot. That is why we have been asking questions of the administration about their future plans.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) says we need to finance an exit strategy. The problem is we have no exit strategy. Until we do, we are going to be floundering and we will have a tremendous number of American lives disrupted. So that is why I have come to a different conclusion on this specific package than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I know that the gentleman inadvertently used some of his time, and I will be happy to yield him 1 minute so that the gentleman could add to his time for closing.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding me time and for his excellent work in putting together the Obey substitute, the Democratic substitute, which unfortunately cannot come to the floor today but nonetheless would be a brilliant, brilliant way for us to reconstruct Iraq, provide for our troops, and bring them home safely and soon, having stabilized Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his always reasonable approach to challenges that we have.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for his great service, and I will say more on that later, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), for what they have added to this package.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), that I am glad to hear that exit strategy means something different to him than some of our colleagues on the gentleman's side of the aisle who said exit strategy means cut and run. The gentleman and I know that that is not what that means.

We all know that we must support our troops. We respect their courage, their patriotism, the sacrifices they are willing to make for our country. We also know that for their successful completion of their mission, that we must invest in the infrastructure in Iraq; and we know that we cannot come home until that mission is accomplished. So that is not what this debate is. There is no difference about that.

The difference is how we go about doing it, and I think there is a big difference there. I would like to say something about the lack of planning on the part of the administration. It is in the spirit of that context that I rise in opposition to President Bush's request for $87 billion to bail out his failed policy in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, as Members of Congress, we all recognize that we have no greater responsibility than that which is charged to us in the Preamble of the Constitution: to provide for the common defense. We have all take that responsibility seriously on both sides of the aisle and all over the country.

The United States military is the best-trained, best-led, best-equipped fighting force the world has ever known. This excellence is due to the dedication of our courageous military men and women and their commanders. It is also due to the commitment of this and previous Congresses over many years to provide for the common defense, by ensuring that our forces have the tools and technologies that they need to prevail on the battlefield.

Again, we respect our men and women in uniform and we should respect them when they are on the battlefield and when they come home. And out of respect for them, I would have hoped that our colleagues could join us in discharging the petition to eliminate the tax on disabilities that exist in current law on our disabled vets.

Going back to the war, whatever our position was on going to the war, once we went in, we were one team, one fight. Our military performed their duties excellently. It is painfully clear, though, that this administration had no plan to protect our men and women in Iraq against the possibility of a guerilla campaign. The war supplemental last spring is proof enough. The President asked for and the Congress provided $63 billion to ensure that our soldiers could complete their mission successfully and securely. Yet, as revealed by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), a decorated veteran whose defense credentials are beyond question, our military personnel are short of Kevlar inserts for their body armor, short of tracks for their Bradley fighting vehicles, short of jammers to protect them from the detonation of explosive devices, and short of spare parts generally for the equipment on which they rely. Again, our men and women in uniform deserve better.

When the President asked for this $65 billion, we gave it to him. We never got an accounting for it. When the President hit with his bombshell of asking for $87 billion more, we said we would like to see an accounting of the $63 billion that was appropriated for last summer. We want to know why our men and women in uniform do not have the protection they need to fight this war, this postwar period. We want an accounting, a justification for the $87 billion that the White House is asking for now. We want an accountability for this failed policy.

The $87 billion request did not yet even include the funding for the Kevlar and the jammers and the spare parts and the tracks. It really was not until the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) made a big issue of it, and I commend him and I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for

putting this in the bill with the help, of course, of the chairman of the committee. But it was not in the President's request.

It was not in the President's request to protect our troops with what they needed. They had a chance to do it and they did not. I find that very, very unacceptable. As General Zinni said, and others have repeated here, the level of sacrifice has not been matched by the level of planning. What he exactly said is this: ''They should never be put on a battlefield without a strategic plan, not only for fighting, our generals will take care of that, but for the aftermath and winning that war. Where are we, the American people, if we accept this level of sacrifice without that level of planning?'' General Zinni.

America wants to know. What was that $63 billion spent on besides the gold-plated, single-source, no-bid contracts for politically connected contractors? We simply do not know. So that is why we take issue with the $87 billion request.

Don't take it from me. General Petraeus, a great general whom many of us have met in our visits to the theater, he has said that U.S. engineers called for $15 million to turn a cement factory into a state-of-the-art factory. Our troops working with the Iraqis got it up and running, not for $15 million, but for $80,000, for $80,000. We were not responsible for a $15 million state-of-the-art factory. It is up and running at $80,000. You hear this over and over again.

Again, to date there has been no accounting for that money, no accountability for the policy. As a result, American soldiers are taking virtually all the risks, and American taxpayers are paying virtually all the bills.

Our men and women in uniform deserve better. The American people deserve better. Make no mistake, the President's supplemental request is an $87 billion bailout for mistakes and miscalculations of this administration. They have miscalculated the risk. We saw and heard General Zinni's statements about that. They misunderstood the challenge, and they misrepresented the cost.

One week into the war, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz told the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and their Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, ''We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon.''

How wrong was that? And we know that this is not the end of it. The administration has told us that they need 50 to $75 billion more for infrastructure. When we asked them why they did not put this in the President's $87 billion request, they said that they were going to get it from oil revenues and from our allies. Again, a miscalculation. That funding is obviously not happening. So let us be clear, what we were considering today is not a final payment; it is a down payment. It is an installment on more to come.

The American people look to us to ask the difficult questions, to ensure accountability and not to rubber stamp a policy that has failed in terms of its planning and, therefore, endangered our sons and daughters in uniform. We all appreciate what we need to do. We must address the needs of our forces in Iraq. We must bring stability to that country. We must invest in the infrastructure.

□ 1630

The administration wants us to do a gold-plated, no-bid contract version of the story. They want the gold-plated version, and they have a tin ear to what the American people are saying. They say honor our responsibilities, honor our men and women in uniform, but please do not put our children into debt, our grandchildren into debt without some idea of how this is going to be paid for and what the cost will be.

We would have been better off if we had internationalized this from the start, but we did not. So now what we need to do, again, is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has said over and over. We need to energize Iraq, turn on the lights and water so we can proceed with the reconstruction.

To hear the administration tell the tale, this has all been done, but nonetheless, more is required. We must ''Iraqtize'' it by giving the Iraqis more authority and responsibility to do what they need to do for their country. And we must internationalize the effort so our troops once again are not taking all the risks and our taxpayers paying all the bills.

The question before us today is simple, what is the best way to achieve this goal. It is a complicated matter, but the question is what is the best way to go about it. The answer to me is clear, the Obey substitute. It is a more responsible approach, both fiscally and militarily. It does more for our men and women in uniform before, during and after deployments.

The Obey amendment better protects American taxpayers and their children and their grandchildren because it is paid for, and by having the World Bank administer a loan program for a portion of the reconstruction effort, it will stimulate more international financial support.

In short, the Obey amendment does more to support our troops and encourage international participation in stabilizing and rebuilding Iraq and costs the American taxpayers less. It deserves our support.

Unfortunately, the Obey amendment will not be allowed to be presented and voted on the floor, and I know why. It is brilliant. If it were presented as an alternative to the $87 billion Bush request, it would probably attract Republican support. It would have an impact on this failed policy. So, sadly, we will not have a chance to vote on it. It is really always interesting to me that it is against the rules of the House to make a proposal that is paid for, that makes it out of order.

I think that we ought to see the Obey substitute and the whole debate in the context of where we are as a country. Here we are, the greatest military power that ever was. Our economy, hopefully soon on the upturn, is the greatest engine for economic growth in the world. The power of our ideas have been a source of strength to us and to others in the world forever. So we are strong in every way, and yet never ever have we been more dependent on other countries for the security of our people.

If we are going to succeed in Iraq, we must reach out to others. President Kennedy said it best in his inaugural address. Some of us were in school at the time and heard the inaugural address, and everybody knows the statement ''Citizens of America, ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.'' Children learned that in school. Others of us heard it. It is history for some. It was our youth for others of us.

The very next line in that speech—is ''to the citizens of the world, ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind.'' Let that be our clarion call, what we, working together with the people of the world, can do for the freedom of mankind. We must not find ourselves in a situation where there is a tyrant, and good riddance to him, where we have to go in with inadequate intelligence, inadequate international support and, again, have our kids take all of the risk.

Let us show the greatness of our country, as well as the strength of our country. We could do that by supporting the Obey amendment today. In the absence of that, let us hope that we can have our policy recognize once again that the security of our great country has never been more dependent on others.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I again reiterate my opposition to the $87 billion bailout of the failed Bush policy and support of the Obey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY's) transfer of 1 minute, the majority has 2 minutes to close.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for giving me the additional minute, and I am very happy that the gentlewoman who made a very persuasive speech ended up talking about freedom of mankind, and she is exactly right.

But what does an Iraq or any other nation controlled by a dictator, a tyrannical dictator like Saddam Hussein, contribute to the freedom of mankind? I do not think it contributes anything.

I said earlier we did not start this war. This war started on February 26,

1993, when the World Trade Center was bombed by terrorists, six lives lost.

This was further exacerbated on June 25, 1996, when the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia was bombed. Nineteen American airmen living in the towers lost their lives.

August 7, 1998, American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were bombed. Two hundred and fifty-nine lives were lost, bombed by terrorists.

October 12, 2000, the USS *Cole*, an American destroyer off the coast of Yemen, bombed, 17 sailors killed and many others injured.

Our responses were rather tepid, some investigations, some strong words and threats, but not much action.

Then, on September 11, 2002, hijacked airplanes crashed into the World Trade Center, 3,000 lives were lost. A hijacked plane crashed into the Pentagon, 189 lives lost. A hijacked plane crashed in rural Pennsylvania, 45 lives lost.

After September 11, the United States of America moved strongly and aggressively with the strong leadership of President George W. Bush to do something about it, more than just talk, more than just words, but action, to eliminate the threat of terrorism so that the freedom of mankind can be enjoyed by everybody, not just of those who live here in America.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, what we do today is an investment in our future, a future free from the threat of terrorism, from the fear of terrorists. We are making an investment in a future for our kids and our grandkids and our great grandkids and future generations for time to come, as we eliminate that terrible scourge of terrorism throughout the world.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, last night I testified before the Rules Committee as they were preparing to draft the rule governing debate on this Supplemental Appropriation bill, and I made a sincere plea that just as we are fighting to provide freedom for the Iraqi people, I hoped that we in Congress would be allowed the same kind of democratic freedoms to debate and vote on the many issues related to this bill.

Once again I was disappointed by the decision of the Rules Committee to not act and protect my amendments and dozens of others put forward by my colleagues so that they might be considered during debate on this bill. So I find it very difficult to support this request from the President, which would address none of the outstanding concerns I have raised about providing for accountability on the cost of the war, about developing a plan for the reconstruction of Iraq and for troop deployments, and finally about not placing the burden of the cost of the reconstruction entirely on a future generation of American taxpayers.

Last year I voted against the Resolution on this floor that sent us to war against Iraq, opposed to the policies of preemption and unilateralism and of giving an open ended and undefined mandate to wage war in Iraq. I coauthored an alternative at that time that would have required the President to work through the United Nations to build international support culminating in a new U.N. resolution authorizing military action in Iraq and providing for an expedited consideration of a use of force resolution by the Congress at that time. The Bush Administration and the Republican Majority in Congress strenuously opposed this proposal, and it was ultimately voted down.

It was voted down because we were told by President Bush and his supporters that there was an imminent threat from Saddam Hussein, who was planning on a moment's notice to attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction. We were told that Saddam Hussein was linked with al-Qaeda and the September 11th terrorist attack on the United States. We were told that we had a strong international coalition of allies poised to take action and share the burden of war and peace with us. We were told that we had a plan for post-war reconstruction and finally, that Iraq had the financial resources and infrastructure to pay for its own reconstruction.

Yet here we are today, almost a year later, debating an $87 billion supplemental appropriation bill for ongoing military action and reconstruction in Iraq. This is in addition to the roughly $79 billion supplemental that Congress appropriated for this war last April.

We have yet to find Saddam Hussein or any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. There is no viable international support for this policy. There remains no plan for reconstruction, and President Bush's father knew full well about these potential problems in pursuing this type of policy in Iraq. In his book, ''A World Transformed,'' which was published before his son took office, he wrote: ''Trying to eliminate Saddam Hussein, extending the ground war into an occupation of Iraq, would have violated our guideline about not changing objectives midstream, engaging in 'mission creep,' and would have incurred incalculable human and political costs . . . Apprehending [Saddam Hussein] was probably impossible. We had not been able to find Noriega in Panama, which we knew intimately. We would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq. The coalition would immediately have collapsed, the Arabs deserting it in anger and other allies pulling out as well.''

While the Administration continues to be unable to provide any details about what the last $79 billion Congress appropriated for this war was spent on or what the costs of a continued U.S. presence in Iraq might be, an analysis conducted by Congressman SPRATT, Ranking Member of the House Budget Committee, concludes that if Congress approves the 2004 supplemental the President has submitted, and does not spend any new money on Iraq after 2004, the cost to the United States, including interest on the public debt, will reach $178 billion over the next decade. This includes only the cost of operations in Iraq, and excludes all estimated costs from 2003 and 2004 supplementals related to Afghanistan.

The point has been made repeatedly about the need to sacrifice. Yet the only people sacrificing for this country currently are the men and women who wear the uniform. Further burdens shouldn't be placed upon them and their children, both incurring more deficit and having this nation pay for this by increasing the already burdensome national debt.

I have drafted amendments to address many of my concerns with this bill, and my first amendment proposes that we pay for the President's $87 billion supplemental appropriation request for ongoing military operations and reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan by suspending a portion of the reductions in the highest income tax rate for individual taxpayers.

It would reduce the total tax cut of the wealthiest top .7 percent of Americans from $690 billion to $600 billion over the term of the tax cut by reducing the top tax rate to 38.2 for the 6-year period between 2005 and 2010. The top rate for wealthiest .7 percent of Americans has dropped this year from above 39 percent down to 35 percent. This amendment would affect less than 5 percent of the $1.8 trillion tax cut enacted during the last 3 years.

I would like to stress that it does not take away the tax cut. The tax rate for the top .7 percent of Americans would still be lower than it was last year. Instead of receiving 100 times the tax cut that middle-class America received, at $600 billion the top .7 percent of Americans would still get 60 times what the middle-class American gets. They would still receive $1 billion more than every other American combined will get from the tax cut.

The average income of the top .7 percent of Americans is $1 million per year. This amendment would affect, at a minimum, people who have an income before standard deductions and exemptions of over $400,00 in gross income. It would also affect those with a net taxable income of over $312,000 after deductions and exemptions. It does not impact or change individuals' capital gains tax rates or dividend exemptions.

My second amendment seeks to provide accountability to the American people on the President's Iraq foreign policy. Specifically, it would provide the full request to the Department of Defense to meet the needs and resupply American service men and women deployed around the world. It also would provide $4.5 billion for security, law enforcement, justice, public safety and public safety infrastructures, Iraqi boarder enforcement, enhanced security communications, and the establishment of the Iraq Defense Corps. However, it would limit to $5 billion the funding for other discretionary Iraq reconstruction efforts of the administration until April 2004 unless the Congress enacts specific legislation authorizing additional funding requested by the President for reconstruction in Iraq.

It requires the President to submit a detailed report to Congress by March 2004 estimating the total cost of U.S. operations, setting out a strategy for securing international support, a schedule, including costs and timetables for an establishment of Iraqi armed forces and a security force, an estimated schedule of the establishment of an Iraqi constitution and an estimated schedule of U.S. deployments and ultimate withdrawal from Iraq.

Finally, this amendment would require the President to certify in a report to Congress that the U.N. Security Council has authorized a multi-national force under U.S. leadership and provides a central role for the U.N. in the political and economic development and reconstruction. The report must also certify that U.S. reconstruction efforts are being implemented according to a detailed plan that includes fixed timetables and costs, with a significant financial contribution from other nations.

The third amendment I am proposing calls for the General Accounting Office to conduct a detailed study of the policy of preemption and unilateralism and its effect on the military deployment capabilities, readiness, recruiting and

retention rates, morale, total force structure, and end strength of the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components.

Finally, when I held a town hall meeting on Monday night, October 13, about this supplemental appropriation request, I heard the story of Pene Palifka of East Hartford. Her son, Bill, is serving in the 248th Engineer Company in Iraq. She came forward and provided the money herself to get a Kevlar vest for her son over there, because as it has been reported and as I heard directly from soldiers serving in Iraq when I visited there in August, there is a shortage of roughly 40,000 of these vests. That's simply wrong. Congress appropriated funding in the last supplemental to procure and distribute these vests last April, but this still has not been done.

So, my fourth amendment provides for the direct reimbursement from the United States Treasury to service members or their families who purchase protective body armor for deployments as part of the global war on terrorism.

However, I understand that because the Rules Committee did not act to protect these amendments that they would be subject to a point of order and that I will be blocked from getting a vote on them. We should be able to debate these issues. We should be able to vote on these issues.

I will continue to pursue these efforts and seek answers to the many questions we all still have about this policy, but I cannot support this bill if it does not address or make progress on these fundamental issues.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which would reimburse air fare costs incurred by members of the United States Armed Forces in connection with travel within the United States while on leave from deployment overseas in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. This amendment is the same as what has been offered and passed by the U.S. Senate but specifically defines United States to include each territory and commonwealth of the United States.

As a Vietnam veteran, I am fully supportive of the military's Rest and Relaxation program which allows soldiers who have served 12 straight months to qualify for R&R and allows them to return home and see their families. However, at present this program only provides travel to hubs such as BWI and requires soldiers to make their own way home. Oftentimes, airfare costs are prohibitive and leave soldiers stranded far from home.

Thankfully, the Senate passed an amendment to its supplemental appropriations bill which would extend the R&R program to include domestic travel and I believe it is time for the House to now demonstrate its commitment to our soldiers. Our soldiers serving in Iraq and Afghanistan should not be burdened with the costs of travel to return to their home of residence to briefly reunite with family, friends, and loved ones. Moreover, soldiers whose home of residence is American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands should not be excluded from any R&R program that may be offered.

Although other amendments may be offered in support of R&R for our soldiers, it is unclear as to whether language proposed by other members for this same type of funding would extend to soldiers whose home of residence is American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands. While I am confident that it is not the intent of Congress to exclude soldiers from the Insular Areas from the benefits of a reimbursement program, I want to make sure that soldiers serving from American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are afforded the same rights and privileges as every other man and woman serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Again, as a Vietnam veteran, I am painfully aware of the sacrifices that our soldiers are making in defense of this nation. Only last month, one of American Samoa's young sons was killed in Iraq and I accompanied his body home to American Samoa. Like others before him, like more to come, he gave his life so that you and I may live in freedom.

While we can never repay the sacrifices being made in our behalf, I do believe we can agree to do right by our soldiers. We can begin by reimbursing service members for the cost of their airfare home to be reunited with their families under the terms of the R&R program. We can also make sure that travel reimbursements are made available to all members of the U.S. Armed Forces, including those from the insular areas.

I would like to point out that American Samoans have a long and proud history of supporting the United States. Tutuila's harbor is the deepest in the South Pacific and the port village of Pago Pago was used as a coaling station for U.S. naval ships in the early part of the century and as a support base for U.S. soldiers during WWII. To this day, American Samoa serves as a refueling point for U.S. naval ships and military aircraft.

American Samoa also has a per capita enlistment rate in the U.S. military which is as high as any State or U.S. Territory. Our sons and daughters have served in record numbers in every U.S. military engagement from WWII to present operations in our war against terrorists. We have stood by the United States in good times and bad and it is time for the U.S. Congress to now stand with us.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, sometimes great nations are called on to assume great responsibilities.

As the greatest nation on earth, and the target of fundamentalist terror on 9/11, we have been obliged to assume the mantle of leadership in a global war on terrorism. That conflict, for better or for worse, has brought us and our allies into Iraq and Afghanistan.

We now have an obligation to support the aspiration of those peoples for a free society and a free economy. Unfortunately, the regimes that have been removed in both countries have left their people in such a wretched position that it requires an active intervention by the U.S. to restore their economic potential. It is our responsibility to help these peoples as much as we helped Western Europe after World War II in the hope they will join us in the community of free nations.

The part of this appropriation measure that I wish to speak on is not the military expenditures. There are many of my colleagues who are better qualified to speak on such matters. Today, I rise in support of the social investments and economic assistance which we are offering Iraq and Afghanistan—$20 billion for two countries devastated by decades of dictatorship.

This appropriation finances the improvement of water resources and sanitation including drinking water for millions of Iraqis with funds to provide these services to both rural and urban Iraq.

This appropriation measure would allow Iraq to restore much of their budget for the critical transportation infrastructure destroyed by war and allowed to deteriorate by a rogue regime.

This measure would also provide for the critical investments in civil society necessary to allow Iraqis to restore order, including funds to adequately recruit, train and equip police, border security, civil defense and traffic police.

This measure will rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure and put its oil economy back on course. For the record, America did not go to Iraq for oil. But Iraq's vast oil reserves are key to its economic resurrection and a keystone to stability in the region.

If these countries are to become bulwarks of freedom, resistant to the influence of Islamic fundamentalism, we need to give the peoples of Iraq and Afghanistan the tools they need to put themselves on a sound footing. Iraq in particular has been devastated by decades of dictatorship and U.N. sanctions.

I would have preferred to be in the position of a lender, extending to Iraq credits rather than direct investments in order to allow the use of their natural economic strengths and huge mineral resources and put themselves on a sound footing. Yet, so large are the dictator's debts against the limited revenues available, I believe what Iraq needs now is our direct assistance, not the weight of additional IOU's.

I hope that the French, Russians and others will also see their way to write down those Iraqi debts that they hold. Until then, we should accept the obligation that springs from being a great nation, a good neighbor, and global defender of freedom to support a prostrate people and give them an opportunity to revive their nation's fortunes.

This vote will be one of the most important that I cast. It may be one of the most controversial. But, if America is to truly lead by example, adhere to its principles and assume the responsibility that comes with national greatness while serving our national interests in every corner of the world, then we must make this contribution now, for their sake, for ours and for the sake of future generations.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, tonight I will cast a vote in support of the Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 2004—to provide $87 billion in supplemental funding for military operations (making up roughly $66 billion) and reconstruction efforts (accounting for an approximate $21 billion) in Iraq.

I believe giving our troops in the field the financial support they need to finish the job in Iraq and providing this critically strategic nation with the resources needed to rebuild its infrastructure and establish a free government is the absolute right thing to do.

However, Mr. Chairman, while I will ultimately support this legislation, I do not believe providing the approximately $21 billion for Iraq to complete its reconstruction efforts should be carried out completely by way of a grant—as the legislation states. Instead, I believe 50 percent of this funding should be made through a grant and the other 50 percent through a loan to Iraq. This, I believe, would still accomplish the same goal, and also help ensure that Iraq will remain a financial stake-holder in helping bear the costs for its reconstruction.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, it's true that Saddam Hussein has already left Iraq with $200 billion

in debt. And I agree with those who have pointed out that saddling Iraq's infant government with more debt so soon in the reconstruction process could put their young government in serious peril and endanger the work that has been done to free the Iraqi people, create an important ally in an unstable region of the world, and fend off terrorist thugs before they have an opportunity to ''set up shop'' on this fertile ground.

Yet Mr. Chairman, I believe this can be adequately addressed by following the recommendations contained in the Pence Amendment that was offered earlier tonight. In short, by providing the first 50 percent of this funding through a grant to be made available immediately—the more critical needs in these reconstruction efforts can be met. Then, once a democratically elected government is in place and has been given time to take root, the additional 50 percent in funding could be made available through a loan.

Additionally, I believe that if France, Germany, Russia, and other creditors to Iraq would forgive that nation's debt owed to them, then our President should have the ability to then convert the 50 percent in funding represented by a loan into a grant.

Unfortunately Mr. Chairman, the Pence Amendment was ruled ''out of order'' and not offered as an alternative on the floor for a vote. If it had been, I would have supported it and continue to believe its premise presents the best solution to accomplishing our goals in Iraq, bringing our troops home as soon as possible, and doing both in a more financially responsible manner.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise, reluctantly, in support of this supplemental appropriations bill.

I do so not because the President has called us to this task, but in spite of that fact.

I do so not because of my sympathy for the people of Baghdad, although I am sympathetic, but because failure is not an option.

The Middle East was, before the war, it remains today, and it will be tomorrow, a region of critical importance to our Nation. We have close allies who depend on America for their freedom; we have vital economic interests; we have ongoing challenges from regimes like Iran and Syria that continue to sponsor terrorism and pursue weapons of mass destruction. We can not walk away.

I rise in support of this massive $87 billion expenditure not because it is the final step in securing Iraq, but with the knowledge that it is in fact just the one more step on a long and hard road this Congress agreed to embark upon in October of last year.

If anyone here thinks we just have to swallow this one bitter pill, they are sadly deluded.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no mistake: over the next few years, Iraq is going to cost this Nation billions upon billions of dollars. And because of the majority's tax-cutting fanaticism, these billions are going to come in the form of debt—to be paid by our children and our children's children. And this, because the majority party has squandered our surplus by their tax pay off to their wealthiest contributors.

Nonetheless, I believe this is money that must be spent. Despite the administration's lies. Despite the President's massaging of the facts. Despite the shameful manipulation and distortion of intelligence that was used to justify the war. Despite the inept and pathetic failure of our diplomacy before the war. Despite the astonishing incompetence of our planning for after the war. Despite the stupid fantasies about an exile takeover and a speedy exit. Despite the incomprehensible pig-headedness that characterized our initial reconstruction efforts. Despite our arrogance toward the international community and so many of our allies.

Despite all these appalling failures and breaches of public trust, there is still the necessity of protecting our Nation. There are still American men and women struggling to accomplish our Nation's tasks in Iraq; they need and are entitled to our support. There are still Islamist terrorists pouring into Iraq to pursue their crusade of terrorism against our Nation; they need to be stopped, they need to be destroyed. There are still millions of Iraqis who are counting on us not to abandon them to mercies of Saddam's loyalists and the invading jihadis, they need to be reassured we will not betray them. These vital tasks cannot continue without the money in this bill.

In the context of September 11th can anyone really believe that abandoning Iraq would not produce a greater haven for terrorists there then the Taliban produced in Afghanistan?

There is no easy way out of this. Pursuit of a quick or cheap solution is as fanciful as a mirage in the desert.

The rest of the world is not going to clean up this mess. While we should aggressively pursue every avenue to involve the international community in this tremendous and critical project, we cannot expect the world to come to our rescue. The Bush Administration did our Nation a terrible disservice in conducting our international relations in such an arrogant and high-handed way. We have alienated much of the world and repairing this error, I fear, will take far longer than resolving the debts we will accumulate from rebuilding Iraq.

Since 1776, our choice as Americans has always been to act, to take our fate in our own hands. We may appeal to heaven, but we should not depend on divine assistance. We may solicit the aid of allies, but we must not place our national destiny in the hands of others. We may fervently hope for success, but we cannot allow hope to be the keystone of our policies. Our Nation has been built and sustained by action, by deeds, and by hard choices.

Today we are called upon to make just such a hard choice: to open the American treasury to rebuild a defeated nation, and to pile up debt upon ourselves and our children (having yesterday given away our ''rainy-day funds'' to Republican rain-makers) so that we might pursue a more secure world tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, we don't have to like it, and I can tell you, I don't. I am bitter and fighting mad about the sly deceit and mendacity that has characterized this Administration's Iraq policy and that is continuing to this day.

But we have a job to do and it costs money. It costs a lot of money. And it will cost even more money in the future.

The alternative, however, is not just ruins left in Baghdad, the alternative is a failed state, a new home for terrorists and their plans. The choice is fighting terrorism by cleaning up the squalor in which terrorism thrives, or taking our chances, and hoping everything turns out OK.

I can not—I will not—vote to put our Nation's future into the unthinking hands of fate, or worse, into the hands of the people we are fighting at this very moment in Iraq.

We must succeed. I urge all Members to support the bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, today, I am pleased to rise in support of a plan of action that will help fulfill the hopes we have for our Nation's security.

For twelve years, the United States spent over ten billion dollars to enforce No-Fly-Zones and sanctions in Iraq that did little to diminish the threat that Saddam Hussein posed to his neighbors and the world.

From 1996 until 2001, the Taliban pillaged a nation and overtly supported terrorists with little effective opposition from the international community.

This inaction did not deter or prevent terrorists from attacking the Khobar Towers, our embassies overseas, the USS *Cole*, the World Trade Center, and Washington, DC.

Our limited action in Iraq did not prevent Saddam Hussein from deceiving weapons inspectors, evading sanctions to enhance his personal wealth, and attacking coalition aircraft almost daily prior to Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Chairman, today, we are at a fork in the road in the war on terrorism—do we take aggressive action to win the war, or do we do something less and hope that somehow things will be different in the future?

This supplemental personifies a strategy to enhance our Nation's security for future generations.

This plan will help rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan so that these nations will become nations that enhance security rather than threaten security.

We can act, and provide our troops with the tools they need to win this war. Or, we can hope that these brave people can somehow do something with nothing.

We can act, and provide Iraq and Afghanistan with the means to rebuild shattered societies. Or, we can hope that these people will prosper without basic necessities and with more crippling foreign debt.

We can act, and give these nations the best possible chance at democracy. Or, we can hope that the Taliban and Ba'ath party will no longer be interested in returning to power through terror and intimidation.

We can act, and pay the cost for security. Or, we can hope that security will come at no cost.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that these nations will soon be free democracies . . . I hope our troops are home soon . . . I hope that other nations will join these efforts . . . but we must act first for the hope for the security of the United States.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. PENCE. This is a well-intentioned amendment that would strike a balance between one of the most deeply debated issues involved in H.R. 3289, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 2004.

Mr. PENCE's amendment would have made the first 50 percent of Iraq Reconstruction funding available immediately as a grant. This $9.3 billion amount would have given priority consideration to the emergency purposes of security, electric sector infrastructure, oil infrastructure, public works, water resources, transportation and telecommunication infrastructures, and other emergency needs. It would

have withheld the final 50 percent of the reconstruction funding until a democratically elected government in Iraq has been established. Once the Bush Administration informs Congress that such a government exists, the balance of the funding would have been made available in the form of loans from the United States Government, under terms determined by the President.

Mr. Chairman, for several weeks I have internally debated the question of whether this reconstruction funding for Iraq ought to be in the form of a direct grant or a loan repayable at a future date. I have listened to my constituents, asked questions at committee hearings, and thought through all of the arguments on both sides of this debate. I did so because this issue is so important to both the people of Iraq and the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, after much deliberation, I saw the validity and accuracy of some of the arguments in favor of a directly granting these reconstruction funds. I believe that debt repayments could become a destabilizing political issue in postwar Iraq and could easily be exploited by anti-American factions. Furthermore, a loan burden also could likely stifle any significant economic development in Iraq.

However, I also believe that we have a responsibility to be conscientious stewards of the American taxpayers' money. We currently have a significant national debt at the federal level, and have several important priorities that are going unmet. Finally, Iraq is not a poor nation. In fact, it has natural resources that are unmatched in that region of the world.

Mr. Chairman, in light of these realities, I would have supported the thoughtful amendment by my colleague, Mr. PENCE. I believe that it would have provided adequate reconstruction funds that are needed in the near term. This is money that would have been used for emergency and immediate purposes fro the most important needs of security, electric and oil infrastructure, public works, and transportation. This $9.3 billion would have built on and expanded the successful work that the Coalition Provisional Authority has already done in a few short months in Iraq. It would have provided the CPA with the resources it needs to make the quality of life in Iraq better than it ever was under the terrible regime of Saddam Hussein.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Pence amendment would have permitted the American taxpayers to be partially refunded once a democratically elected government is established in Iraq. Once this governing authority is present in Baghdad, which is expected to occur within a year, Iraq would have been able to use its considerable natural oil reserves to repay a portion of the money we are debating today. To me, this appeared to be a fiscally responsible manner by which to approach the subject.

Mr. Chairman, again let me reiterate my support for the Pence amendment. I believe that it was a responsible compromise solution for both the people of Iraq and the people of America. Because I believe Congress has a responsibility to both of them, I would have supported the Pence amendment as a sensible, middle ground approach to this difficult question.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2004. This is a critical decision—too important to be colored by partisan political agendas. At stake is the future of the Iraqi people, the lives of 150,000 American soldiers, and our status as the leader of the free world.

Our intervention into Iraq has the potential to be the greatest foreign policy success since the rebuilding of Germany following World War II. We have the chance to help the Iraqi people transform a country torn apart by totalitarian rule into a beacon of freedom, opportunity and democracy. We have the chance to put to rest the misguided belief that Muslim countries are not capable of living in democracy. We have the chance to demonstrate to the rest of the world that America embraces its role as defender of the oppressed, and leader of the free world.

We have rejected the contradictions of colonialism. We did not send our troops to Iraq to take their oil or force the Iraqi people to pay tribute. We came to give a people who were crushed and oppressed a chance to change their destiny. To finish this effort, we must be willing to make sacrifices.

Already, Iraqi children are going to new schools that have been refurbished, where there are no longer pictures of Saddam Hussein on the wall, and where curriculums teach math and science rather than loyalty to the Baath Party. Men and women are able to build businesses, develop new ideas, and express their political views freely.

We must enable this to continue by investing in Iraq's future. We must also guarantee that our troops will have the resources they need to maintain order throughout the country. There can be no substitute for success in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support our continued efforts in Iraq and to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I will support passage of this Iraq Supplemental Appropriations bills for our troops and their families.

I will support this bill because we must support our troops and we must continue to engage the effort in Iraq to its successful conclusion. I have the honor of representing the Army's Fort Bragg, Pope Air Force Base and many Guard and Reserve units in North Carolina. Many of them are serving in Iraq while their families here at home pray for their safety and speedy return. This bill increases funds to purchase body armor for our troops and to contract for the clearing of unexploded ordnance. The bill provides funding for the contracting of security guards to replace reservists currently performing these duties. The Army has indicated this provision would permit the demobilization of 7,000 to 10,000 reserve component soldiers. The bill also includes a provision to continue the increased monthly rate of hazardous duty pay and Family Separation Allowances through September 30, 2004. These provisions are very important to the military families in my district because they have a very real impact in relieving some of their financial burden. I am proud my Democratic colleagues in the House and I have successfully led the fight to secure these needed funds.

I will support this bill because America must heed history's lessons from the previous century. After the Allied victory in the First World War, war-weary America turned its back on the European countries that had been ravaged by the war. Postwar Europe's chaotic power vacuum gave rise to Benito Mussolini and Adolph Hitler and led to great destruction and human suffering before they could be defeated. Constructive engagement in postwar Iraq is critically important to America's long-term interests. As the world's sole remaining Superpower, America simply cannot afford to fail to lead.

I have serious reservations about this vote because despite the brilliant and valiant action of our soldiers to defeat the evil regime of Saddam Hussein, this administration has failed to implement an adequate plan to win the peace. This administration has failed to level with the American people and the Congress about the true costs and duration of the ongoing war in Iraq. I voted to authorize the use of force to overthrow Saddam Hussein, had the world is undoubtedly a better place with him out of power. But the Administration's evasions and misrepresentations of the truth represent a deeply troubling lack of honesty. The American people and their Representatives in Congress deserve true and honest presentation of the facts, especially on such weighty matters of war and peace.

I am also concerned that the Administration has failed to work cooperatively with our friends and allies abroad to secure international support to share the burden for rebuilding Iraq. It is not only in America's interest that Iraq emerge from Saddam's grip as a stable, peaceful nation; it is also in the world's interest. The Administration's diplomatic failures have forced the American taxpayers to bear too much of the burden for an effort that should draw a great international coalition. This Administration must redouble diplomatic efforts to bring all the nations of the world on board the efforts to rebuild Iraq and secure relief from Iraq's international debt incurred by the deposed regime.

Finally, I am reluctant to support this bill because this Administration has failed to provide effective leadership on real problems we have right here at home in America. The Administration is shortchanging education by $20 billion under the new No Child Left Behind law. Despite more than $300 billion in unmet school construction needs, this Administration has provided no leadership to upgrade educational infrastructure in America. And as rural North Carolina begs for a tobacco buyout, this Administration refuses to act to give our struggling farmers some hope for economic security for their families. These are just a few examples of the failure of leadership of this Administration.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, despite my reservations, I will support this bill because failure to lead is not an option. I will support this bill because it is the best option we have before us to win the peace in Iraq. I will support this bill on behalf of the people of North Carolina's Second Congressional District and the men and women in our armed forces.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the question is not whether people support the war; it is whether people will support our troops. That is why I rise in support of the Iraq supplemental bill. I may not agree with the Administration's current strategy in Iraq, but I will always support the dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces.

Of the $87 billion, over $65 billion is for the men and women sacrificing their lives. It is extremely important for our troops to know they have the support from their government. The supplemental will provide the necessary safety our men and women need by purchasing

more flak jackets and more Humvees. This will hopefully decrease the amount of soldiers being killed in Iraq. The bill allows for the hire of more civilian security guards to replace 10,000 reservists, allowing them to do the job that they were brought there for. The measure will assist the families of our troops, who are also sacrificing for our country. The cost family members must pay to see their injured family member will be subsidized and it increases the Family Separation Allowance.

The rest of the money will be used to aide with the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan. We should help Iraq and Afghanistan rebuild. Our assistance will also play a key role in the War on Terrorism. Whether or not we should provide these funds in the form of grants or loans has been debated. Though we will not be able to have separate votes on these segments, I believe we should loan Iraq the funds to rebuild their tattered nation, rather than sending ''no-strings attached'' grants from American taxpayers. The idea of making the reconstruction activities a loan has had bipartisan support until he Administration strongarmed those Republicans who felt a loan was appropriate. Now, at this time, we should not be putting more of a burden on the taxpayers. We are facing a deficit of almost $500 billion; we do not need to add to it.

I, along with seven of my female colleagues, am traveling to Iraq later this month. I look forward to seeing for myself the progress we've made and the challenges that still lie ahead in Iraq. This trip should cut through the spin and the filters, giving us a first-hand look at the rebuilding effort in Iraq. While there I want the opportunity to look our troops in their eyes and tell them that I and my colleagues, are doing all we can to fully equip them and safely bring them home.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful our soldiers will return home soon and I will continue working to achieve that goal.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the need to support Iraq in its quest to become a free democracy. I still believe we did the right thing. But I also recognize that there must be greater attention for those who need help in the United States.

In no way does the Pence Amendment alter or change funding for our troops. That money is set aside and will be given with full faith and assurance. However, families in my district are reeling from the manufacturing recession. As a result, I believe we need a more balanced approach to the Iraq reconstruction funding. I support Congressman PENCE's approach to giving the first 50 percent as a grant for those projects in greatest need of repair and the remaining 50 percent as a loan to the new Iraqi government. This savings of 10 billion dollars could be well spent on economic development and retraining funds for unemployed workers in my district as well as many others. I applaud Congressman PENCE for his efforts to craft a compromise on this important issue.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3289. I call upon the President and his Administration to make clear to the Congress and the American people how long we will be in Iraq, how much it will cost, and when we can expect certain outcomes. I continue to support a multilateral approach to the war effort, and recognize the tremendous sacrifices of the men and women in our armed services. I want them to know we fully support them. My heart goes out to the soldiers in Iraq and their loved ones at home as well as to the Iraqi people to whom we have promised democracy and economic freedom. I have held listening sessions in my district with the wives and families of the servicemen and women. Their message is clear: ''We want them home; in the meantime we want them safe.''

In my conversations with families of our troops, I learned of the ongoing needs of the brave individuals who serve our country in Iraq. I support the efforts of Ranking Member OBEY, the gentleman from Wisconsin, to improve this legislation with an amendment that would include the following provisions: significant water purification equipment for our troops; adequate medical and dental screening for activated reservists prior to deployment, and extended coverage following their duty in Iraq; sufficient prepaid telephone cards to enable soldiers to communicate with loved ones in the States without incurring exorbitant phone bills; reconditioning equipment that is insufficiently armored and in need of repair; and covering domestic travel costs when our soldiers return home for short periods during deployment.

By denying Mr. OBEY the opportunity to offer his amendment, this measure fails to guarantee the basic needs and thus the reliability of our troops in Iraq, and undermines the future of our Reserve and National Guard programs.

I'm not interested in talking about the existence or lack thereof of weapons of mass destruction or the urgency which compelled the President to get America into this effort unilaterally. I am interested in going forward, offering the necessary support to ensure our troops success and safety and keeping the promises we've made to rebuild Iraq.

As a student of history, I see strong parallels between the post World War II period when America launched the Marshall Plan and the current situation we have in Iraq. When America launched the Marshall Plan; however, it was with full disclosure of the multiyear costs and the ultimate benefits of that plan.

The Administration's approach to date is similar to a house builder who says to the owners, ''I'm building your foundation. The first brick will cost you $87 Billion. Period. Trust me on the rest.'' That's no way to build a house and no way to rebuild a crumbling and troubled nation. We the American people have to know: how much? how long? by when can we expect certain outcomes?

Let us reflect on and learn from past war efforts, and model our current action to avoid failure and yet one more ''forgotten war.'' As George Santayana wisely noted: ''Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.''

I urge my colleagues to support a reasonable and responsible approach to our efforts to stabilize and rebuild Iraq and address the needs of our military. Reject H.R. 3289. Provide real support for our troops, a real plan for rebuilding Iraq, and restore stability to the region.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there are moments in history where we are aware that decisions we are making will affect the world in the future. Today we stand at such a moment, charged with the enormous task of helping to rebuild Iraq. We must be up to the challenge.

Our own history offers us guidance about how to best rebuild a wartime adversary.

After World War I, Germany was soundly defeated and the parties gathered in Versailles to negotiate the terms of surrender. The talks came to a question of who was responsible for the aftermath. Was Germany responsible? Should a country with a new government be burdened by the debts of a defeated regime? Should they be responsible for reconstruction and reparations?

We all realize how the reparations inflicted upon Germany at that time created an atmosphere of despair. We are also aware of how this atmosphere was exploited by the evil monster Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Chairman, we know how this story ended in Germany and it could end up that way in Iraq: a leader, or a sect, seeks to rebuild a fractured national pride with acts of violence committed in the name of a downtrodden people.

The assistance we are voting for today will significantly contribute to preventing an ending such as that. This assistance is for the defense of our troops abroad and our citizens at home, as we make the world safer for all of our friends and allies.

A free and democratic Iraq will be a beacon for hope in the Middle East. It will show to the people of the region that democracy is possible, that the United States does not impose its will, only the ability for peoples to decide their own destiny.

Great challenges require courageous decision. The easy road has sometimes been taken in the past and we know its disastrous consequences.

The long and fiscally difficult road has also been tried by the United States of America. An alliance scarred by battle once again sat across from debt heavy and defeated nations and the alliance did not make the same mistake of 1918. The U.S. eventually formulated a systematic recovery program that became known as the Marshall Plan.

The Marshall Plan was not entirely made up of U.S. aid, it also called on the devastated European nations to eventually contribute to their own recovery. Yet the first installment of $4 billion in aid required great political will. At the time $4 billion represented 13 percent of the entire budget. That act of Congressional courage helped to remake Western Europe into a subcontinent of strong economies, strong democracies, and thus strong allies. Again, we all know how the success of that plan contributed to the creation of a stable, free and democratic Western Europe.

We all acknowledge there are many domestic issues that we must address as a Congress. Protecting our Homeland is perhaps the greatest mission before us. It is my belief that working for stability in Iraq and the Middle East is essential in order to protect our citizens at home. We do not set the correct example if we only support freedom and safety at home. That is why I applaud President Bush for setting the course of reconstruction in Iraq. Encouraging progress is already happening, schools are opening, electricity is turning on, new currency is being distributed today, but we have the ability to do so much more. As Iraqi people see continued progress in rebuilding, we help keep Americans safe at home.

Mr. Chairman, the great American poet Robert Frost once wrote, ''Two roads diverged in a yellow wood.'' We know that one road today leads to debt and internal strife. We

know the harder road leads to reconstruction and reconciliation.

In a section of the world that has already imperiled too many lives, in a country whose previous, savage regime caused too much suffering and too many deaths, we in Congress are obligated by the lessons of our history to support an emerging Iraqi democracy with our wisdom, our experience and our resources.

The vote we are about to cast will have enormous repercussions. If this assistance has the same effect that the Marshall Plan funding had in Western Europe, it will help create a stable, democratic Iraqi government and a lifelong ally of the United States.

My colleagues, today we must act with the same vision as our forebearers in this House. We must support our troops in the field and the reconstruction of Iraq.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, October of last year, I voted against the Authorization for Military Force Against Iraq. Leading up to that vote, the Administration supplied a wide array of reasons justifying an immediate invasion, reasons that they had to revise, change, and pull back. Some examples are: the Administration initially claimed, when they first started advocating the use of military force, there was a link between Saddam Hussein and the September 11th attacks, however, British and U.S. intelligence revealed that was not true; around the same time, the Administration claimed they had the authority to remove Saddam Hussein under a 1998 resolution, however, the authorization of military forces was later brought before Congress at the President's request; the Administration said it was prepared to go it alone, and then decided to ask for the support of as many allies as possible, including the United Nations; the Administration claimed Iraq has weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems capable of reaching beyond their borders, yet this assertion has since been proven false by the intelligence community and coalition forces. These are some examples of the mixed message from the Administration. One final concern I had was the failure of the Administration to answer the question as to the timing of abandoning the containment policy that had been working for the past decade.

In March, with over one hundred thousand Coalition forces in and around Iraq, I stated we could not turn back. The fact remained that Saddam Hussein was a vicious and brutal dictator and the Iraqi people, Middle East security and the security of the entire world would be better off without him. To not liberate Iraq at that point would be detrimental to American leadership in the world. As I predicted at the start of the war, the troops' actions resulted in a quick resolution of the war but led to prolonged occupation involving guerrilla operations.

With each week that goes by, we continue to lose more American lives in Iraq. Recently, President Bush requested an additional $87 billion to pay for the occupation and rebuilding of Iraq. While I am not against increasing funds to stabilize Iraq, the Administration must provide more than a mere spending request. A clear and workable plan is necessary.

Furthermore, I believe a broader post-war contingency is needed consisting not only of American and other coalition soldiers but also military police, civilian advisors, and international troops. In addition, I support continued efforts to return control back to the Iraqi people. By training Iraqi police forces, government employees, and civilian personnel, we will be leading the nation and the Iraqi people toward a more stable and efficient democracy. This is an approach top State Department and Pentagon officials have recently stated is necessary as part of the post-war strategy.

Now, more than ever, America needs the monetary and manpower support of our allies to rebuild Iraq. We should diligently re-establish relations with the international community so peace and stability can be brought to the region. The United States should begin working immediately with the United Nations and our friends around the world to share in all aspects of the post-war reconsideration efforts. More flexibility is needed in allowing other nations to share in the rebuilding process. Securing Iraq unilaterally has the potential for failure; therefore, involving other countries in the nation-building efforts should be a core objective.

Some have argued we have already invested too much in Iraq and we need to pull all of our troops out immediately. However, abandoning post-war operations in Iraq now is simply not an option. Leaving now not only would be damaging to the Iraqi people, but would also weaken America's position on the world stage. The consequences for the United States in the Middle East would be severe. Larger efforts by the Administration to help bring the international community into the fold are necessary, but so are our continued Iraq rebuilding efforts. Even if other countries refuse to participate, the United States cannot afford to have this job left unfinished now, and we must continue to strongly support efforts to provide Iraq with stability.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I will cast my vote on the $87 billion supplemental appropriation for Iraq based on two conflicting influences.

First, this central premise: we simply cannot invade a country, destroy its infrastructure, leave it without lights, water, or jobs, and then walk away from it. We made a commitment to rebuild Iraq, and voting against this bill is effectively canceling the check.

Conversely, Mr. Chairman, is my belief that this bill, and particularly the political process that brought it to the Floor, is deeply flawed. There is no doubt in my mind that the Administration is essentially holding the safety of our troops hostage to the passage of this bill without any of the commonsense compromises sought by the Democratic Caucus.

The issue for me, Mr. Chairman, is whether flaws should override final passage of the appropriation. I have come to the conclusion that the Administration's irresponsible handling of Iraq and this supplemental bill cannot allow us to irresponsibly defeat it. But, I cast my vote with the demand that the Administration use these resources to make immediate and dramatic improvements in several areas of engagement in Iraq.

We used force in Iraq based on the view that we could create a transformative model in the Middle East of democracy, prosperity, human rights, education and empowerment. Defeating this appropriation would be the equivalent of saying we are canceling the check for those vital goals. It is the equivalent of saying, ''We broke the merchandise, and now we are returning it.''

And to what are we returning it? Waging war on Iraq and refusing to pay for the peace would not create a transformative model of peace and prosperity, but of violence and poverty. It would bolster the calls for jihad against the West. It would fuel permanent resentments against our country and the West. It would be handing terrorists a long-term victory after we supposedly won a short-term war. It would create a rubble-strewn stage on which Baathists could stand, holding Iraq as an example to the world: ''What have the Americans brought: no jobs, no lights, no roads.'' They would exploit the instability and proselytize an ideology that places suicide bombings ahead of ballots as the agent of change in society. They would make Afghanistan under the Taliban look like a summer camp.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, there is the issue of our troops. Last week, I met in my Long Island office with two soldiers who are serving in Iraq. They were home on rest and recreation. I believe the Administration's horrible planning of post-war activities has already left our troops exposed and fatigued. The Pentagon's own Stars and Stripes newspaper has surveyed our troops and found widespread dissatisfaction, low morale, weak sense of mission, and potentially serious reenlistment problems. Our soldiers need flak jackets, they need armored vehicles, they need communications equipment, they need a much more serious program of military police and civil affairs training.

When things go wrong, as they have in Iraq up to this point, there are two ways to respond. We can say, ''What went wrong and who do we blame? or we can say, ''What went wrong and how do we fix it?'' Refusing to fund our troops and the construction of Iraq is not the way to fix the Administration's current failures there. The way to fix those failures is to fund improvements and require accountability and responsibility.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I use this vote today to put the Administration on notice that it must use these resources to improve the following specific areas: create broader alliances; crack down on cronyism and war profiteering; hasten the supply of flak jackets and armored vehicles needed by our troops, end the strain and fatigue on our Guard and Reserve and provide them with a realistic return date, and account for every penny that is being spent. If the Administration fails basic tests of responsibility and accountability, then they cannot and should not ask for my vote again.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I also wish to express my outrage at the leadership of this House for putting politics over the military, for putting partisanship over the very lives of our troops. The Republican leadership has steadfastly refused to even consider Democratic amendments that would have made this bill more palatable by releasing funds in increments on an as-needed basis. The Republican leadership refused to move forward like statesman President Harry Truman working with a responsible Republican Senate to create and implement a transparent Marshall Plan. Instead, they have forsworn consensus for cronyism and have basically said, ''It is our way or the highway.'' They have essentially held our troops as political hostages to a cynical legislative strategy: either vote for the bill as we demand it, or leave our troops behind.

I will not play that cynical game, Mr. Chairman. To protect our troops and bring them back to Long Island safe, I will vote for this

bill. But let everyone understand that this Administration and the leadership of this Congress has compounded bad planning with bad politics, and is shamefully exploiting the vulnerability of our troops to advance a legislative strategy.

It is for the future of a safer world, a stable Middle East, and the lives and well-being of our troops that I support this bill. It is not for the present policies and politics of those who drafted it and sullied it with partisanship. I rise to vote ''aye'' because I am proud to stand with our troops during these dark days. But I am not proud to stand with those who exacerbated the problems and manipulated the process. The future will judge them. The present requires me to support this bill with the improvements I have stipulated.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I stand today to state my continued opposition to the funding of our invasion and occupation of Iraq.

Some of my colleagues have mourned the apparent death of U.S. domestic policy. They have detailed what this $87 billion could provide in this country. If we pass this bill, every person in this country will lose services in education, healthcare, housing, veterans programs, homeland security and social security. This is a fact.

Other colleagues have come to this floor to question our entry into the war, our standing in the world community, our ability to govern an occupied nation and our exit strategy. The Administration has never revealed plans which indicate when we will have done enough, committed enough resources, or restored enough of the infrastructure to leave Iraq. It is strange that a country like America, born out of a desire to shake off British colonialism may now be engaging in a new era of imperialism. I align myself with those who have expressed doubts about the short-term consequence and the long-term wisdom of such a policy.

And while I share those concerns, I am most concerned about the lack of accountability throughout this Iraqi adventure. We have already passed a $79 billion spending bill for the current conflict in Iraq. However, no one here knows how that money was spent. We do not have any accounting of the no-bid contracts, but we do know that the majority of our soldiers are wearing Vietnam era flak jackets. And while we talk about building an Iraqi democracy, we refuse to allow the Iraqis the ability to directly participate in the rebuilding of their own nation.

We do know that the money is not getting to the soldiers and it is not getting to the people of Iraq. So we are obligated as good stewards of the hard-earned dollars of the American people to ask where is the money? Where has it gone and where will it go? No one from this Administration has bothered to answer and if they cannot answer this basic question of accountability, this body—which controls the purse strings—must keep the purse closed. Under the Constitution we have a duty to be responsible for governmental spending. Because this Administration has spent the budgetary surplus left by the Clinton Administration by providing $387 billion in tax cuts which primarily benefitted the wealthy, it is clear that the cost of this war can only be paid by borrowing money. My children's grandchildren will end up bearing the cost of this war. It would be irresponsible to saddle them with a $166 billion burden.

I will not support this resolution. I cannot uphold my constitutional duties as a Member of this House while signing over a blank check to this Administration. It is wrong and your vote should reflect it. Vote no on this supplemental.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Last year I voted against the war in Iraq because I believed this administration had overstated its case for this preemptive war, rushed us unilaterally into this conflict, and ultimately had no real plan for the postwar reconstruction. Despite the President's protests, these concerns have proved legitimate.

Iraq is still in chaos. American soldiers, international diplomats, and Iraqi civilians are being killed every day. And the administration is still a long way from pacifying Iraq or setting up a stable government.

Mr. Chairman, when U.S. soldiers are in harm's way, the first concern of Americans is how to best support our troops. We want to be sure they have the material and equipment they need to protect themselves and complete their mission. And we want to know that our troops are being used appropriately and that the administration is doing everything feasible to keep them as safe as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have their doubts about the progress in Iraq and the administration's wisdom in handling this situation. So do I.

The administration clearly did little or no planning for postwar Iraq. It has proven to be unprepared for the complexities and dangers of restoring Iraqi stability. And we have not yet realized the success in Iraq that the administration claimed it delivered when it declared the mission accomplished five months ago. In their rush to get public support for the war administration officials scoffed at experts who predicted that more troops and more money would be needed.

Now the President has requested a staggering $87 billion in taxpayer money to fund his efforts in Iraq. I am amazed at the audacity of the President's request.

While I do believe we will have to make a substantial financial commitment to the rebuilding of Iraq, I am concerned that this administration is starving efforts to solve problems here at home. The size of this package, on top of the trillions of dollars in tax cuts mostly for the wealthiest Americans, will significantly add to the budget deficit, already the largest in history. And yet the Administration has said over and over again that there is not enough money for Medicare, for education, for housing, or for any of our domestic priorities.

And Americans seem to be bearing this burden in Iraq alone. The President has failed to get international support or give the UN a prominent role in this mission. And the Administration has not shown the Congress or the American people a plan for completing the reconstruction. Nor does it show any signs of having a plan that will reduce the threat to our soldiers in the near future. In fact, the Administration seems to be in denial that anything is wrong in Iraq.

I support giving our troops the funding they need. And I understand and agree with our responsibility to rebuild Iraq. I firmly believe that after dismantling the Iraqi government we cannot pull out until we have restored stability. But sometimes the best way to achieve our goals and support our troops is to send a strong message that the current policy is not working.

This Administration needs a wake-up call on its Iraq policy. Defeating this supplemental would be that wake-up call.

The proposal I support would be much better for the troops than the President's request. It allocates more resources to improve the quality of life for the men and women serving in Iraq. It would have provided for much more accountability for the Administration's efforts in Iraq. And it would have paid for this huge amount of spending so it would not increase the budget deficit.

It is time for the Administration to reexamine its policy in Iraq. It is time for the US to make changes to assure success. And it is time for the President to swallow his pride, admit that things are not going well in Iraq and ask for international support.

Let's send him this message by defeating this bill.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of our troops in Iraq. Thousands of young men and women, my neighbors and yours, remain in harm's way. They are suffering casualties daily and fatalities every week.

We must do all we can to provide for their protection and safe return. We are indebted to our troops for their service and sacrifice. The men and women of our Armed Forces make all Americans proud.

My vote for this bill is for one reason only: to give our troops the resources they need to carry out their mission. But my vote should not be interpreted as supporting this Administration's post-war policy in Iraq or the lack of one.

The only way my vote should be interpreted is of one opposing this administration's post-war policy in Iraq or the lack of one.

As I cast my ''yes'' vote, I will supply the troops with the resources they need. My hope is that the President will finally supply a policy the Nation deserves. Because the absence of a policy has never measured up to the valor and patriotism of our troops.

As we will do our part in Congress, now it is long overdue for the administration to do theirs—enunciating a policy.

Our troops will get the Humvees and the Kevlar vests they need. But the policy is as important for their protection as this equipment, and this administration has failed in that endeavor.

Just over 2 years have passed since the September 11 attacks when the world reached out and expressed sympathy and solidarity to America and all Americans. Because of our arrogance we have turned the world's sympathy into antipathy.

This administration lacks a coherent policy that spells out a clear vision for the Iraq mission, invites the support of our allies, and provides an exist strategy that will bring our troops home.

I supported the war, and I still believe that getting rid of Saddam Hussein was the right thing to do.

But the administration has made a legitimate war illegitimate through its actions. While it sold the war on a set of claims that were not true, the administration never leveled with the American people.

As we fought the war nearly alone, so we are left to go it alone in the reconstruction.

The irony is that this administration is committing American families to pay for investments in Iraq that it is unwilling to provide for here at home. We are paying for basic health care for half of Iraq's population, but will not provide coverage for any of the almost 44 million uninsured Americans.

We are footing the bill for world-class police and security forces in both Iraq and Afghanistan, but American communities are imperiled by deep funding cuts to their police and firefighters. With taxpayers spending nearly $6 billion to completely overhaul Iraq's electricity system, not one single dollar is provided in the Energy bill for overhauling our own electrical grid.

Because the administration's reconstruction budget for Iraq is so flawed and filled with cronyism, it has insisted on attaching it to the military budget—in effect, holding our own troops hostage.

I will not cast a vote that might endanger our troops in any way. But I will not continue to support indefinitely a failing and flailing policy in Iraq, and neither should the American people.

When this administration comes back to Congress again for more funding, as it surely will, it must accompany that request with a real plan, which to date it has not—or it must bring our troops home.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, Congress today will vote on an issue of great importance to the Nation.

This week, Congress will vote on the President's request for $86.7 billion in supplemental spending to fund ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the reconstruction effort in Iraq.

Like many, I have grave concerns about this administration's failure to forward a plan on the reconstruction of Iraq that will lead to Iraqi self-rule, lessen the financial burden of the reconstruction effort on American taxpayers, and successfully conclude our military efforts in that nation. And I believe this failure has unnecessarily put our troops in harm's way and made our nation less secure. Yet while I have significant reservations about this administration's prosecution of the aftermath of the war in Iraq, I will support this request because I believe supporting our troops in the field and providing them with the necessary resources to successfully complete their mission is the right thing to do.

While some may attempt to characterize my support for the supplemental legislation as an endorsement of the Administration's failed policy, nothing could be farther from the truth. I met with President Bush and congressional leaders following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. I told him that we would have to trust each other and put politics aside if we hoped to successfully address the new threats confronting our Nation. My paramount objective has always been to keep our people safe, and that objective has motivated my every action without fail since September 11.

To that end, I worked with the President in an honest, good-faith effort last year to develop legislation that would provide a responsible policy framework to address the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's leadership of Iraq. At my insistence, this legislation included provisions that: Called on President Bush to work with our allies and others through the UN to build a consensus for action; demanded that the President's actions against Iraq not undermine our nation's broader efforts to prevent terrorism; and required the President to develop a plan to promote stability and democracy in post-war Iraq.

Congress adopted this legislation with wide majorities in both the House and the Senate, and President Bush signed it into law. Unfortunately, he subsequently failed to implement any of these guidelines, which I believed were necessary to ensure the success of our effort. In my view, it is undeniable that this failure has led to the situation we find ourselves in today in Iraq and across the globe.

First, by not working with other nations and building a broad international consensus, America is now much more isolated. Even our closest allies are reluctant to join a U.S.-led peacekeeping force in Iraq and contribute the necessary resources to the reconstruction effort. This administration's posture has also made it extremely difficult to obtain support for a meaningful United Nations role in Iraq, needlessly delaying tangible support that is critical to reducing the burden on the U.S. with respect to the restoration of Iraq's civil authorities and provision of ongoing humanitarian assistance. In addition, without broader international support, our goal to turn authority back to the Iraqi people and their new democratic institutions will take much longer to accomplish. Our goal must be the tangible support of our allies in the form of a meaningful financial contributions and additional troops on the ground, not just their unanimous consent on a piece of paper at the U.N. Security Council.

Second, in many ways we are now more vulnerable to terrorist threats, especially our troops in Iraq who are subject to attack on a daily basis. Saddam Hussein has assumed a role similar to that of Osama bin Laden, encouraging terrorism against the United States by disgruntled Iraqis and other extremists. Furthermore, the President's continued articulation of the so-called ''preemption doctrine'' and his lack of a coherent diplomatic strategy has inspired other nations not to stop their pursuit of dangerous materials, but to accelerate their efforts in order to avoid being ''preempted.'' North Korea—which today appears to be ramping up for full-scale production of nuclear weapons—is a very troubling case in point.

Third, with a unique opportunity to help the Iraqi people establish a stable, democratic government and society—and serve as a model in a critical area of the world—the President failed to plan ahead for many predictable post-war challenges. As a result, today we are spending more time—and money—trying to protect our troops and prevent chaos than we are helping the Iraqi people build democratic and fee-market institutions that will provide a foundation for long-term stability.

Let me make one thing clear to our president: I believe Congress will support our troops and the Iraq reconstruction effort by approving the supplemental request currently under consideration, and I will cast my vote reluctantly in favor. It is my hope that he will take this opportunity to come to terms with the significant challenges before us and reorient his policies accordingly. In my view, failure is not an option in Iraq, we must see this hard work through with the support of the international community and the Iraqi people. I only ask that the President use this supplemental funding in a manner that ensure our men and women in uniform can come home soon, having completed a mission that we all can be proud of.

Mr. SERRANO, Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my intention to vote against the Iraq supplemental. This is a vote that can only be explained if taken in the context of an earlier vote—my vote last year against the war with Iraq.

At the time of that earlier vote, the administration was arguing that we had to invade Iraq because of the imminent threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. The situation was so desperate that we couldn't wait for the weapons inspectors to finish their work or for the diplomacy to gain the support of the international community. Our President argued that action needed to be taken preemptively and quickly.

Now, with the passage of time, and with the issuance of subsequent reports, it has become more and more unlikely that those threatening weapons of mass destruction existed. So now the administration is engaging in revisionist history as to why we went to war in the first place.

Today, Congress is again facing a vote on Iraq. This time the vote is on whether or not to continue funding for our misguided policy in Iraq. Again the administration is arguing that we don't have a choice—we must quickly and immediately pass this important war spending bill. Again, the patriotism of those who oppose this effort is being questioned.

I think it is time for us to pause. Our troops stationed in Iraq are brave but suffering. They are experiencing hardships that are the direct result of this flawed policy. It is time for Congress to challenge the administration's policy with respect to Iraq.

My vote today is a vote of protest. I was opposed to the war and I am opposed to funding the results of this unjustified war. I do not believe that when the needs of our own country are so great, we should be asked to fund this war spending bill. When I look around the South Bronx, I see man wants. I see housing, education and health requirements that have been put on hold by this administration, because it claims it does not have the resources. If we don't fund this war spending, we could change so much in the South Bronx. I want may constituents' tax dollars spent to make positive changes that can impact the lives of many.

Since I voted against this war, I do not believe I now have an obligation to fund the results of a unjustified action that I so strongly opposed. Some might say we have a responsibility—and we do have a responsibility, to end this funding. We should no longer pretend that what we did in Iraq was right. It is time to stop this charade.

If I were to support this war spending, it would serve to legitimize the war against Iraq. The war was fought based on intelligence manipulated for political ends and with a total disregard for international conventions, coalitions, and public opinion. We need to revise our foreign policy with respect to Iraq. We need to work cooperatively with the international community and truly listen to their concerns. We can no longer afford the cost or lost of life that is accompanying our unilateral approach to Iraq. The only way to end this terrible loss of life in Iraq is to end the funding, and so as an appropriator, I must vote my conscience and vote against supporting this war spending bill.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, a great challenge lies before this Congress as we debate a supplemental spending package for the reconstruction of Iraq. American forces bravely liberated an oppressed population from decades of terror and the evil rule of Saddam Hussein's regime. While freedom

may have been born on the streets of Iraq after the fall of the regime, its long-term survival clearly depends on our commitment to help the Iraqi people establish a government and infrastructure that will allow freedom and democracy to grow.

History highlights situations where wars may have been won, but long-term peace and security clearly was not. In the 1980's, for example, the United States helped Afghanistan defeat the Soviets, but failed to follow through to ensure long-term security and stability. Just 20 years later, Afghanistan's governing body—the Taliban—protected and housed Osama Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda terrorist network.

Abandoning Iraq without ensuring stability will only provide opportunities for terrorists and extremists to eliminate Iraq's hopes for freedom and democracy. This will ultimately bring a greater threat to the United States and our allies.

America's commitment to freedom and democracy is unwavering. The soldiers that bravely liberated the Iraqi people and brought an end to an evil regime, demonstrated this commitment to freedom and democracy that America has fought for throughout its history. We must not turn our backs on the very principles this nation fought for. We must not return the Iraqi people to a state that sponsors terrorism, lacks all regard for human rights and poses an international threat to peace.

As Members of Congress we must support measures that will ultimately protect America and the American people. Along with President Bush's support, this body has passed major initiatives to protect Americans since September 11. The authorization to use force against Saddam Hussein's regime was one such initiative. However, those efforts—and the successes since the fall of the regime—will be meaningless if we abandon Iraq and allow for similar regimes to emerge.

Initiatives to protect Americans must exist far beyond our borders. Threats to our security are developed far from our borders and should be addressed long before they have a chance to reach one of our major cities. We must not allow Iraq to become another breeding ground for anti-American terrorist dictators that will not only abuse its people, but also seek to destroy the United States.

Some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed concerns with this reconstruction package. Such hesitation is reminiscent of similar hesitation on this very floor in 1947, while the House and Senate were debating the Marshall Plan after the conclusion of World War II. At that time, some Members had concerns that the Marshall Plan was expensive, poor policy and would ultimately fail.

One Senator claimed that the American people ''are thoroughly disgusted with the whole program, when they know anything about it, or when it is explained to them, and when they understand that it may lead to the destruction of the United States.'' Another Senator stated that ''the Truman-Marshall Plan will be no more successful than our previous adventures in foreign policy.'' One Member of the House even referred to the plan as a ''campaign of propaganda.''

As history recorded, the Marshall Plan became one of the most successful foreign policies in American history. We were able to secure an unstable region of the world, build long-term international relations and ensure the security of America and our allies. A comprehensive assistance program was essential in securing the stability of Europe, especially Germany. Had America and our allies walked away from Europe after we fought to liberate it, destabilization would have certainly been a consequence.

Like the Marshall Plan, our reconstruction package seeks to ensure the long-term stability of a region that plays a major role in the security of America. We must ensure that future generations are not faced with the same threatening regimes we have faced. The only way to make that assurance, however, is to help rebuild a nation that has been significantly damaged by a government which had no regard for its own citizens.

I proudly stand in support of this initiative, which will create long-term stability in Iraq and will ensure that a terrorist regime will never reemerge. We own this to the people of Iraq and to all Americans—here and abroad—that must be protected from every threat to their security and safety.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation, which will protect our troops, the principles of freedom and democracy, and will ultimately eliminate a major threat to the United States that has existed for decades.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose President Bush's request of $87 billion for the rebuilding of Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, these are the most troubling days this country has gone through in my lifetime, not just because we are at war, or even because of the terrorist attacks on 9/11, as horrific as that event and its aftermath has been, but because we are living in a time when we cannot rely on government to protect our civil liberties, and we cannot rely on the word and the stated intent of the administration in power. Moreover, it is a time when those sworn to uphold the Constitution undermine it at every opportunity.

For the President to ask then for $87 billion after having sent this country into the largest deficit in year with tax cuts for the wealthy and an ill conceived economic policy, without being accountable for the prior $65 billion, or even trying to justify this new request, is unbecoming of the high office he holds and a slap in the face of Members of Congress and the people we represent.

Mr. Chairman, I want our men and women protected, well equipped and with their needs addressed. I want us to restore basic stability and services to Iraq. I want troop support in Iraq from our allies, and I want the bulk of our soldiers home and out of harm's way.

More than anything, I want us to become a better nation and to regain the respect and the moral leadership that the current administration has squandered away.

Reliable reports such as one done recently by the Congressional Research Service has shown that this funding is not needed immediately. Other reports open questions on the efficiency and efficacy of what has already been spent. Just about every American has questions about why Bechtel and Halliburton have sole and uncontested claim to so much of the millions spent and proposed.

Mr. Chairman, there are too many questions which we have not only a right but a constitutional obligation to ask and have answered.

We do not help our soldiers, Iraq or our country by giving the President this blank check.

I urge my colleagues to vote no, and to insist that the President respect the Constitution, this body and the American people, and respond to our request for the important and accurate information needed to vote responsibly on this request.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill spending $87 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan.

We have a responsibility to finish what the President started in Iraq. We must honor our commitment to help the Iraqi people rebuild. Our troops must have the resources to safely complete their mission.

But, what is the President's strategy for Iraq? Where is the Administration's plan other than this bloated spending bill that continues to throw good money after bad. The American people deserve more accountability for the billions we continue to spend.

In Iraq, we're still witnessing chaos and violence in the streets. There's been little improvement in basic living standards as many Iraqis continue to suffer without water or electricity. It is unclear how and when authority will be transferred to a new, unified Iraqi government.

In the meantime, our young men and women in uniform are walking targets—daily casualties continue to rise. Terrorist groups have found safe haven in Iraq and now pose a threat far greater to our security than any previously posed by Saddam Hussein. And not one shred of evidence has been recovered showing Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction as the President falsely claimed.

In the midst of it all our commander-in-chief has not shown the vision and leadership to right the course. His Administration is divided and confused. And the world refuses to aid our nation with our President having been so arrogant as to shun their full participation, foolishly believing we can win the peace alone.

In fact, the Administration is trying so hard to keep a lid on this daily disaster and keeping information from getting out, that they even have the Army on the ground in Iraq doing spin control.

As reported in yesterday's Washington Post, an officer with the Combined Joint Task Force in Mosul inadvertently distributed an internal email to the media giving strict orders to the 101st Airborne not to ''highlight killing the enemy'' in their press releases. ''The intent to show that we are taking the fight to the enemy etc. is well understood,'' wrote the captain. ''However, we don't want to get into an enemy body count,'' he concluded.

I guess the Administration thinks making a good impression is better than presenting the facts when lives are on the line. This deception must not be tolerated.

It is time for Congress to hold this President accountable. I will not support writing a blank check to fund this disaster without a strategy for ending it. There are billions in borrowed money for this failed policy that'll shoot the deficit farther through the roof while burying our children in debt. And this won't be the last time this Administration comes begging at the trough.

Make no mistake, we will continue to pay the price for this misadventure. According to the National Priorities Project, the cost to California so far for overall Iraq spending is over $18 billion. This is money being taken away from important priorities for Californians, like expanded unemployment benefits for those

out of work, teacher training and smaller class sizes in our schools, improved access to health care for families, and investments in our infrastructure and security.

In fact, while Iraq is plush with billions in new funding for roads and infrastructure, housing, schools, hospitals and medical care, these same investments have been cut by Republicans here at home.

Today, there are 9 million Americans out of work. America has lost 3.2 million private sector jobs since this President took office. Yet, this same President wants us to pay for the creation of 3 million new jobs in Iraq.

There is no question the Iraqi people need and deserve our help to rebuild. But, we have our own reconstruction needs at home amidst the war the Bush Administration has been waging on working Americans and middle class families.

It is this majority of Americans who are being forced to bear the cost of this war. They are making the sacrifices. Yet the richest Americans get to keep the lush tax breaks they don't need as big defense contractors grow fat on wasteful budget pork they don't deserve.

If we were to suspend President Bush's tax cuts to the richest 1% of Americans—the top income tax bracket—it is estimated that we could save $125 to $150 billion that could be used to fund ongoing operations in Iraq.

We could also save billions by suspending funds that have been appropriated in the Pentagon's 2004 budget for unneeded and wasteful programs. We could take away $9 billion appropriated for the pie-in-the-sky Star Wars program; $1.1 billion being paid to Northrop Grumman for design of the Navy's DDX Land Attack Destroyer the Congressional Budget Office says ought to be scrapped; $2.3 billion to General Dynamics for one Virginia Class submarine, just one of 18 the Pentagon plans to build; $3 billion to Boeing for the F–18 E/F that according to the General Accounting Office hasn't met performance goals justifying its development; $3.7 billion to Lockheed Martin for the controversial F–22, the most expensive plane ever built that was designed to combat Soviet aircraft that no longer exist; and $4.3 billion to Lockheed Martin for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, a program CBO argues could save $17 billion between now and 2013 if Congress just slowed down its development. In suspending these Fiscal Year 2004 appropriations alone, we would save nearly $24 billion that could be applied to operations in Iraq.

Congress has a clear message to send to the President: winning the peace in Iraq cannot be won on the backs of working Americans. Investments made abroad must be made at home and the sacrifices being made for Iraq must be shared. I urge my colleagues to hold this President accountable to the American people. Demand a clear strategy from this Administration, rip up this blank check, and vote down this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my grave concerns with the Administration's additional $87 billion supplemental request for Iraq. Earlier this year, Congress gave a good faith approval of $78.5 billion in Iraq and other related costs as part of the Administration's FY2003 supplemental request. At that time, those of us concerned with the long-term budgetary impact of the operation were repeatedly assured that any additional funding needed would be negligible, and that Iraq's own resources would go a long way towards financing the reconstruction. In spite of repeated pleas for an honest accounting of future plans, we were frustrated by the Administration's refusal to be straightforward with the American people about the long-term costs necessary to secure on the ground the stability that fosters peace.

Our frustration continues today, as the Administration now asks us to pass along to the American taxpayers the burden of funding an additional $87 billion for Iraq. And we know now—as many of us suspected then—that the $165.5 billion in spending from the two supplemental requests thus far is only the tip of the iceberg. The American people deserve real answers and accountability with their hard-earned dollars, and I believe they are already doubting the Administration's insistence that our financial house is in order and all is ok: the Administration would like us to think that we can afford to pour billions into Iraq, give greater tax cuts to millionaires, and still meet the needs of working families. We can't.

It doesn't take a mathematician to notice that someone loses out in this unbalanced equation, and I believe the losers will be working-class families. Working families know a lot about getting by on tight budgets, and they know that you cannot balance your checkbooks if you refuse to sacrifice. It is simply wrong to continue to impose an American taxpayers the results of a failed economic policy that promises to burden future generations with the costs of today's failures.

This is why I joined with Congressman TOM LANTOS in offering an amendment before the Rules Committee that would offset the cost of the $87 billion supplemental by reducing the size of the tax cut for the wealthiest one percent of Americans. This is a commonsense amendment that allows us to follow through with the responsibilities we've assumed in Iraq without abandoning our responsibilities to the American people. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee blocked our amendment. Throughout history, when our troops have been in harms way abroad, the American people have been asked to sacrifice at home. However, this Administration seems to think it is perfectly fine to pad the pockets of the millionaires and billionaires, while ballooning deficit to the detriment of most American taxpayers, and taxpayers of generations to come.

At a time when so many Americans are out of work and down on their luck, we find ourselves shouldering the significant costs of rebuilding Iraq. We find ourselves in this conundrum because of a conscious decision by the current Administration to abandon diplomacy in order to launch a preemptive war, due to a threat that now appears to have been far less than imminent. In a world threatened by the clear and present danger of Al Oaeda and other terrorist groups, we decide to divert our resources to pursue a threat that was not at all clear and, the evidence seems to indicate, was not at all a present danger.

In the months after 9/11 the entire world was behind us, people from nations far and wide opened their arms to us, as did their governments. It defies reason that our government could have squandered this almost unprecedented international goodwill, pursued a course of unilateralism, and treated our allies in a dismissive if not contemptuous manner. Consequently, we are essentially single-handedly assuming the lion's-share of costs associated with maintaining security and rebuilding Iraq. An even more profound consequence of this unilateralist approach is that it is overwhelmingly our men and women in uniform who are bearing this burden, who are away from their families, suffering casualties, and giving their lives.

Despite all of my objections to the supplemental request under consideration today, I believe that we are basically left with no choice but to complete our mission. I urge Congress to offset the costs of Iraq by reducing the tax cut for millionaires. This is why I offered an amendment before the Rules Committee, and this is why I voted against the previous question in an effort to make the Obey substitute in order. The Administration sent us down this path, and now we cannot afford to create greater regional instability by wiping our hands of our unfinished business in Iraq. However, in order to assure that we are doing everything possible to restore fiscal order to these immense funding requests, I believe we must at minimum make wise choices about the long-term costs of our mission, hold the Administration accountable for the funding in this Supplemental, and insist upon the imposition of real benchmarks.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, one of the most difficult challenges of this job is to balance the responsibilities of being an elected official with those of one's family. Too often, the family is sacrificed.

On Monday, my mother-in-law, Helen Zimmer, passed away. At 91 she lived a full life as a wife and mother, serving her family, friends, and God. Today she is in paradise with the Lord, her husband George, her brothers and sisters, her parents, my dad, and others who died before her.

She has no more pain or periods of loneliness, because there are no tears in heaven. She is celebrating with our Lord and Saviour. It is her family who is left behind that grieves.

Edmund Burke referred to family as our ''Little Platoons.'' Weddings, funerals, and the occasional reunions are the times we pass our values to our children and to one another.

Our time together reminds us all of the comparative brevity of our lives. How do we redeem the time God has given us? Did we use it selfishly? Did we spend our life serving others or serving ourselves? Did we stand up and be counted? Were we ''strong and courageous'' or did we crave popularity? Were we fearful of being looked down upon or laughed at for standing for what is right and just?

I wanted to be with my family as we spend these rare days together from far and near. Thus, I will miss these critical votes. I personally prepared this statement because I didn't want my absence to be misunderstood as any sign of weakening of my support for President Bush and his policies.

And, if my vote is needed—which my understanding is that it is not—I will fly back to vote in favor of this supplemental. But I will not abandon my family at this time for a vote that is not needed.

I have been disappointed in some of my colleagues who have been expressing ''surprise'' and ''frustration'' at the difficulty of the reconstruction of Iraq.

Where were you the last few years? Did you meet with any Iraqis before you voted?

In Fort Wayne we have Iraqi Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds, all with substantially different experiences. If there are Iraqis in Fort Wayne, they

are probably in the home districts of many, if not most, Members.

Are you leading us to believe you were uninformed when you voted to send our troops to war? Are you learning just now that there are no other democracies among Arab nations in the region? If no such examples exist, it only makes sense that trying to establish one is a massive challenge. Those of us who voted for the war, like me, have no excuse for not knowing that this would be expensive, hard, and potentially lengthy.

President Bush came before this body and clearly laid out his goals and the work necessary to achieve them. Members in this Chamber applauded and cheered. Now, some of the same Members whine: ''$87 billion is too much.''

Sixty-seven billion of this emergency funding request is for our soldiers. It seems to me that many of the critics want these same troops to do even more—be museum curators, traffic cops, and water system managers—but without casualties. How do they propose to do this without spending the dollars?

The $20 billion for reconstruction will go largely to American companies employing American workers. We are, for the most part, paying ourselves.

As for loan repayments, can you imagine the outcome if we were to take revenue from the limited current Iraqi oil as payment for a staggering long-term debt that no elected Iraqi chose to obligate?

We will face additional funding requests to rebuild Iraq, and I support the Administration in trying to develop some variation of the idea put forth by Congressman CHARLES TAYLOR of North Carolina. Congressman TAYLOR proposes a blended cost recovery—as oil revenues rise, a proportion of previous debt and American taxpayer contributions are retired, but at a level that gives the free Iraq room to grow and breathe. If in the future, Iraq enjoys massive oil revenue increases, the American taxpayer should be repaid accordingly. More repayment than France ever received.

At the end of World War II, the United States invested billions of dollars in Western Europe. The United States believed rebuilding war torn Western Europe would keep Communism from spreading. The Marshall Plan, perhaps some of my colleagues have heard of it, is often considered one of America's most successful foreign policy initiatives.

From the amount of reconstruction necessary to the existence of a functioning government, Western Europe and Iraq are worlds apart, but there is one unifying goal that transcends any differences between the two situations—stability and democracy.

What alternative do we actually have? If we pull out now, we probably will have to return to Iraq yet again when terrorists regain government control.

An investment of billions of dollars is painful but less than large human losses in combat or thousands of deaths from weapons of mass destruction.

We—the United States, President Bush, and Congress—may fail to give the Iraqi people the chance for peace and freedom but we will have exhausted every effort in doing so because it is the right thing to do.

The alternatives seem to guarantee more death and destruction in the future. And of course, greater financial costs over the long run.

To my Republican colleagues especially, let's not be ''summertime soldiers'' and ''sunshine patriots'' who pose with President Bush when he's at 75 percent in the polls, and criticize him and whine when he is not as popular.

We need to do this. We need to do it because it is the right thing to do, not because it is popular or unpopular.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the President's $87 billion request which represents a combination of funding for the reconstruction of Iraq and funding for our troops.

This extraordinary request of Congress should be bifurcated, with 2 individual bills, one for our troops, and the other vote on the reconstruction package. However, the House Leadership refuses to allow a bifurcated vote, knowing one would pass, support for the troops, and one would fail, reconstruction.

I will vote against the President's request because it furthers a failed policy; because the Administration continues to operate without a plan; and because the President has yet to account to the Congress and the American people exactly how the $65 billion appropriated in April, 2003, for Iraq has been spent.

I firmly believe that the policies of unilateralism and preemption are wrong but the reality today is that our troops are in Iraq and cutting and running is not an American option. We need transparency, we need a plan and we need the truth.

Supporting our troops is essential and that's why I voted for the $65 billion appropriation in April. But now we find out that our troops don't even have Kevlar flak jacket inserts or portable jammers that block radio signals used to detonate remote control bombs that have been used repeatedly to kill and injure our troops.

The Administration is still incapable or unwilling to articulate a coherent and workable strategy to accomplish our mission in Iraq and bring our troops home. The power of the purse remains the only effective means that the Congress has to ensure for the American people that such a strategy exists and that it has a reasonable chance for success.

To support this huge request for funds prior to evidence of such a strategy would be an abdication of my responsibility.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with a heavy heart. It is weighed down by the many peace and security challenges our nation faces in Iraq, Afghanistan, North Korea, Iran, Syria, Liberia, Colombia, Israel, the West Bank and Gaza, China and Taiwan, and India and Pakistan. It is weighed down by the humanitarian crises we face: famine, displaced persons, AIDS and other health care challenges. And it is also weighed down by the very serious challenges we face here at home: unemployment, budget deficits, the need for affordable health care, improving education for our kids, keeping our promises to our veterans, investing in our infrastructure, guaranteeing Social Security and Medicare, and protecting our homeland and our civil liberties.

I wish we had the ability to work on all of these challenges simultaneously. I wish our leaders in the executive branch and those of us here in Congress could give each of these challenges the focused attention needed to make significant progress.

I wish we had enough resources to pay for a war, rebuild two countries, fight the war on terrorism, stop nuclear proliferation, negotiate peace in the Middle East, stop the spread of AIDS, return refugees to their homes, ensure that every child in every country has food to eat and is vaccinated against preventable diseases. I wish at the same time we could get our economy growing and put people to work. I wish we could give everyone a tax cut without underfunding our health care, education, and homeland security, or borrowing from our retirement and leaving the bill for our children.

I have all of these wishes, but simply wishing will not make it so.

Our job is to listen to the American people as they talk about their needs and their desires, and then set and fund our nation's priorities. Our job is to keep our homeland safe. And our job is to protect our freedom and liberty.

Mr. Chairman, the war in Iraq is the wrong priority, conducted in the wrong way, at the wrong time.

We all were shocked and horrified by the attacks of September 11. All Americans faced a new sense of vulnerability, one that could find them here at home, out of the blue. It was natural for us to be afraid. Our reaction as Americans was to demand action. Our reaction as national leaders was to act to confront the threat and protect our homeland.

All Americans were united in the desire to seek justice by finding and punishing the perpetrators of September 11. The world came together in solidarity with our loss, working with us to find the perpetrators, to break up Al Qaeda, arrest its leaders, and to interrupt the flow of money to terrorists. It should have been crystal clear that fighting terrorism and protecting American security would require friends and allies; cooperation, not confrontation.

Yet, the Bush Administration instead engaged in a singled-minded drive to achieve its Iraq objectives at any cost, instead of developing a policy to deal with Iraq by working with our allies and the entire world community. It is particularly troubling that the very rationale used by the Bush Administration to try to win the endorsement of the United Nations Security Council—the urgent threat of Iraq's use of weapons of mass destruction—cannot now be verified. Some in the Bush Administration have even suggested that the imminent threat of WMDs was not the main reason for the war. The shifting justifications for war and the lack of WMD evidence undermines U.S. credibility around the world. If the intelligence that Colin Powell brought before the U.N. Security Council now appears inaccurate, how will future intelligence presented by the U.S. be received? Will it be believed?

Throughout our history, the United States has been viewed by the world as a beacon of freedom and a pillar of democratic principle. Following the devastation of World War II, the United States showed tremendous leadership as we created international institutions and a framework of international law to prevent war and to sustain and maintain peace. We were the leaders in promoting a world where conflicts could be resolved peacefully and cooperatively. While never perfect, this system of international institutions has been remarkably effective. The United States was seen as a constructive force in the world. Right now we are seen by many as a destructive force in the world. That is not the vision for America that I have, and it is not the vision that Americans have.

Many around the world are shocked and dismayed by the unilateral, confrontational approach that the Bush Administration has taken in the world arena. I share their concern. We must recognize the consequences in the world community of our rejection of Kyoto, of the International Criminal Court, of the treaty to ban land mines, our failure to ratify the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Convention to End All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and our own withdrawal from the ABM treaty. We must be mindful about how our criticism of the UN and NATO are heard throughout the world community. Calling longtime allies ''Old Europe'' is terribly counterproductive. The war in Iraq is seen against this larger backdrop.

I stand here today to urge this President and this Congress to return to our tradition of constructiveness rather than destructiveness. We should be builders rather than destroyers.

Before the war started, I wrote to President Bush asking a series of questions concerning possible U.S. military engagement in Iraq. One question asked was, ''what is the exit strategy and how do we know when the campaign has successfully concluded?'' I still have not received an answer to this critical question, nor have the American people.

In May, the President dramatically declared an end to major combat operations in Iraq. It may have made compelling television, but nearly 170,000 American troops are still in Iraq or the immediate region, facing attacks and wondering when they are coming home. No doubt, they are doing the best they can to carry out their mission. All Americans should be proud of their dedication, hard work and professionalism. We must give our troops every tool they need to protect their safety as well as provide them with every possible comfort during their incredible service in this military campaign.

The problem is that the military campaign continues with no end in sight. Since the end of ''major combat operations'' the Bush Administration has been reacting to events and improvising. It is becoming apparent that they still do not have a plan.

And they should have had a plan. Prior to the war, most experts were saying that military conquest was the easy part, rebuilding the peace was the challenge.

While I am very critical of the rosy scenarios painted by the Defense Department, purposely spread to allay the concerns of Americans about the costs and consequences of war, the real problem here is the lack of leadership. It is unacceptable to claim that events in Iraq could not have been anticipated. It is simply not true that the extent of damage to the electrical and water systems in Iraq were unknown. Prior to the war, the United Nations conducted a detailed assessment of Iraq's infrastructure which clearly delineated the problems and the requirements for repair and rebuilding. The report was unheeded.

There was planning for a post-Saddam Hussein Iraq. The State Department organized the ''Future of Iraq Project'' that brought together exiled Iraqis to develop detailed plans for Iraq's economy, security, and governance. A series of working groups completed these comprehensive plans. So what happened to the recommendations of the ''Future of Iraq Project?'' The first civilian in charge of postwar Iraq reconstruction, General Jay Garner, has said publicly that he was instructed to ignore those proposals.

It should be no surprise that so many American troops are still in Iraq attempting to maintain order and begin reconstruction of Iraqi society. Army Chief of Staff Eric Shinseki testified to Congress that ''several hundred thousand soldiers'' would be needed for a year or more. What did Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz say about General Shinseki's estimate? He testified that it was ''wildly off the mark.''

It should be no surprise that the costs of the war and reconstruction are running far higher than suggested by the Administration. When asked about the likely cost of a war with Iraq, then-Chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisors Lawrence Lindsay said it would cost between $100 million and $200 million. Budget Director Mitch Daniels and economic advisor Glenn Hubbard immediately said the cost would be much less. If we approve this $87 billion request, we'll be approaching $140 million so far. And with no plan, there is no end in sight.

Mr. Chairman, my heart is heavy today because the President of the United States is coming to this Congress and asking us to appropriate $87 billion to a policy without a plan and a military commitment without an exit strategy. The American people have so many questions about our mission in Iraq, but they have received so few answers.

I have no doubt that there has been progress in Iraq. Our servicemen and women are working hard to restore security in the streets. No-bid contractors are working on the electrical system and water treatment facilities. I have heard from Iraqis that progress is being made. But I have also heard their fears and concerns. Despite our best efforts, too many streets are unsafe for women to walk along. Jobs are scarce, leaving people with few options to earn a living. Gas lines are long and telecommunications are mostly inoperable. The problem in Iraq isn't that the stories of our successes are not getting out in American media. The problem is we're not making progress fast enough. No PR campaign will fix the electrical system, purify the water, make the streets safe, restore oil production, reconstitute a representative Iraqi government, create jobs, restore hope, or bring our troops home any sooner. Failure to convey a positive message is not the problem, the policy (or rather lack of policy) is the problem.

Emblematic of the policy failure is the $87 billion emergency supplemental spending request submitted by the Bush Administration. It contained essential funds to support our men and women involved in the military campaign, but even that amount was insufficient in crucial areas like bulletproof vests and spare parts for Bradley fighting vehicles and Humvees. At the same time, the Administration requested: $400 million to construct two new prisons, at a cost of $50,000 per bed; $20 million for a four-week business course at $10,000 per student; $100 million to enroll 100 five-person families in a witness protection program, at a cost of $200,000 per person; $100 million to finance 500 experts to investigate crimes against humanity, at a cost of $200,000 per person; $9 million to create zip codes and $4 million to create area codes; $100 million to build seven new model communities; and $900 million to import petroleum products like kerosene and diesel to one of the largest oil producing nations in the world.

The need to import millions of dollars of petroleum products to Iraq speaks volumes about how poorly the administration of postwar Iraq was planned. Officials did not expect oil refineries and pipelines to be sabotaged or U.S. troops to be continually ambushed. Their revenue projections for Iraqi oil production were off the mark. Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz testified that oil revenues ''could bring in between $50 and $100 billion over the course of the next two or three years. Now we know that this year the revenues are only going to be a few billion dollars. Today, Defense Department Comptroller Dov Zakheim told the House Budget Committee that revenues are now projected at $31 billion for the next two years. Even if these oil revenues are achieved, it will not all be available for reconstruction since a large portion will need to be used for essential government services like police, health care, education and transportation.

I am glad that the House Appropriations Committee dropped many of the most outrageous spending items requested by the Administration. However, I still have major concerns about how much of the reconstruction funds will be used. It is impossible to evaluate whether or not, or how much, money is needed in each area.

Iraq's needs are great. It is a country that has gone years under a brutal dictatorship and subject to debilitating international sanctions. By virtue of being the occupying power, under international law, the United States is responsible for what happens in Iraq. We have no choice but to meet our legal responsibility. Beyond legal requirements, we have a moral obligation to help Iraq rebuild. As New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman has said, ''You break it, you buy it.'' By unilaterally attacking Iraq, we have assumed the task of ensuring it is reconstructed.

I hope that the Administration will succeed at the international donor's conference later this month. Iraq needs more help than the United States alone can provide. Debts owed by Iraq, taken out by Saddam Hussein, should be forgiven. Rebuilding Iraq will be hard enough without large debt payments to wealthy countries absorbing Iraq's oil revenues. In deciding to go to war in Iraq with few international allies, the Bush Administration has left the United States in a very difficult situation and with a very large financial obligation. It should be no surprise that those nations that never supported our war with Iraq remain, at this juncture, unwilling to pay for rebuilding it. Because of Iraq's great need, I hope that other countries will reconsider and provide the Iraqi people with the generosity they so desperately need.

Mr. Chairman, the Administration has come back to Congress for $87 billion, on top of the $62.3 billion we previously appropriated. It is difficult for those of us who opposed the President's decision to attack Iraq to now give the Administration a blank check, a down-payment on an occupation without an exit strategy and a rebuilding fund without a real plan. Based on the Administration's track record, this funding request is just the tip of the iceberg.

Recently, Ambassador Paul Bremer, who is the U.S. Administrator for Iraq, said the country would need $100 billion for rebuilding efforts. Only $20 billion of that is included in the President's current $87 billion request for emergency funding. Since current estimates of likely foreign contributions total a few billion dollars at best, there are huge bills coming due just a short way down the road.

The bill we have before us today is inadequate in so many ways. I think that this House could have significantly improved the bill. Many of my colleagues proposed amendments that, if considered, would have improved the bill. The bill could have been improved in many ways, but there are two changes that I believe are essential. First, the bill should require a detailed report from the President describing how funds in the previous war supplemental have been spent, how funds appropriated in this bill will be spent, and the level and types of funding needed for future years for both military and reconstruction activities.

Second, the bill should require that Congress be notified of non-competitive contracting, require a report from the General Accounting Office on accountability, and tighten public disclosure requirements. The initial Iraq reconstruction contracts were issued without a standard competitive bidding process. These contracts went to firms closely connected with the Bush Administration. One large contract went to Brown, Root & Kellogg, a subsidiary of Halliburton, the company formerly headed by the Vice President CHENEY. The Halliburton, no-bid contract was worth an initial $948 million. Because of this contract, Halliburton has a competitive advantage over other businesses during future rounds of bidding. Another large contract was awarded to Bechtel, a company that is lead by former officials from the first Bush Administration. We need to make sure that every cent of the $20 billion for Iraq reconstruction is awarded fairly and openly.

What is wrong with the House voting on these and other amendments? I wish someone would tell us. Unfortunately, the Republican House leadership used procedural roadblocks to prevent debate on most of these alternatives and improvements. The Administration is going to get the bill they wanted, with few amendments, requirements or limitations. I believe it is a mistake to reward their previous poor estimates, bad planning, withholding of information, and refusal to provide cost estimates with a blank check now. It is time for some accountability.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, the Iraq Supplemental must be considered within the context of our national priorities. We do not have unlimited funds to spend. With our federal budget in deficit, every dollar we spend in Iraq is money that we are borrowing from our children.

Even under the most optimistic scenario for Iraq, in which this is the last request for funding, we will add $178 billion to our nation's budget deficit. Of that $178 billion, $66 billion will be interest payments on that debt. A more realistic scenario, in which our military remains in Iraq until the end of 2006, we draw down our force over that period, and we spend an additional $5 billion for reconstruction, would add $238 billion to the debt, $84 billion just in interest.

It's almost surreal to live in a time when our budget deficit is growing by leaps and bounds, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans get massive tax cuts in the midst of economic difficulties, and now this huge unpaid bill is being amassed in Iraq. We have very real domestic priorities that need to be addressed. We must get our people back to work. We must provide funding for ''No Child Left Behind.'' We must to take care of our veterans. We must protect our homeland. Each of their priorities requires resources. The situation in Iraq does not mean that we should not move forward at home.

This Administration spends a lot of time talking about fiscal discipline. Yet they have spent more than any Administration in our nation's history. Instead of fiscal discipline and instead of providing funding for our nation's key priorities, they squandered our budget surplus and continue to amass greater and greater debt to pay for tax cuts that we cannot afford. This does not serve our nation well.

Our funding priorities must include protecting our brave servicemen and women in Iraq and taking care of their families back home with hazard pay and other tools to make the separation easier to bear. This supplemental bill only takes modest steps to help them.

I opposed authorizing the use of force in Iraq. I urged the President to not use that authority after it was granted by Congress. This is not a war that I support. Putting tens of billions of dollars into an inadequate plan with no end in sight makes no sense. I cannot in good conscience vote for this supplemental spending bill. What I suggest is that the Administration go back to the drawing board and work to develop a real plan, with Iraqis, the United Nations and other countries. After we have a real plan, with better cost estimates, the President can come back to us with a detailed proposal.

I strongly support our troops. We must ensure they have the resources they need. It is fortunate that a vote against this bill will not harm our troops. An analysis by the Congressional Research Service estimates that already appropriated funds will last until at least early April 2004. That is plenty of time for this Administration to regroup, figure out what they are doing, and return to Congress with a better proposal.

Mr. Chairman, my vote today will be cast with a heavy heart. But I cast it with confidence that it is the best vote to serve our country.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, protecting and securing America's homeland remains a top priority within out national borders and abroad.

Global stability or instability directly affects the United States in all areas, rural or suburban.

Investing money now to defeat terrorists overseas where they plot evil schemes is unquestionably better than spending money later to rebuild New York City or Los Angeles, after thousands of innocent lives are potentially lost.

The war on terrorism is one America cannot afford to lose. Our way of life is at stake as we defend freedom, democracy and peace around the world. I support this approach.

One necessary campaign in the war against terror was in Iraq.

We went to war to dispose of a brutal dictator guilty of the most atrocious human rights violations in the modern world.

I voted to support the use of force against Iraq for many reasons: a litany of ruthless atrocities by Saddam Hussein against his own people; decades of deception and violation of United Nations resolutions; invading neighboring countries; and, links to al Qaeda and other terrorist training camps.

David Kay recently issued a statement that his team has indeed found substantial evidence that Iraq had many programs hidden from view to produce nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and had active illegal programs to deliver them using ballistic missiles, cruise missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles.

I believe this is 95 percent of a smoking gun.

I remain convinced these are solid justifications for war and asking our brave men and women in uniform to potentially sacrifice their lives so we can live in freedom.

The rebuilding of Iraq will take considerable time, effort and resources.

It requires the support and will of the American people.

The country is devastated after being neglected for years by an evil leader that spent money on palaces and weapons instead of infrastructure.

America has no desire to be an occupying power in Iraq but instead wants to transfer power and accountability to the Iraqi people as soon as realistically possible.

The $18.6 billion portion as part of the President's supplemental request for Iraq reconstruction funds is an important part of the overall effort to win the war on terrorism by helping to rebuild Iraq.

The President recently told the country that Iraq has become the central front in the war on terrorism.

Without this money, there is a real risk Iraq will become a breeding ground for terrorism.

This request will pay for essential needs, not Iraqi foreign debt or frivolous desires.

The President's request includes funding to enable this progress to continue.

It will help create and train the New Iraqi Army to enable Iraqi forces to work with Coalition forces to eliminate remaining remnants of the Saddam Hussein regime.

The request also include money to equip and train an Iraqi police service, civil defense force, and border patrols—all of which will increase the security of and reduce the need for U.S. troops performing these missions.

Finally, the supplemental request includes funds for U.S. force protection through additional body armor and quality of life funding for extended hazardous duty pay and travel assistance for military families.

After achieving military victory, we must now ensure a peaceful and prosperous Iraq emerges.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, before consideration of any other amendment, except pro forma amendments by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments:

Number 1, an amendment in the nature of a substitute by Mr. OBEY, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

Number 2, an amendment by Mr. YOUNG of Florida regarding sustenance, which will be debatable for 10 minutes;

Number 3, an amendment by Mr. OBEY regarding quality of life, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

Number 4, an amendment by Mr. PENCE regarding loans, which shall be debatable for 1 hour; and

Number 5, an amendment by Mr. OBEY and Mr. LANTOS regarding loans, which also shall be debatable for 1 hour.

Each such amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by a Member designated or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3289

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, namely:

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a splendid amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. OBEY:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, namely:

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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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

(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. (a) DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND CLOSE-OUT AUTHORITY.—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) ACCOUNTS CHARGEABLE.—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 appropriation 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: *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. 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 our 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.

SEC. 1112. (a) PROVIDING MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCREENING FOR RESERVISTS CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY.—Section 1074a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) At any time after the Secretary concerned notifies members of the Ready Reserve that the members are to be called or ordered to active duty, the administering Secretaries may provide to each such member any medical and dental screening and care that is necessary to ensure that the member meets the applicable medical and dental standards for deployment.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall promptly transmit to each member of the Ready Reserve eligible for screening and care under this subsection a notification of eligibility for such screening and care.

''(3) A member provided medical or dental screening or care under paragraph (1) may not be charged for the screening or care.

''(4) Screening and care may not be provided under this section after September 30, 2004.''.

(b) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $40,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Defense Health Program'' only for covering the costs of reservists medical and dental screening and care. Such 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. 1113. (a) EXTENDING TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR RESERVISTS.—Subject to subsection (b), during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2004, section 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be administered by substituting for paragraph (3) the following:

''(3) Transitional health care for a member under subsection (a) shall be available for 180 days beginning on the date on which the member is separated from active duty.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—(1) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to separations from active duty that take effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Beginning on October 1, 2004, the period for which a member is provided transitional health care benefits under section 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be adjusted as necessary to comply with the limits provided under paragraph (3) of such section.

(c) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $60,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Defense Health Program'' only for covering the costs of extending transitional health care benefits for reservists. Such 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. 1114. (a) INCREASE IN SUPPORT FOR RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD FAMILY ASSISTANCE CENTERS.—In addition to any other amounts appropriated in this or any other Act for fiscal year 2004, $50,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 2004, as follows:

(1) For the Army Reserve, $4,000,000.

(2) For the Army National Guard, $42,000,000.

(3) For the Air National Guard, $2,000,000.

The 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.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available only for family assistance centers.

SEC. 1115. PERMANENT ELIMINATION OF SUBSISTENCE FEE FOR MEMBERS HOSPITALIZED FOR WOUNDS RECEIVED WHILE IN COMBAT OR TRAINING.—Subsection (c) of section 1075 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 8146(a)(2) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87)), is repealed.

SEC. 1116. (a) PREPAID PHONE CARDS FOR MEMBERS DEPLOYED IN COMBAT ZONE.—Beginning on the first day of the first month following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a program to provide prepaid phone cards to members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in a combat zone. The value of the benefit shall be at least $50 per month per person.

(b) TELEPHONE AND INTERNET SERVICE FOR MEMBERS DEPLOYED IN COMBAT ZONE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary should seek to provide free telephone and Internet access to members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in a combat zone.

(c) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $65,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for covering the costs of providing telephone and Internet service to members of the United States Armed Services in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such 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. 1117. (a) GOVERNMENT-PAID TRAVEL UNDER REST AND RECUPERATION LEAVE PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS SERVING ONE YEAR OR MORE IN-THEATRE.—In the case of a member of the Armed Forces serving outside of the United States for a period of one year or more who is granted rest and recuperative leave, and provided the travel and transportation allowances authorized by section 411c(a) of title 37, United States Code, in connection with that leave, the Secretary of Defense shall also pay the member for transportation, or provide transportation for the member, between—

(1) the locations specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of such section; and

(2) the permanent duty station of the member, the home of record of the member, or other location in the United States or overseas approved by the Secretary.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to travel beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act in connection with rest and recuperative leave described in subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act, $50,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense only for covering the costs of providing transportation for service to members of the United States Armed Services in Iraq and Afghanistan on rest and recuperation leave. Such 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. 1118. PROVIDING ESSENTIAL GOODS AND SERVICES FOR TROOPS.—Of amounts appropriated under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' in this Act, $40,500,000 shall be made available only for providing essential goods and services to the military exchange services.

SEC. 1119. (a) MILITARY CAMPAIGN MEDALS TO RECOGNIZE SERVICE IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM AND OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.—The President shall establish a campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and a separate campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by the President, eligibility for a campaign medal established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be set forth in uniform regulations to be prescribed by the Secretaries of the military departments and approved by the Secretary of Defense or in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 1120. (a) ENHANCED TRANSITION ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED SERVICEMEMBERS RETURNING TO CIVILIAN LIFE.—In addition to amounts appropriated in this or any other Act, $50,000,000 is appropriated for the Disabled Transition Assistance Program, in addition to any other amounts available for that program. Such 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.

(b) USE OF APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be used to increase the number of personnel within the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense assigned as case managers and discharge planners with responsibility for managing the case of a member of the Armed Forces who is very seriously ill, or seriously ill.

SEC. 1121. INCREASE FOR RECONSTITUTING THE MILITARY FORCES.—In addition to amounts appropriated in this or any other Act, the sum of $3,126,400,000 is appropriated only for the maintenance, repair, replacement, or reconstitution of weapon systems and equipment used in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, to be distributed to the following accounts and in the following amounts:

(1) ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $323,700,000;

(2) ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $861,000,000;

(3) ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $467,100,000;

(4) ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $129,200,000;

(5) ''Other Procurement, Army'', $329,700,000;

(6) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $61,000,000;

(7) ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $220,400,000;

(8) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $146,300,000;

(9) ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $33,000,000; and

(10) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $555,000,000:

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.

SEC. 1122. INCREASE IN ARMY MANPOWER END-STRENGTH LEVEL.—Notwithstanding the limitations set forth in Section 691 of title 10 United States Code, as amended by Public Law 107-314 (116 Stat. 2524), the number of members of the Army on active duty at the end of fiscal year 2004 shall not be less than 500,000: *Provided*, That in addition to amounts appropriated in this or any other Act, $1,000,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to be allocated as follows:

(1) ''Military Personnel, Army'', $600,000,000; and

(2) ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $400,000,000:

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

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Construction, Army'', $364,100,000, 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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. 1201. (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.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

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 such 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.

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 such 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. Each such 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.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance'', $43,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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, $14,031,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, to be allocated as follows: $2,104,000,000 for security and law enforcement; $1,081,000,000 for justice, public safety infrastructure, and civil society; $3,735,000,000 for the electric sector; $1,800,000,000 for oil infrastructure; $3,507,000,000 for water resources and sanitation; $500,000,000 for transportation and telecommunications; $185,000,000 for roads, bridges, and construction; $793,000,000 for health care; $73,000,000 for private sector development; and $253,000,000 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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 such 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. (a) COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN IRAQ.—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.

(d) GAO REPORT ON NONCOMPETITIVE CONTRACTING.—The Comptroller General shall submit a report to the appropriate committees on a quarterly basis on the contracts awarded under procedures other than competitive procedures that were subject to the notification requirements of paragraph (a). Such review shall include an evaluation of the reasons for using other than competitive procedures and an evaluation of the selection procedures used to make final contract awards.

SEC. 2203. (a) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF NONCOMPETITIVE CONTRACTING FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN IRAQ.—

(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 5 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 an 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 relates.

(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.

SEC. 2212. (a) REPORT ON MILITARY OPERATIONS AND RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN.—The President shall prepare and transmit to Congress on a quarterly basis, beginning January 15, 2004, 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 detailed and complete accounting of amounts appropriated under any previous Acts used to support military or reconstruction activities in and around Iraq and Afghanistan; a detailed and complete accounting of funds appropriated in this Act that were expended during the preceding quarter for military operations and reconstruction efforts in and around Iraq and Afghanistan; and, an estimate of the remaining total cost to the United States of military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan for fiscal year 2004 and subsequent fiscal years.

(2) A description of activities undertaken and findings made in the search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

(3) 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, sewage systems, road construction and other public works, transportation and telecommunications infrastructure, medical and hospital services, and private sector development.

(4) A description of progress made to reduce attacks against members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq; a detailed listing of the casualties suffered by United States Armed Forces personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan during the preceding quarter and cumulatively; a listing of equipment, weapons, and spare parts shortfalls (compared to stated military service requirements) and a description of the actions taken to address the shortfalls; and a timeframe for the withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

(5) An analysis of the impact that military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have had on overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

(6) An analysis of the impact the 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.

(7) An estimate of the remaining 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.

(8) A description of progress made toward holding of free and fair elections in Iraq.

(9) A description of the extent of international participation (including financial and other) in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq.

(10) A detailed accounting of the number of United States Armed Forces currently deployed in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(11) A detailed accounting on the use of private contractors for contracts over $10,000,000, including the costs of salaries, insurance payments, oversight plans, costs of security provided by coalition troops to contractors, performance schedules, plans to train Iraqi national to assume functions of the contract, and the extent of the use of local procurement and local management.

(c) LIMITATION.—Beginning on January 15, 2004, none of the funds made available by this Act that remain for obligation may be obligated unless and until the President has submitted to Congress the report described in subsections (a) and (b) of this provision.

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.

SEC. 2214. (a) TRANSPARENCY IN CONTRACTING: NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—(1) The head of an executive agency that enters into a contract, or task or delivery order under a task or delivery order contract, in excess of $5,000,000 relating to activities in Iraq shall, within 7 days after entering into the contract or order, notify the chairman and ranking member of the committees described in subsection (b) that the contract or order has been entered into.

(2) Upon request of the chairman or ranking member of a committee described in subsection (b), the head of an executive agency shall provide, within 14 days after receipt of the request, unredacted copies of any documents required to be maintained in the contracting office contract file, the contract administration office contract file, and the paying office contract file pursuant to subpart 4.8 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including—

(A) copies of the contract and all modifications;

(B) orders issued under the contract;

(C) justifications and approvals;

(D) any government estimate of contract price;

(E) source selection documentation;

(F) cost or price analysis;

(G) audit reports;

(H) justification for type of contract;

(I) authority for deviations from regulations, statutory requirements, or other restrictions;

(J) bills, invoices, vouchers, and supporting documents; and

(K) records of payments or receipts.

(b) COMMITTEES.—The committees referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(3) Each committee that the head of the executive agency determines has legislative jurisdiction for the operations of the department or agency to which the contract, task or delivery order, or documents referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) relates.

SEC. 2215. (a) IRAQI INVOLVEMENT PLAN.—The head of each executive agency entering into a contract relating to activities in Iraq shall develop a plan for minimizing costs to the Federal Government through the use of Iraqi firms.

(b) COMPONENTS OF PLAN.—(1) The plan shall require the head of each executive agency to assess, before entering into a contract relating to activities in Iraq, whether the use of Iraqi firms to carry out the contract could reduce the costs of such contract to the Federal Government.

(2) The plan may provide for the waiver of otherwise applicable Federal procurement

laws or regulations with respect to the contract if the head of the executive agency determines that such laws or regulations impede the ability of the executive agency to reduce the costs of such contract to the Federal Government through the use of Iraqi firms.

(3) The plan shall ensure that all contracts with respect to which laws or regulations are waived pursuant to paragraph (2) are entered into using contracting procedures that are open, fair, accountable, and, to the maximum extent practicable, competitive.

SEC. 2216. (a) LEGAL STATUS OF COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY FOR IRAQ.—For purposes of the following provisions of law, the Coalition Provisional Authority for Iraq shall be considered to be an executive agency within the meaning of the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code:

(1) Procurement statutes, including chapters 137 and 141 of title 10, United States Code, title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.), and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.).

(2) Section 552 of title 5, United States Code (known as the Freedom of Information Act).

(3) Financial management statutes requiring the preparation of audited financial statements, including section 3535 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''Coalition Provisional Authority for Iraq'' means the entity charged by the President with directing reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

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 of 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.

TITLE IV—IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION TRUST FUND

SEC. 4001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Iraq Reconstruction Trust Fund Act''.

SEC. 4002. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY.—The term ''Coalition Provisional Authority'' means the entity charged by the President with directing reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

(3) GOVERNING COUNCIL IN IRAQ.—The term ''Governing Council in Iraq'' means the Governing Council established in Iraq on July 13, 2003, or any successor governing authority in Iraq.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of State.

(5) TRUST FUND.—The term ''Trust Fund'' means the Iraq Reconstruction Fund .

(6) WORLD BANK.—The term ''World Bank'' means the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

SEC. 4003. LIMITATION OF USE OF FUNDS.

Of the funds appropriated in title II under the subheading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' under the heading ''Other Bilateral Economic Assistance Funds Appropriated to the President'' other than amounts appropriated under such subheading for security and. for refugees, human rights, democracy, and civil society, $7,000,000,000 may not be obligated or expended before the Secretary negotiates with the World Bank, in consultation with the Coalition Provisional Authority, the member nations of the World Bank, and other interested parties, for the establishment within the World Bank of the Iraq Reconstruction Trust Fund in accordance with the provisions of this title.

SEC. 4004. DESCRIPTION OF THE TRUST FUND.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Trust Fund shall be to use contribute funds to—

(1) assist in restoration of infrastructure and essential services in Iraq;

(2) assist in the creation of civil society in Iraq; and

(3) ensure a secure environment for the people of Iraq.

(b) IN GENERAL.—As part of the negotiations required by section 4003, the Secretary shall negotiate with the World Bank to establish conditions under which the Trust Fund will be terminated.

(c) REPAYMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—If the Trust Fund is terminated, any amounts contributed, to the Fund that have not been expended shall be returned to the countries that contributed funds to the Trust Fund, on basis proportionate to their contribution.

SEC. 4005. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—In carrying out the purposes set out in section 4004(a), the Trust Fund shall be used to provide loans and loan guarantees under terms that will facilitate economic development in Iraq.

(b) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—The funds in the Trust Fund shall be used to provide loans and loan guarantees that carry out the purposes of the Trust Fund, including projects to—

(1) create or repair infrastructure to—

(A) produce and distribute electricity;

(B) extract, refine, and distribute oil;

(C) provide drinking water;

(D) treat and dispose of wastewater;

(E) provide transportation; and

(F) facilitate communications;

(2) promote public health;

(3) provide housing;

(4) ensure public safety; and

(5) develop a private sector economy.

SEC. 4006. CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO SOLICIT AND ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Trust Fund shall be authorized to solicit and accept contributions from governments, the private sector, and nongovernmental entities of all kinds.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY OF FUNDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall, consistent with subsection (c)—

(1) take such actions as are necessary to ensure that adequate procedures and standards are in place to account for and monitor the use of funds contributed to the Trust Fund, including the cost of administering the Trust Fund; and

(2) seek agreement with the World Bank on the criteria to be used to determine the programs and activities to be assisted by the Trust Fund.

(c) SELECTION OF PROJECTS AND RECIPIENTS.—The Trust Fund and its contributors shall establish—

(1) criteria for the selection of projects to receive support from the Trust Fund;

(2) standards and criteria regarding qualifications of recipients of such support;

(3) such rules and procedures as may be necessary for cost-effective management of the Trust Fund; and

(4) such rules and procedures as may be necessary to ensure transparency and accountability in the making of loans and loan guarantees.

(d) TRANSPARENCY OF OPERATIONS.—The Trust Fund shall establish procedures to ensure full and prompt public disclosure of the proposed objectives, financial organization, and operations of the Trust Fund.

(e) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—The Comptroller or any duly authorized representatives of the Comptroller shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and. records of the Trust Fund for the purpose of preparing the reports required in section 4007(b).

SEC. 4007. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act,

and annually thereafter for the duration of the Trust Fund, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the Trust Fund.

(b) REPORT ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

(1) the goals of the Trust Fund;

(2) the programs, projects, and activities supported by the Trust Fund;

(3) private and governmental, contributions to the Trust Fund; and

(4) the criteria that have been established that would be used to determine the programs and activities to be assisted by the Trust Fund.

SEC. 4008. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other funds available for multilateral or bilateral programs related to the purposes of the Trust Fund, of the amounts appropriated in title II under the subheading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' under the heading ''Other Bilateral Economic Assistance Funds Appropriated to the President'', other than amounts appropriated under such subheading for security, and for refugees, human rights, democracy, and civil society, $7,000,000,000 shall be made available for the fiscal year 2004 for contribution to the Trust Fund. Such 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.

(b) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—Subject to the maximum amount available for contributions to the Trust Fund under this Act, the United States shall contribute to the Trust Fund out of the additional amount made available under subsection (a), the amount that equals the total amount contributed by foreign countries to the Trust Fund during the 180-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—On the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, any amount made available for the Trust Fund under subsection (a) that exceeds the amount required to be contributed to the Trust Fund under subsection (b) shall cease to be available for transfer to the Trust Fund and shall be transferred to an account to be available to the Coalition Provisional Authority for use as loans to, or to guarantee loans made by the Governing Council in Iraq.

SEC. 4009. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

Not later than 15 days prior to the initial obligation or expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to section 4009, the Secretary shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the Trust Fund has been created in accordance with the provisions of this title; and

(2) adequate procedures and standards have been established to ensure accountability for and monitoring of the use of funds contributed to the Trust Fund, including the cost of administering the Trust Fund.

TITLE V—REVENUE PROVISION

SEC. 5001. TOP MARGINAL RATE INCREASED TO 39.6 PERCENT BEGINNING IN 2005.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The table contained in paragraph (2) of section 1(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to reductions in rates after June 30, 2001) is amended to read as follows:

''In the case of taxable years beginning during calendar year:	**The corresponding percentages shall be substituted for the following percentages:**			
	28%	**31%**	**36%**	**39.6%**
2001	27.5%	30.5%	35.5%	39.1%
2002	27.0%	30.0%	35.0%	38.6%
2003 or 2004	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	35.0%
2005 and thereafter	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	39.6%.''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2004.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004''.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the administration has asked us to approve $87 billion in the second installment for Iraq. I understand the necessity for military appropriations and for a reconstruction package. I understand the necessity that they be tied together. But the majority has set up the debate in this House so that a single Member will be able to prevent a comprehensive amendment from being voted upon. That is the way they ensure a victory for their approach.

We are offering this amendment in hopes that the majority will not exercise its right to strike it from the floor, because we believe that if the Congress is going to spend $87 billion on this operation, that this amendment represents a better way to do it. It does more to support our troops. It does more to protect the taxpayers. It does more to restore balance between obligations on us and our allies.

First, it would scale back reconstruction funding by roughly one-third in order to force the administration to redesign its approach in Iraq so that more contracts will go to small indigenous companies and fewer to huge multinational corporations. I have already told the story about General Patreas who, when told by his own engineers that it would take $15 million to build a cement plant in Iraq, managed to get that plant built for $80,000 by using local ideas and local approaches. That is what we ought to be looking for.

Second, we convert half of the remaining funds from grants to loans by running them through the World Bank. This has three advantages. It internationalizes the burden because it will be matched with contributions from other countries on a two-to-one basis. Secondly, it insulates the contracting process from cronyism that can result if it is run by an agency that is responsive to political appointees in the executive branch. And thirdly, because of the way the World Bank can capitalize it, it will, in fact, deliver more assistance to Iraq on the ground at less cost to the taxpayers. It is patterned after a Senate amendment that has been promoted by Senator HUTCHISON.

We transfer $4.5 billion to support our troops. First, we add money to provide U.S. troops in Iraq with clean drinking water. Eighty percent of them now do not have it. That is a shame. It is a shameful indictment of the poor planning associated with this operation.

Secondly, we provide predeployment health and dental screening for Guard and Reserve forces. Right now, they have to pay it.

Thirdly, we extend health coverage for returning Guard and Reserve personnel from the existing 60-days that they are now entitled to, to 6 months.

Fourthly, we provide the full amount that the Services have requested to be used this year to refurbish military equipment that has been used and used up in Iraq. Without it, that equipment will be unusable for 2 years and our readiness to deal with other problems around the world will be substantially inhibited.

Fifth, we face up to General Shinseki's warning that we should not have a 12-division strategy if we only have a 10-division Army. The administration ignored that warning, and as a result, we are at least a division short. That is why Guard and Reserve forces have effectively been drafted for an extra year of service, and that is why regular Army troops have seen their rotation schedules obliterated. This amendment helps to fix that over time.

Most importantly, we try to pay for this operation. In the spirit of shared sacrifice, what we are asking is that we do not limit the sacrifice only to the troops in the field and their families. We are asking that we pay for it in the most fair way possible, by saying to the most prosperous of all Americans, the top 1 percent of the population, that we want to scale back the tax cut that they have just been given by the President and the Congress so that they will only get a $52,000 tax cut rather than $130,000 tax cut they would otherwise receive.

I would point out that if we follow that approach, we would also be able to save $4 billion a year in interest costs. That $4 billion is larger than all of the money that we will spend this year for Alzheimer's research, research on autism, breast cancer, ovarian cancer, prostate cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's, Lou Gehrig's disease and all kidney diseases combined.

□ 1645

It is a responsible amendment. I am amazed that, once again, the majority feels that the only way that they can win the debate is by denying us the opportunity to waive the same rules that they waived in bringing their approach to the floor.

This is an attempt to be more prudent with the taxpayers' money, more balanced in terms of responsibilities between us and our allies, and more responsive in terms of meeting the needs of the troops. It can neither be called a liberal nor a conservative amendment. It is a hard-headed approach to real problems; and I would urge the majority to, despite the fenced-in rule which they adopted, to allow us to at least have a vote on this proposition. If it does not have the merits to beat the majority party approach, then it will be defeated. If it does, it should be adopted. All we ask is for the opportunity to put this issue to a vote, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the Obey substitute amendment. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). He does very serious work not only in the full committee but also with the Foreign Operations subcommittee. His devotion to our international posture in the world and to foreign affairs is genuine. Having said that, I do disagree with the approach of this amendment.

This amendment aims to be a complete substitute. But, it really completely turns, I think, what we are trying to do in terms of our foreign policy direction in Iraq on its head. At the end of my remarks in the opening part of this general debate, I quoted General Abizaid, who made it clear in testimony before our subcommittee that the work of the reconstruction is every bit as important as what we do for the military. The Obey amendment would take and convert much of the reconstruction money and would put some of it into additional funds for the military.

Mr. Chairman, we can argue whether or not there should be additional funds there or not, whether or not we were adequate in the efforts that we made in terms of giving the right support to our troops there or not. I think that this legislation today, this supplemental bill that is before us today, does address that issue, however, on the military side of the equation. What we have attempted to do here is to balance that with roughly one-fifth of this total amount, $20 billion, going to reconstruction in Afghanistan and Iraq. I think that that amount is a relatively small amount and a very much-needed amount.

Now, let me turn to the issue of whether or not this money, or even half of it, as the gentleman's amendment suggests, whether this amount should be done in the form of a grant or whether it should be done in the form of a loan. We have heard, and we will continue to hear today, a very extensive debate on an amendment that deals with the issue of whether or not the funds that we provide under this heading should be in the form of a grant or a loan. But let me just say that for the purposes of this debate here on this substitute, in my view, the arguments against the loan are very persuasive.

We do not have a legal government that exists in Iraq now. By doing it through the World Bank, we may get around that, although the World Bank and the president of the World Bank made clear in a meeting with me that the World Bank is not in any position to loan the amount of money we are talking about here today at any time in the near future. So we would really be saying that we are not going to make this money available at all for reconstruction to Iraq. And I think it is very clear this money is needed and it is needed within the next year.

Now, will it all be spent in the next 12 months? No. But can most of it be obligated? I believe it can. And that is why our subcommittee worked hard to go through this line by line, to take out those items we did not think could be obligated in the course of the next year. I think what we have come up with is a carefully crafted bill that covers those items which are most needed and which can be used.

The second reason that we ought to oppose a loan agreement is that it sends the wrong signal to our allies as well as sending the wrong signal to Iraq and to the Middle East. It says to our allies who are going to the donors conference in Madrid next week, it says to them that while we are asking you to give cash, we are giving ours in the form of a loan. It is the wrong signal to send. To the Iraqis it says we came into this country, and now we are going to loan you money that is going to go to hire American contractors and you are going to pay them back. It is the wrong signal to send.

Mr. Chairman, I just believe this is not the right approach to dealing with what is a very complicated, complex issue. We need to give the maximum flexibility to the President of the United States to carry out the purpose of the Foreign Assistance Act and our foreign policy, consistent, I might add, with our obligations as a Congress to make sure that we provide proper oversight of the spending of these funds. The bill that we have before us today does do that. It does require reporting. It requires regular reporting. It requires there be notification of changes. It gives some flexibility to move money from one account to the other, but requires notification in order to accomplish that.

So we have, I think, balanced the needs of the President to be able to carry out the foreign policy of the United States with the need of Congress to provide the oversight that is its responsibility under article one of the Constitution.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is indeed a comprehensive amendment; and it is given, I know, with the best of ideas in mind of the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I think it is simply the wrong approach. It robs the President of his responsibility as well as the flexibility that he needs to carry out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act, and I think it would needlessly tie the President's hands in carrying out those responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, if it is indeed voted on, though I believe a point of order lies against it. I think this is the wrong approach, and I would hope that we would not adopt this approach to this very important legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will simply say two things.

We have heard a lot of talk about supporting the troops today. I would urge Members to simply put their vote where their mouths are. This amendment gives far more support to the troops before, during, and after their service than the committee bill or the administration plan.

Secondly, I would note the gentleman from Arizona said that he disagreed with the approach that I take in this amendment. That is his right. That is perfectly appropriate. All we are asking is at least let us vote on it.

For years, whenever spending propositions hit the floor, people would say, ''How are you going to pay for it?'' Well, we are showing you how we will pay for it. We are trying to pay for it. You are denying us the ability to pay for it if you object to our ability to bring this to a vote.

So I would ask the majority to forego the opportunity that it has given itself under the rules to wipe out this amendment without a vote, and at least let the House face this issue squarely and vote on it. This is, after all, supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. This is a democracy. Let us act like it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further debate on this amendment, but I do make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment directly amends existing law, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say the minority leader said it was ironic that the rules of the House could be used in order to deny Members an opportunity to pay for whatever it was they were suggesting. I regret that. We could have faced this, if the Committee on Rules had given us the same courtesy in waiving rules that they gave to themselves. However, they did not; and so I, unfortunately, must concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has conceded the point of order. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order. It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

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

ENHANCEMENTS TO EXEMPTION FOR MEMBERS WITH COMBAT-RELATED INJURIES FROM REQUIREMENT FOR PAYMENT OF SUBSISTENCE CHARGES WHILE HOSPITALIZED

SEC. ___. (a) EXEMPTION MADE PERMANENT.—Subsection (c) of section 1075 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 8146(a)(2) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87)), is repealed.

(b) RETROACTIVITY.—Subsection (b) of section 8146 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87), is amended to read as follows:

''(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) Subsection (b)(2) of section 1075 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any period of hospitalization on or after September 11, 2001, because of an injury covered by that subsection that is incurred on or after that date.

''(2) The Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code) shall take such action as necessary to implement paragraph (1), including—

''(A) refunding any amount previously paid under section 1075 of title 10, United States Code, by a person who, by reason of paragraph (1), is not required to make such payment; and

''(B) waiving recovery of any unpaid amount for which a person has previously been charged under that section and which that person, by reason of paragraph (1), is not required to pay.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to offer this amendment for myself and for my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who has been part of this effort from the very beginning.

Members of the House were astonished when we learned that military members of our Armed Forces injured on the battlefield and recuperating in military hospitals were charged $8.10 a day for the food they consumed during that hospital stay. So this is stage three and the final stage of the congressional effort to correct that problem.

The first stage was including in the defense appropriations bill, that became law on October 1, a repeal of that act that made that requirement. However, because it was an appropriations bill, it could only be effective for 1 year. So the second phase was when the House passed by a unanimous vote H.R. 2998 to make the repeal permanent. And that passed, as I said, on a unanimous vote in the House.

Now, this third and final phase makes it retroactive to September 11 of 2001 and provides for repayment to those members of the armed services who actually did pay that charge. So it provides for refunding of the amounts previously paid, and it waives recovery of any unpaid amount for which a person was charged because of that law.

This, I think, this was an insult to the men and women who serve in our military and who are injured on the battlefield and who recuperate in our military hospitals. So I am very happy that we are going to fix this permanently and that we are going to make it retroactive to September 11, 2001. I appreciate the fine support all of this Congress have given and especially the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) as we move through the three stages.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would simply say that I know the chairman and Mrs. Chairman, as well, have spent considerable time focusing on this issue, and I appreciate that. We agree with the amendment and would urge support.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can expeditiously approve this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 2, line 9 of the bill, strike the dollar amount ''$12,188,870,000'' and insert the dollar amount ''$12,238,870,000''.

On page 4, line 19 of the bill, strike the dollar amount ''$4,485,452,000'' and insert the dollar amount ''$4,600,452,000''.

On page 7, line 7 of the bill, strike the dollar amount ''$1,988,600,000'' and insert the dollar amount ''$5,294,000,000''.

On page 13, line 8 of the bill, strike the dollar amount ''$658,380,000'' and insert the dollar amount ''$808,380,000''.

On page 30, line 1, strike ''$18,649,000,000'' and insert ''$15,028,000,000''.

On page 30, line 2, strike ''$3,243,000,000'' and insert ''$2,355,000,000''.

On page 30, line 3, strike ''$1,318,000,000'' and insert ''$1,133,000,000''.

On page 30, line 4, strike ''$5,650,000,000'' and insert ''$4,118,000,000''.

On page 30, line 5, strike ''$2,100,000,000'' and insert ''$1,866,000,000''.

On page 30, line 6, strike ''$4,332,000,000'' and insert ''$3,688,000,000''.

On page 30, line 8, strike ''$370,000,000'' and insert ''$225,000,000''.

On page 30, line 9, strike ''$153,000,000'' and insert ''$91,000,000''.

On page 30, line 10, strike ''$280,000,000'' and insert ''$259,000,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 15 minutes.

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

□ 1700

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, we have heard a lot of talk today about supporting the troops. This is an opportunity to do so. What this amendment does is increase by $3.6 billion funds that are not provided in the committee mark for quality-of-life items for the troops as well as other items reconstituting the force.

What we try to do, for instance, is first of all to correct the problem that we face with our troops not having clean water. Eighty percent of our troops in Iraq have to drink bad water. They get dysentery. The President's request contains only $15 million for such purposes. We try to provide an amount consistent with meeting the needs of all of the troops in that country. Secondly, we provide funding to allow Reservists to obtain medical and dental screening prior to activation. Right now, they have to pay for that themselves. Thirdly, we say that for troops returning from theater and returning to a normal, back-home life, that we will extend their coverage under the military health care program from the existing 60 days to 180 days. We also provide additional funding, $50 million, to cover the cost of increasing support for Reserve family assistance centers

to address domestic problems resulting from extended deployments. We also provide additional funds for prepaid phone cards for the troops in theater, $65 million. And we provide funds to fully cover service members' transportation while on R&R. Finally, we provide additional case managers for the VA and DOD joint Disabled Transition Assistance Program to enhance transition assistance for disabled service members.

In addition to that, as I indicated earlier, we have about a $20 billion task facing us to reconstitute and refurbish and replace the equipment that was used or used up in Iraq. We have almost half of our Army divisions with, at this point, equipment which is not up to full readiness standards. We need to correct that as soon as possible. The services asked for the full amount necessary for this year. The Department denied them a good share of the funds. We provide the full funding levels that were requested by the services.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, that is it. If you are for the troops, I, for the life of me, do not understand why people would not support 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, the amendment as I understand it here is designed to improve the quality of life for our forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. Nobody can dispute the need to do so. However, my concern is obviously where the funds come from. The amounts that are taken here are all from various accounts that are devoted to the reconstruction in Afghanistan. One can argue it is relatively small amounts here and there, it is a couple of hundred million in this account, a couple of hundred million in that account, but when it comes to the reconstruction which is only 25 percent of the total amount of this supplemental bill, the amounts that are taken out of here are rather substantial. The amounts that are added in on the military side are not that large. But this cuts very deeply into what Ambassador Bremer and this administration and this United States and the Coalition Authority is trying very hard to do in Iraq, which is not only to make sure that the quality of life for our Armed Forces is adequate, but to improve the quality of life for the Iraqi citizens, to improve not just the material quality of life for the Iraqi citizens, but to improve the quality of governance life under which they live.

That is, to make sure that the institutions of democracy begin to take root in Iraq, that there is freedom for people to speak out, that there is freedom for those who are Shiites to practice their religion freely. That there is the ability of people to have electricity and water that is essential not only for their livelihoods but, in many cases, for their very lives. To be able to have the health care that they need. These items, where these reductions come from, would come from those accounts. It also comes out of the security. A very large part of this comes out of the security within Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to have the security for the United States military forces, but if we are going to bring our forces home as rapidly as possible, it is very important that we provide for the security within Iraq. That is, that the forces, the army and the national police forces in Iraq are able to be constituted as quickly as possible, stand on their own two feet and that they can substitute for the United States forces the security needs of Iraq. That is the only way in which we are going to be able to bring our troops home in a timely fashion.

And so this amendment, I think, is misdirected. On the one hand, it says we want to improve the quality of life for our forces in Iraq, but on the other hand, it cuts in a disproportionate way from the accounts that are necessary to get them out of there and to get them back with their families, in the United States with their families.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is unfortunate, because on the one hand, it looks like it is a good thing to do to help the quality of life for our troops, and no one disputes that motive. But on the other hand by disproportionately taking from these categories, security, health care, electricity, the water and sanitation, the constitutional reconstruction needs in Iraq, by disproportionately taking from those accounts, we damage the ability of the Coalition Provisional Authority. We damage the ability of the United States. We damage the ability of our Armed Forces in Iraq to carry out the foreign policy objectives that we are trying to achieve and for our forces to be removed from Iraq as quickly as possible. We damage our ability to help the Iraqis take the responsibility for their own security and for running their own country.

This is the wrong approach, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that we will reject this amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to vigorously support the quality-of-life provisions, the very modest quality-of-life provisions, but important provisions that my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has included in this bill. I would say that we have worked together to develop many of these proposals. We have winnowed them through several different processes, the personnel subcommittee, the Democratic side of the personnel subcommittee, the House Armed Services Committee.

Go through this bill, $87 billion. It does all manner of things for Iraq and the Iraqi people, the Iraqi army, the Iraqi police force, and ask what it does for our troops. They are the ones who not only won the war, but in the aftermath of the war when there was a real vacuum, through improvisation saved the day. They are the ones who, right now, are the foot troops who are putting Iraq back together. They have been called for hard duty, they have been asked to extend their tours, and the least we can do for them and their families is to show some concern and say thank you, and that is what these provisions do.

First of all, we know that family assistance centers which help Reservists, many of whom have had their tours extended, help their families deal with problems, are underfunded by $50 million. This corrects that deficiency. Secondly, we know, if we have been there, that one of the chief complaints is the inability just to call home and talk to your family. In this era of telecommunications, it is the least we can give our troops, and this bill provides $50 million to help our troops call home and stay in touch with their families. Transportation costs. The biggest complaint in Bosnia, the biggest complaint, you have been to Bosnia, all of you have been to Bosnia, all of you have been to Iraq. The biggest complaint was R&R is great, but if you are at Fort Bragg and happen to live in El Paso, it can cost you an arm and a leg if you are an E–6 or an E–7 to get home. And so this bill provides the money to fly all the way home and get back to your duty station.

Finally, funds are provided for transition assistance for disabled service members. Many of us have been out to Walter Reed. A very affecting piece of testimony was given by General Jack Keane, where he recounted the case of a blind GI who had lost one limb, who cannot be reintegrated back into the Army, but he said, let me tell you something, we're going to see that this GI, wounded as he is, gets reintegrated into society. We're going to help him get to school, we're going to give him a mentor, help him every step of the way. The problem, and I take General Keane at his word, there is no money to provide for that. This bill would provide for that.

These are four modest provisions. The least we can do for our troops is to support this package and help our troops.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I will not take that much time, but it is very important to know that within the bill, we do provide for hazardous-duty pay, for the extra funding that is required to make sure that we take care of our troops.

Indeed, over recent years, we have done a fantastic job by way of the regular order to improve the pay levels, the housing circumstances, et cetera, for our troops. We are doing everything we can to make sure there is a pattern set there that encourages our people not just to serve, but to reup when they have finished a specific tour of duty. We have made fantastic progress there. And we commit ourselves to continuing that progress.

In the meantime, I think it is instructional to mention the very important conversation we had with General Sanchez when our group was in Iraq. The General is in charge of our men and women who are representing us in that country, and he said very clearly that it is impossible to delink the relationship between the security of our troops, the job that they are doing for us in Iraq, from the reconstruction effort in Iraq. If we want to stabilize the circumstances there, he said, secure our troops as well, make sure they are as best possible protected, then we have got to move forward quickly with reconstruction. To take this amount of money out of the reconstruction process is bound to slow it down. That in turn will have an effect upon how long our troops will have to remain there. This is the wrong place to be moving money at this point in time.

So I would strongly object to this decision at this moment. I do appreciate the support long-term for improving the living condition and otherwise as well as the current hazardous-duty pay and support for the troops that we are expressing in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank my friend the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know, but I do not think that any Member of Congress has a son or a daughter actually serving in Iraq. If they do, I hope we hear about it. But if we did, I trust that our fatherly love would trump our political loyalties. But even though we may not have children, it is we who are responsible for sending the children of our constituents, the young men and women of America, to fight our wars. And we have to determine how much we spend on their protection and on their fighting capability.

In a recent trip by the members of the Subcommittee on Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations, they found that there was a shortfall of protective body armor for 40,000 troops in theater. That has been reduced subsequently, but there are still tens of thousands. The supplies of portable jammers used to defeat land mines and other radio-detonated bombs are woefully short. The division patrolling the most dangerous area in the Sunni Triangle had only nine where 86 were required. In the First Armored Division which is responsible for that most dangerous area, a third of the division's Bradley vehicles had been sidelined due to a lack of spare track. In that same division, 40 percent of the Humvee vehicles were out of commission due to a lack of spare parts. And overall, 46 percent, almost half of all the Army's spare parts needed in the country were not available.

All this amendment does is to take the word of the Armed Services, not of the politicians, but of the people in uniform as to what they need.

□ 1715

We are told that 80 percent of our troops are drinking dirty water. In a recent survey, 30 percent had dysentery. And we will not provide this relatively small amount of money specifically targeted to correct those deficiencies?

This is our responsibility, we in the Congress, whether or not the executive branch acknowledges it. This is an opportunity to accept that responsibility, to do the right thing. It is easy to talk the talk about how much we support the troops. This is one amendment that is only designed to do what we would do for our own children fighting in Iraq. This is absolutely essential. There are no excuses to vote down this amendment. It is the right thing to do. I urge the Congress to do the right thing.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told that we cannot afford to cut back the reconstruction package, the $20 billion reconstruction package in Iraq, in order to fund these few additional services for our troops and to restore the readiness of our military units around the world.

Let me point out we are taking $3.6 billion out of the reconstruction program in order to fund these efforts. That still leaves us with $15 billion. That means that it still leaves us with a reconstruction package that will spend $650 for every Iraqi, $650. That means that we will be spending seven times as much per Iraqi as we spent on a per capita basis for the entire population of Europe in the Marshall Plan.

It is also a dead letter fact that Mr. Bremer is not going to be able to obligate $15 billion in the time frame that this bill envisages, and it is a fact that some of those contracts would not be finished for 5 years. Surely we recognize that even with this reduction, this assistance package on a per capita basis would be the most generous aid program in the history of the world.

What are we trying to use that money for? We are trying to provide water for the troops that will not make them sick. Is that too much to ask? Is there something wrong with our dedication to the war against terrorism if we are for that?

We also are trying to provide health and dental screening for Guard and Reserve personnel before they go into active service to do their duty, and what we are trying to say is just in case that when they were on active duty and got a health problem that is not going to show up for a few months, we are going to give them 6 months of coverage after they have done their duty and they are back home. Is that too much to ask? I know this Congress will not help provide health coverage for the 42 million Americans who do not have it, but can we not at least do it for these?

And then, lastly, we are asking for a little bit of money so that our soldiers can pick up a cell phone, so that they can pick up one of these, open it up, it is against the rules to use this on the House floor, but we want them to be able to pick up one of these, open up a cell phone and dial their family when they are lonely. That is what we are asking.

I think this amendment represents a far better balance of priorities than does the administration request or the committee package, and I respectfully and urgently ask for an ''aye'' vote for the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the debate and the arguments that were made by the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Wisconsin, it occurs to me that the problem in this debate is it is as though it was taking place in some kind of vacuum, that the only thing we were talking about here was the amount of money that is in this bill for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan. It is as if the assertion is that we are not doing anything for our troops that are over there. Let us not neglect the fact that three-fourths of all the dollars that are in here, or the $67 billion, is for the military forces in Iraq and in Afghanistan. It is to replenish those accounts. It is to do exactly some of the things that the gentleman from Wisconsin just described to us a minute ago. It is not as though we were not cognizant of that, that we were not thinking about that when this bill was crafted by the administration and worked on in the Committee on Appropriations. But what the gentleman is suggesting is that more of the money should be going there. So as I said earlier, we are adding a relatively small amount to the military to help the quality of life there and taking a very large amount out of what is necessary for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Let me just give a few of the figures. Out of security and law enforcement, these are the people that we are asking to train them to replace our security forces. The amendment would take almost $900 million out of that account. For justice and public safety, the amendment would reduce about $180

million. Out of electricity, the gentleman from Wisconsin suggests that we would reduce that by $1,530,000,000.

When we were in Iraq in August and we were in Basra, we had a briefing by the commanding general, the British commanding general, who talked about how the temperature had gotten up in August to 130 degrees. The electricity system just simply collapsed under those circumstances. They were without any electricity in Basra for 4 days, and that is when the riots took place. People went out in the street and started throwing rocks out of sheer frustration. I would be doing that. You would be doing that. And that put the safety, in this case of British soldiers, and the same is true in Baghdad and elsewhere where American soldiers are located, put the safety of those soldiers at risk. We need to get that electric system up, and we need to get it running.

Let me repeat this again. General Abizaid said we cannot separate the reconstruction dollars from what we are doing for the military. They are just as important. It is just as much a part of the security of the forces that we have in Iraq as is every dime that we give for ammunition or for any weapons or for clothing or for food for our troops over there. The reconstruction dollars are part and parcel of the security of our forces over there. I am paraphrasing what General Abizaid said. I quoted it directly a few minutes ago in my general remarks.

Let me just close with this statement, Mr. Chairman: If we are concerned about the quality of life of our American forces that are in Iraq, we do no favors to the quality of life of those troops by keeping them there longer and by denying the reconstruction effort and the constitution of the security forces in Iraq that will get our troops out of Iraq. If the Members want to improve the quality of life of our troops, bring them home; and the fastest way to do that is to improve the security of the Iraqis to allow them to take back the country and allow our forces to leave.

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. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. 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. OBEY) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 33 offered by Mr. PENCE:

In the item relating to ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND—(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)'', add at the end before the period the following: '': *Provided further*, That 50 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under this heading shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure until (1) the initial 50 percent of funds appropriated under this heading have been obligated giving priority consideration to the emergency purposes of security, electric sector infrastructure, oil infrastructure, public works, water resources, transportation and telecommunication infrastructures, and other emergency needs, (2) the President prepares and transmits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report in writing that describes the programs, projects, and activities that are or have been financed by such initial funds and includes a detailed analysis of the extent to which such programs, projects, and activities are or have been successful, and (3) the President determines and certifies to Congress that a democratically elected government in Iraq has been established: *Provided further*, That the remaining 50 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available in the form of loans subject to repayment to the United States Government, on terms and conditions determined by the President''.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I come before this Chamber in support of the Pence amendment tonight, but I do so with a great sense of gratitude for the strong leadership that the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and other members of the Committee on Appropriations have provided in preparing this important legislation in the life of our Nation, and I strongly support the measure in every respect save one. And it is on the question of whether reconstruction costs in Iraq should take the form of a grant or a loan.

I have considered the arguments of the administration, the opinions of my constituents with much deliberation and prayer, and on this question I have decided that it is appropriate for me to stand firm in my belief that a portion of the reconstruction costs should be eventually repaid by the Iraqi people to the people of the United States. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) before the Committee on Rules yesterday said, memorably, a difficulty with a loan is that ''there is no authority in Iraq to whom we may make a loan,'' and that is a legitimate and significant point as we consider other loan proposals before this Chamber. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member, also made, in my view, a compelling point in saying that the debate between pure grant and pure loan was not constructive, that what we needed was a rational balance of the short-term and long-term needs of the people of Iraq and the people of the United States of America. And I would humbly offer that the Pence amendment is precisely that middle ground which addresses the lack of a governing authority present in Iraq against the needs of the American people who see this oil-rich nation as needing to bear some of the cost at some point in the future of the creation of their own civil society.

As the administration has argued and the chairman noted, it is simply impossible to extend a loan from the United States to a nation not yet formed. In recognition of this reality, the Pence amendment makes the first 50 percent of the funding available immediately as a grant, giving priority consideration to the emergency purposes of security, electricity, oil infrastructure, public works, and the like. And then, Mr. Chairman, once the administration informs Congress that a democratically elected government in Iraq has been established, the balance of the funding would be made available in the form of a loan from the United States Government under terms and conditions to be negotiated by the President of the United States.

Having addressed the logistical issues raised by the chairman and by the administration, I believe it is appropriate that Congress defer to the consent of the governed, especially in matters of foreign aid. Many Americans, even in my conservative district, overwhelmingly support some repayment of reconstruction costs. Most Americans know Iraq is an oil-rich nation, possessing by some estimates some $7 trillion, the second largest oil reserve of any nation on the planet.

□ 1730

Most Americans know Iraq will eventually be able to bear the burden of repaying some of the costs of rebuilding its infrastructure. In fact, it was Iraq's interim trade minister, Ali Alawa, who said, in Australia just yesterday, that Iraq was announcing plans in the middle of 2004 to increase their oil production from the current 2 million barrels a day to 3.5 million barrels a day. The American people know this, and they desire earnestly to partner with the people of Iraq when it comes to the bricks and mortar of building their own civil society.

At a time of mounting deficits, also making a portion of the reconstruction costs a loan reassures the American people that there is a financial endgame strategy. In my district, very few Americans, it seems, Mr. Chairman,

worry about a military quagmire. We have won the war decisively and humanely. But even in my rural district in Indiana, many Americans worry about a financial quagmire. By partnering in a loan for a portion of these reconstruction costs, we allow for an end-game strategy to begin to emerge.

Finally, by making a portion of the infrastructure reconstruction a loan, Congress will set an important precedent as we partner with the Iraqi people in establishing a free society. This is especially important since most anticipate this request for reconstruction will likely not be the last.

In the end, I am grateful for the opportunity agreed upon by both parties to bring the Pence amendment to the floor with such thorough opportunity for debate. As I have said before, I will support the final version of the Iraq supplemental as the Congress works its will, because I fully support the President and am anxious to continue to support the courageous work of our military-civilian personnel and the members of the committee. Nonetheless, I am offering the Pence amendment humbly today, with the firm belief that the United States should provide for the liberty and security of Iraq, but improvements in the civil society in Iraq should ultimately be borne by the Iraqi people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward in good form.

I supported going into Iraq. In fact, I served on the President's working group for Iraq, and I think it was the right thing to do. I believe it was still the right thing to do, and I support our troops, the men and women in uniform over there giving their all for us. There is no question about that. I want them to see that they have all the resources that they need at this difficult time in their lives to protect themselves and to protect us. And we need to remember, we are over there fighting so we do not have to be fighting here on our own shores.

But I come from a district where there has been a great deal of hardship lately, a lot of job loss, and my people, frankly, do not understand why this cannot be a loan instead of a grant. A lot of them say to me that this just does not make any sense. Iraq has all that oil. I think it has the second largest oil reserves in the world. They are going to be running a surplus in their oil reserves very soon, I think by the end of next year. So if they would pay for part of their reconstruction, they buy into the process, and literally they have a commitment there to help with their own freedom.

I work for the people of the Ninth District of North Carolina, and they feel very strongly about that, and I feel very strongly that I would like to see this be a loan as well. That is why I support the Pence amendment. I would like to have a vote on this amendment, so we could express our opinions and the thoughts of our people at home. I do support the underlying bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have served in the military know the meaning of the old term ''hurry up and wait.'' Well, that is what we have got here, a hurry up and wait amendment. It says we are going to withhold 50 percent of the money that the President seeks on an urgent basis until we know how the first 50 percent worked out.

If between $18 billion and $20 billion in reconstruction aid is needed to get our troops back from Iraq, to put Iraq on its feet, to be able to get our troops out of there, and I believe that a majority of this House is prepared to provide that much money, this amendment says to our troops over there in Iraq, do not plan on coming home for a while, because we are going to see how this first half works out. We will see whether or not we get a democratically-elected government, how it gets established in Iraq. I guess if we want to be facetious, we could say what happens if they decide to have a recall election, if there are some hanging chads over there?

But the reality is, not speaking facetiously, that the return of our troops and the utilization of the urgently needed second $9 billion to $10 billion for reconstruction under this amendment would be put on hold until there is a democratically-elected government. So we are, in other words, putting ourselves in the hands of the Iraqis to decide when our forces are going to be able to come home.

The amendment gives priority consideration to various sectors of reconstruction in the first half that it allows to be spent as a grant. It says it gives priority consideration to uses for security, for power, for oil, for public works, for water, for transportation and telecommunication. Well, those items are 80 percent of what is in the $20 billion that we have got in this bill. So which of those priority items are going to be done and which ones really are not priority items, or how much of them are not really priority items? Which of these things do we decide are really not priorities until we have a democratically-elected government in Iraq?

The fact is, these are important, and we need to move these things forward now, and we need to do it on an orderly basis.

While not all of this money is going to be spent during this first year, the vast majority will be. That is what our subcommittee looked at very carefully, how much of this money can be obligated in the next 15 months, and I believe the vast majority of it can be obligated during that time. That provides for an orderly flow of the contracts.

One of the reasons we are considering this supplemental bill now is because many of us pushed with the administration to get it up here so that in January when the contracts run out of the existing funds that were in the last supplemental bill, we will not have a break in the construction process. What would happen if we were not able to go forward with the water projects, the sanitation projects, the electric projects, the projects to restore the oil production in Iraq. The worst thing we could have is to have a break in the reconstruction process. And yet this is exactly what this amendment would do. ''Once we see what happens with the first half, then we will decide how to proceed with the second half.''

The supplemental bill that you have before you, talking about the reconstruction part of this, is comprehensive. It addresses security, such as border enhancement. It is needed to get the oil industry up, to get the industry operating, and all the aspects of long-term recovery are dependent on whether or not the Iraqis are able to get their oil production up so they will have the funds they need to do these things themselves.

It fixes the transportation infrastructure in the Port of Umm Qasr. It addresses education, and helps the Iraqis deal with investigating the crimes of Saddam Hussein against humanity.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate as to what the supplemental package is all about. It is about the strategic interests of the United States. It is about creating a peaceful and stable Iraq. It is about creating a more peaceful Middle East. It is very much about fighting terrorism. But, most of all, this is about winning the war, winning the war against terrorism, and it is about the safety of our troops, the men and women in uniform.

I know I have said it several times on this floor, and I have quoted him and paraphrased him several times, but I think it is worth repeating, and I am sure I will do it more times today. General Abizaid in testimony before our subcommittee said that you can pay the U.S. military, but you will be paying them to stay in Iraq forever without fully providing the direct assistance for reconstruction.

What this supplemental appropriation is designed to do is not keep our forces there forever, but to find a way to get them home, by saying to the Iraqis we are going to train your security forces, your military forces, your police forces, so that you can take over those responsibilities from us. If we say that we are not going to do those responsibilities now, we are saying to ourselves that we are going to keep our military forces there for a longer period of time, and the longer we delay

with the construction, the longer our troops will be there.

If you want to bring our troops home, let us move on with the reconstruction, and let us oppose this amendment.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY), who has been from virtually day one an outspoken and unapologetic advocate of a loan partnership between the people of America and the people of Iraq in the reconstruction of their nation.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman and his committee for the wonderful job they have done in empowering the White House, and the President's team and our military for the wonderful prosecution of this very difficult war.

Second, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for the courage he has shown to stand up and do the right thing for the American taxpayer, and yet continue to help the White House and our military successfully prosecute the aftermath of the war.

Third, I want to thank God. I want to thank God for President Bush's team that has done such a terribly important job in the aftermath of September 11 in Iraq. In particular Vice President CHENEY, Secretary Rumsfeld, Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell, just to name a few.

I remember in Washington's first farewell address, he warned all of us about entering into ''entangling alliances'' oversees. The second President of the United States, John Adams, said ''America does not go abroad in search of monsters to destroy.''

But on September 11, all of us recognized that this is a much smaller world, because monsters found America and tried to destroy us, and they are going to do it again. The next attack could be from a vial of nerve gas, a nuclear weapon, a chemical or other biological weapon that may be built in the hills of Afghanistan or the deserts of Iraq. We understand that. We recognize that, and we fully support the prosecution of the war.

I will tell you that for some 220 years, my view is that America has been the moral conscience of the world. I will tell you that at times in this very difficult global-terrorist-threat environment, we will have to be the world's policeman in certain regions.

We will never be able to be the world's nanny. When it comes to building a nation's infrastructure, when that nation has the type of oil availability and resources that Iraq does, we ought to do the right thing by the American taxpayer.

I believe that President Bush is 100 percent right. The oil fields belong to the Iraqi people. But I also believe that the infrastructure, the roads, the bridges, the hospitals, the schools that we will build, the electric grids, also belong to the Iraqi people, and it is fitting that America lead the way and that we help the Iraqi people establish, for the first time, a real, serious infrastructure that can help their people survive and thrive, and that we help them with our moral leadership, teaching them about democracy, teaching them how to be prosperous and peaceful, things like free trade, low tax rates, respect for private property and individual freedoms, from the right to speak or choose your own religion.

But ultimately, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the American taxpayer is owed nothing less than to say with respect to building infrastructure or nation-building, that it is only right that our children not bear the brunt of the cost of building schools, hospitals and roads ultimately in Iraq.

The proposal of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), I think, does a marvelous job in balancing the needs that the administration has to successfully prosecute the aftermath of the war to make our troops successful so we can bring them home. But it also respects the challenges that face America's taxpayers.

Finally, we should help Iraq build for the future. We should adopt principles of prosperity and freedom, but, ultimately, we should never be their nanny or be the only people spending money to build their country.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a member of the committee.

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

I rise in opposition to the Pence amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some feel that we should give loans to Iraq rather than provide direct assistance. I believe that this is the wrong approach. As the Washington Post asserted in its lead editorial yesterday, ''To make a loan in these circumstances is like swimming out to a drowning man and handing him a 10 pound weight.''

I could not agree more. For two decades, Saddam Hussein spent billions of dollars building his elaborate palaces and war machine and neglecting his oil infrastructure, while the people of Iraq were forced to bear the burden of his neglect of basic health and educational services. Now, Saddam has left Iraq $225 billion in debt, including approximately $100 billion owed to France, Germany, Russia and other nations, and an additional $125 billion in reparations owed to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia for damage done by his invasion of Kuwait in 1990.

□ 1745

At this point, why should the Iraqi people bear the brunt of debt incurred by their former dictator?

There is an underlying premise that we must never forget: support for reconstruction and stabilization in Iraq is inextricably linked to the security of our soldiers on the ground. With success, a free Iraq will send a clear message to the people of the Middle East and beyond that freedom and democracy, not violence and terrorism, are the best paths for the future.

A larger crushing debt burden will lead to greater discontent and instability, and again make Iraq an incubator for terrorists who will stop at nothing to hinder our mission.

To lessen this risk, this supplemental request will provide the resources necessary to help ensure stability, peace, and democracy in Iraq. This will create a safer environment for our troops and a safer world for our children and grandchildren and, indeed, our strategic interests.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), who has been an outspoken advocate of this junior Member's efforts to bring this issue to the floor.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his good bill and diligence on this bill, and also President Bush for his standing up for America in both Afghanistan and Iraq, and standing up for the Iraqi people and a better stability in the world. I also want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), for his leadership on this issue. He has been a leader in fiscal responsibility throughout his time in Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the right policy for our Nation. It takes the fiscally responsible approach for rebuilding Iraq and protecting our troops at the same time.

I think we can all agree that money is needed now to help Iraq lift itself up into a stable country. This is in the best interests of all nations. We also recognize that rebuilding Iraq is necessary to protect our troops. The truth is that the more quickly we can rebuild Iraq and alleviate critical shortages, the more quickly we can bring about peace and stability so that our brave men and women in uniform are no longer the targets of Iraqi hostilities.

However, there is no reason that the money needed to carry out this rebuilding must be free of charge. I think it is fair and reasonable that some of the money we are providing today be a loan.

Iraq is a very resource-rich nation. They will soon have the capability to provide for their own rebuilding and will not need U.S. money. The funds we are providing today provide a bridge to take Iraq from the shambles Saddam Hussein left to a country capable of providing for itself. Once the Iraqi people are on their feet and are able to produce oil, they will have plenty of income and will be able to repay us for loans.

In my district there are people who are losing their jobs because we cannot even see fit to provide domestic steel companies with loans to modernize and compete with foreign producers; yet, somehow, we are going to find the money to give, not loan, but to give Iraq $19 billion.

In closing, this amendment is at the core of how we believe the United States should carry out its foreign policy. We need to ask ourselves if the United States is a charity or a partner for Iraq.

Some countries, by the way, are demanding to be repaid for loans that they gave to help prop up Saddam Hussein's dictatorship. The least we can do is ask to be repaid for part of the money that will be used to rebuild the ruins Saddam Hussein left.

With our help, Iraq can quickly rebuild and become prosperous and productive with enough resources to make it one of the wealthiest nations.

Again, it is a very sensible amendment by the gentleman from Indiana, and I urge support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. KOLBE. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think perhaps not for the same reasons that some may; but, from my view, this is simply a fig leaf for those people who were in favor of the war but do not want to pay for it.

The Geneva Convention says that when you occupy a country, you are responsible for putting that country back on its feet.

Now, the idea that we are going to go in there and sock them with how many billions of dollars' worth of debt, I do not know, half the debt? Half of $87 billion? It makes absolutely no sense, especially when we read the papers. If we read the al Ahram Weekly out of Egypt and they talk about the privatization that our viceroy has announced, the viceroy said that every state-owned company will be sold to private investors. This is the equivalent of pillaging. My colleagues know: rape and pillage that comes after war. This is pillage, and the war profiteers are gathering around the White House and around Mr. Bremer waiting to buy these companies on 10 cents on the dollar. And we are going to say to the Iraqi people, wherever this money comes from, you people are going to be responsible for it.

Now, I do not know how many times I have heard people come in here and talk about the Third World and they say, the way we are going to help the Third World is to lift the debt. And here we are sitting right here, looking at it, knowing the oil industry is not functioning; and we are saying, we are going to stick you with the debt. We are going to put this debt on their children. We do not like putting it on our children; I agree with you. That is why I am going to vote ''no.'' But this puts the debt on their children. That is certainly fair, is it not? I mean, these kids over there that we bombed and kept from medical care and everything else with our sanctions, now we are going to give them some debt to worry about for the rest of their lives.

This is simply a bad amendment so that some people can say, well, I voted to make a loan, but the House turned me down, and so I had to go for the full boat out of your pocket to their own taxpayers. I understand why you are a little anxious about going home and defending this bill, since you know there is no plan. I mean, who has decided they are going to privatize Iraq's economy? One man, the viceroy, Mr. Bremer. He got some guy in the council who says the new policy will create a free and market-oriented economy, without any precedent in the Arab world. He claims the reforms would promote economic growth and raise the living standards of all Iraqis.

Every time you privatize, you put people out of work.

We have hundreds of thousands of people out of work in that country, and you are planning to put more out.

This is a bad amendment.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has 17 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 19 minutes remaining.

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

As a point of clarification, I would say to the gentleman from Washington that the Pence amendment does not call for a 50 percent loan of the entire Iraq supplemental; it specifically applies to the section of other bilateral economic assistance, Iraq relief, and reconstruction funds. The debate today on the floor with respect to the gentleman from Washington is about the reconstruction funds in the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), my colleague and friend.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

If this amendment were put to a vote tonight, it would pass overwhelmingly; I am just confident of that. But the Committee on Rules chose not to make this amendment in order. Yet we are allowing the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and those who oppose this amendment to debate this for an hour. And I would just say to my colleagues, this is nothing more than a facade. It is something that we should not be doing, because this amendment is going to be ruled nongermane.

The American people overwhelmingly would support this as a loan to Iraq, a noninterest loan that could be paid back in 20 or 30 years; but at least when the oil comes in and they start making money over there, it could be repaid.

So the only thing I wanted to say tonight is that I am very disappointed that this was not made in order, number one; and, number two, I am disappointed that we are debating this for an hour when everybody knows we are not going to have a chance to vote on it. It is just not right to do business that way.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana for bringing up the amendment which he and his followers feel is balanced as far as the loan versus grant issue that we are now debating. I think if it were a year from now and we were debating further supplementals for Iraq, it would be very appropriate; but it is not a year from now.

We have tens of thousands of American soldiers in Iraq. Many of us have visited them. There is, when we look into their eyes, a deep sense of courage; but there is also, as anybody that has ever been in combat can see, there is a deep sense of fear. Coupled with that, there is urgency. There is not a sense of urgency; there is urgency.

There is urgency that we get the supplemental out tonight so the 60-some billion dollars reinforces what our soldiers have, and there is an urgency that we heard from every military person we met at every base we went to that money is ammunition. What that means is, if we can get the electric turned back on, that puts Iraqis back to work. If we can get 80,000 Iraqi police within the next year, that will relieve our MPs from guarding the city streets and guarding the prisons. If we can get 27 battalion Iraqi units on the road, on the borders, in the hinterlands, in this famous peninsula area that is very, very dangerous, 27 Iraqi battalions, that will bring our troops home. There is real urgency in this supplemental, not as a loan, but as money that will go to secure the troops in Iraq to ensure their safety and to ensure their quick and speedy return.

Mr. Chairman, we did not debate loans or grants at the height of World War II. There is a critical juncture that we must realize. We are at that fork in the road. We do it with a sense of urgency, with a sense of responsibility. We will succeed. If we falter, it makes it much more difficult. Our troops will be in Iraq a great deal longer.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), a great leader of the House on this issue.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the gentleman from Maryland will vote for a loan in the next supplemental that is going to come, and I rise in support of the Pence amendment.

Despite the arguments that we have heard against the use of these loans, we

need to reinforce the point that the taxpayers of this country should not be required to foot the entire bill for Iraq reconstruction indefinitely. So maybe not this time, but maybe next.

I think many of my colleagues know I have an amendment also; it is a sense of the Congress that, once Iraq is on their feet again, that they will help pay back some of these loans. We do not want to tie the hands of the administration or the Iraqi Government, but we want to allow some type of flexibility. So I may offer my sense of the Congress on this same matter.

The people of Iraq should not be burdened, of course, with the lavish spending of the Saddam Hussein regime which borrowed heavily to oppress his people and to enrich its own leaders.

Mr. Chairman, I also believe that it is unfair to compare the proposed U.S. loan idea in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom to the debts amassed under Saddam Hussein and his evil regime. We and the American taxpayers want to rebuild hospitals, schools, and prisons. Saddam's debt went to gilded toilet paper holders, a backyard zoo for his delinquent children, and, of course, a weapons of mass destruction program.

We will give the President the funds our country needs to protect and sustain our troops and rebuild a country whose people want to live proud and free again. All we are seeking is some measure to ensure that the American people are not permanently footing this bill.

I rise in support of the Pence amendment. I believe, despite some of the arguments that we have heard against the use of loans, that we need to reinforce the point that the taxpayers of this country should not be required to foot the entire bill for Iraqi reconstruction indefinitely.

At recent town hall meetings in my district, constituents voiced concerns on this very subject. Why can Iraq not begin to provide funding for reconstruction and security themselves? I think all of my colleagues would agree this is a valid question. Late into last night, my staff fielded call after call from constituents who were proud of America's efforts to rebuild Iraq, yet they wanted to see Iraq begin to shoulder the burden of reconstruction once a sovereign and viable government is in place.

I also have an amendment a sense of the Congress that once Iraqis are on their feet again they can help pay us back these loans, but felt compelled to speak on this amendment. We don't want to tie the hands of the Administration or the Iraqi government. What we want to do is allow for flexibility. I may offer the sense of the Congress later on.

At the center of this debate over loans vs. grants is the massive outstanding debt that European and Arab powers are holding over the recently freed heads of the Iraqi people. Last night we debated a resolution that would ask that these countries no longer saddle the war torn nation with what is at best a dubious debt.

Forgiving these debts would constitute both an historic contribution to the economic development of post-Saddam Iraq and a major gesture of support for the Iraqi people. Estimates of Iraq's indebtedness vary greatly, from 60 billion to several hundred billion dollars. The most comprehensive study of Iraqi debts, by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), calculates Iraq's total debt to be $127 billion, of which $47 billion is accrued interest. Iraq owes a further $199 billion in Gulf War compensation and $57 billion in pending contracts signed between the Saddam Hussein regime and foreign companies and governments. Iraq's overall financial burden, according to the CSIS figures, is $383 billion.

Based on these figures, Iraq's financial obligations are 14 times its estimated annual gross domestic product (GDP) of $27 billion—a staggering $16,000 per person.

Arguably, the people of Iraq should not be burdened with the lavish spending of a tyrannical regime, which borrowed heavily to oppress its people and enrich its own leaders. I also believe that it is unfair to compare the proposed US loan idea in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom to the debts amassed under Saddam and his evil regime. We, and the American taxpayer, want to rebuild hospitals, schools, and prisons. Saddam's debt went to gilded toilet paper holders, a backyard zoo for his delinquent children, and, of course, a weapons of mass destruction program.

Mr. Chairman, we will give the President the funds our country needs to protect and sustain our troops and rebuild a country whose people want to live proud and free again. All we are seeking is some measure to ensure that the American people aren't permanently footing this bill.

The American people are generous people. They understand that it is for the greater good to help another help themselves. But the American people also recognize we cannot continue to provide open-ended monetary assistance if we do not receive something in return. It is a meet-us-halfway approach.

Are we asking too much for the administration to provide opportunities for American generosity, persistence, patience and sacrifice to be acknowledged, appreciated and repaid? I think not. Americans will not shy away from the mission it has been tasked to complete. We are making progress every day, and our troops, while facing danger, are at the same time offering their time, money, and supplies to assist the local Iraqi people.

I hope that my colleagues will consider supporting this amendment. It strikes the right balance between grants and loans and shows the American people that we are approaching the use of their taxpayer dollars in as a responsible manner as possible as we help rebuild a newly freed country.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order and I reserve my time.

□ 1800

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I asked for 1 minute because I have got three simple reasons that I think the Pence amendment is good.

First I would like to suggest, after serving 5 years in the Nixon administration, the wisdom and common sense in this body is just as good as it is in the Department of State that made this recommendation to the President of not having any loan. That is probably the biggest reason we are pursuing a no-loan provision.

The second is what is the implication on our kids? Let me remind everybody we are borrowing this money which means our kids and our grandkids are going to have to pay it back. It is reasonable to have half of this money in a loan.

The third reason that we want to pursue it is to try to encourage other countries to forgive part of their loan. And the language in the Pence amendment gives the administration the authority to bargain, to move ahead, to encourage other countries to forgive their loan.

I say let us vote on the Pence amendment. I suggest the leadership make it in order.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire about the amount of time we have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, since September 11, 2001, the American people, in fact, people throughout the world have lived in particularly tumultuous times. As a result of that, our Nation finds itself in deficit spending for the first time in 4 years.

There is no question that the American people are a compassionate and generous people and they want to help the people of Iraq. But we also have needs in America today, transportation needs, health care needs, educational needs.

So at this time of deficit spending I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for his commonsense and practical approach to solve the funding needs in Iraq. His amendment simply says that we will give 50 percent of the $20 billion, approximately, as a grant to the Iraqi people that would not need to be repaid. But the other 50 percent would be a loan, once the President of the United States, President Bush, determines and certifies to the Congress that a democratically-elected government in Iraq has been established.

I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for his amendment and urge Members to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have had some very general discussion about this issue of loans. I just want to go through this amendment kind of piece by piece so that people understand what we are talking about were this

amendment to be adopted. And I believe we will sustain our point of order against it.

But this deals with, let us make it clear, it is dealing only with that part, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has made this clear, that is the reconstruction for the IRRF money, as it is called, in Iraq.

And it says that 50 percent of the total amounts of the roughly $20 billion, 50 percent of the amounts appropriated under this heading ''shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure until,'' and then there are several conditions. The first condition is the money will be withheld until the initial 50 percent of the funds appropriated has been obligated—giving priority consideration to emergency purposes of security, electric sector infrastructure, oil infrastructure, public works, water resources, transportation and telecommunications infrastructures, and other emergency needs.

Well, Mr. Chairman, 80 percent of the total amount of $20 billion is for those items. So the question legitimately raised, I think, here is which 50 percent of that is a priority and which part is not a priority?

The second condition is the money will be withheld, until the President prepares and transmits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and of the Senate a report that describes the programs, projects, and activities that have been financed by the initial funds and includes a detail analysis of the extent to which such programs, projects, and activities are, or have been, successful.

Mr. Chairman, that means that we have to have a, basically, a completion of the project. You cannot tell us immediately when you start a project whether it has been successful. You have to have a completion of that project. Then you prepare an analysis of it. And then you can release the second half of the money.

So there is necessarily a very large gap in here. All of the 50 percent has to be done and all of it has to be analyzed before you can release the second half.

And the third condition, Mr. Chairman, is the 50 percent is withheld until the President determines and certifies to Congress that a democratically-elected government in Iraq has been established.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are going to say that our ability to finish this job in Iraq and our ability to get the security forces in place in Iraq is going to depend, and the ability therefore, to get our troops home from Iraq, is going to depend on whether or not we are successful in getting a democratically-elected government there.

Mr. Chairman, I just would suggest to you that I think this is not the right approach, that we ought to be doing everything we can as quickly as possible to get Iraqi security forces in place so that American troops can come home. And that means spending the money that is necessary to build the Iraqi Army, to build the Iraqi national police, to build the oil and the electric infrastructure, to put the security forces that guard those facilities in place. All of that has to be done as quickly as possible so that American military forces can get out of those duties that every day puts them in harm's way as they are in the inner sections of Baghdad, as they are beside these facilities around the country. That ought to be the responsibility of the Iraqi people to do that, but it cannot be done until we spend the money to train the people, to equip them, to arm them and to get them out there to do this.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the balance of his time and also his point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I prepare to introduce our next speaker on the Pence amendment, I would express my deep respect for the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), but to say of the Pence amendment that, with regard to the language of the amendment, it says that the funds appropriated under this heading would simply give priority consideration to the emergency purposes of security electric structure infrastructure.

It was very much my intention in drafting this amendment, Mr. Chairman, to defer to the authorities on the ground and to the President of the United States to set the priorities in the disbursement of funds on an as-needed basis.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a courageous voice for taxpayers.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. PENCE's amendment which will provide the funding necessary through 50 percent of the funding for the emergency funds that are needed today. The question has been raised if those funds are 80 percent and this is just 50 percent, I would ask this administration do what all families have to do, and that is prioritize. So when it comes to issues like water resources, perhaps we do not have to spend the money right now on marsh restoration. When it comes to transportation, perhaps we do not have to spend the money right now on escalators, parking lots, and esthetic improvements at airports as far as transportation needs.

So we must prioritize these issues and put the rest of the money into a loan. The American public and my constituents know that this is an oil rich nation and they will be able to bear the burden of paying this money back, if not today, then at least some time in the future.

My constituents also realize that this is a nation that we want to stand behind and stand with to provide for liberty and security, but we know, as well, that liberty and security is not free and the price of freedom is not free. Some of this burden must be borne by the people of Iraq.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his hard work in support of this appropriation. I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Indiana's amendment.

Our former great President Ronald Reagan was proud of saying America is great because America is good. I think that is what this debate is about. I just returned from Iraq and met many of the people, including some of the ministers, the council of ministers. Put yourself in Iraqi shoes for just a minute. Think of the leap of faith it would take you to conclude that America, first of all, these people for the last 30 years have had the boot of tyranny on their throats. Americans come through and they liberate, or concur, however you want to interpret it, this is the Iraqi thinking, what are they going to do next? The Americans are saying we are going to help you rebuild your country and give it back to you. It takes a real leap of faith.

I suggest to Members if we give them this money, help them to invest it, build their country back as opposed to putting more loans on them, the leap of faith will be aided. The goodness of America will be noted.

We were also briefed by the coalition provisional authority. The estimates of oil-derived revenue for Iraq after 2 or 3 years when production increases roughly estimates the cost of running this country of managing the systems, of teaching its kids, of providing its health care and for the welfare of the people. But if we put additional burdens on them, they will not be able to payment to manage the country in addition to the debt service.

We also, by the way, lose tremendous credibility with this donor's conference that is coming up in just a week. If we put additional debt upon the Iraqi people how can we go to the French, the Germans, the Russians, and the Kuwaitis who are owed reparations of $100 billion and say to them you have to forgive your debt, but we are not going to forgive ours, we are going to put additional debt on this poor country.

This country has tremendous potential, but we have to help them to reach it. And they cannot get there without us. No one has helped the Iraqi people in the last 30 years. We believe that we have come to do that, and I believe that we will.

The Marshall Plan model that you have heard about really did work in Western Europe. It prevented the third world war. As my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has said over and over, the best way to prevent the third Iraqi war or sending American soldiers back to the Middle East, is by investing in the future of

this country, in this really accomplished and thoughtful and resourceful people who have not had the ability to express themselves or their potential for the past 30 years.

So, in conclusion, I would just argue very strongly that we help them. The American public with a good explanation will support us on this. If we do not sell it, the American people will not support us. We need to sell it to them, but it is a good investment in our future and in the future of democracy in the world.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have been in my office and trying to find out what was going on. My understanding is that are we are at the moment debating the Pence amendment, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the Pence amendment, that Mr. KOLBE from Arizona has risen to reserve a parliamentary point of order against this amendment, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEFAZIO. So, basically, Mr. Chairman, we are debating an amendment which is not going to be allowed so all of this debate is meaningless. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry. And at this moment in time the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has reserved a point of order. No one has yet made the point of order. So the gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, could I have a further inquiry. Do we anticipate that there is some prospect that an actual vote might be allowed on this amendment?

Mr. PENCE. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not clairvoyant, and the Chair will wait for the points of order to be made.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the Chair.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire about the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has 10½ minutes. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 9½ minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a long-time advocate of taxpayers' interests on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Pence amendment. We are talking about $18.6 billion of reconstruction funds. Should it be a loan? Should it be a gift?

I have legislation, an amendment that I have submitted and have been pushing for the last week, suggesting that all of that money should be in the form of loans. We should not, when we have to borrow this money, and we are already $400 billion in deficit spending this year, we have got to borrow this money in order to give it to Iraq, which is going to be rich with oil 10 years from now.

□ 1815

And our children are going to have to pay that back and their children will not? That is ridiculous. It is obscene.

The Pence amendment goes half way. If it passes, I will be supportive of this amendment and withdraw my amendment. But if the Pence amendment is struck down by a point of order, I would suggest my Republican colleagues join me in supporting the Obey-Lantos amendment which accomplishes the same goal of a 50/50 loan versus grant of the reconstruction money, and I understand that that will not be struck down by a point of order.

Let us get something done here today. The American people bear too much of the burden. Let us think of them for a change.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise with great reluctance in opposition to this amendment from my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE); but I feel it is important that I must speak out about what I view is the right thing to do.

I am joined by many of my colleagues who have been to Iraq. Certainly I cannot speak for every Member who has been to Iraq, but everyone that I have spoken with has seen the hope and seen the optimism, seen the possibilities that our support of the Iraqi people can bring, not only to Iraq but to all Americans here at home.

We realize this is not only an investment in the Iraqi people; this is an investment in the future generations of America. Because if we can help the Iraqi people build a secular, strong, free government and a viable economy, the ripple effects of freedom and democracy and stability will reach our shores in great waves.

Mr. Chairman, I will say that we will be paid back, that we must make this a grant; but we will be paid back in the dividends of freedom and hope and stability and more security right here in our country. And I think that is the most valuable dividend we could ever receive.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a veteran of the Persian Gulf War and a senior member of the Indiana delegation of Congress.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, in response to all these monies should be in the form of a loan, I disagree. Of the $87 billion, those monies which go to pay for our military and our equipment, our military are not mercenaries. The only cause for which they fight is that of freedom. They do not fight for any bounty of their own. And that should not be.

With regard to reconstruction, I think many of my constituents in Indiana supported the military ouster of Saddam Hussein. These very same Hoosiers recognize that if you are willing to invest in the success of the war, you also have to be willing to invest in the peace.

Our Hoosiers also know that we are in the middle of a jobless recovery with growing domestic needs combined with a growing budget deficit. This amendment attempts to recognize two very important concerns: investment in the success of a new Iraq, a country with the potential of great wealth, along with the concerns of our budget deficits and growing domestic needs of our citizens. I believe the Pence amendment reflects our culture and our heritage.

In an emergency over the years we were there, whether it was a hurricane, fire, flood or even war. Just like the Red Cross or Salvation Army we were always there to respond. And that is exactly what this amendment tries to reflect. In the state of an emergency we are there to help develop the new nation-state and as soon as they are on their feet, then they have the ability to repay.

I think this is only another tool which we can use, our negotiators can use with other countries at the donors conference with regard to getting other countries to forgive these debts that were incurred during Saddam Hussein's reign.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, the ''Book on Terror'' has a chapter in it labeled ''Iraq.'' You cannot close the Book on Terror without closing the chapter on Iraq.

We are there to make America safe. On September 11 we were thrust into this war on terrorism. We realized then we cannot make every airport, every water tower, every bus line, every shopping center in America safe. We decided we had to find the root cause of terrorism and sever the root. That is why we are in Iraq. We are finding the root cause of terrorism and severing the root.

What we found 3 weeks ago when I went to Iraq and when we met with the commander of the Marine Fourth Infantry Division, General Odeniero, that in areas where we have rebuilt the community, where we have opened the playgrounds, where we have opened the schools, where we have made sure the hospitals were open, the water was running, the lights were on, where they had a community, those are the areas where people of Iraq have come forward and showed us where the bad guys were.

He told a story about two young kids who came up to a Humvee and pointed

out a position where an ambush site was set up. They went and investigated, and sure enough it was true. They learned a lot about making our troops safe by seeing how the terrorist try to ambush our troops.

Well, these kids did that because their playground was opened by United States servicemen and -women. Their school was opened because of our military; and they liked that idea and they wanted to preserve that, so they came forward.

Up to this point we have been funding the opening of schools and playgrounds and communities with money confiscated from the old regime. Well, that money has run out, and now it is time for us to step forward. And the reason we are doing this is because this is how we are going to make our troops safe in Iraq. This is how we are going to encourage the Iraqi people to come forward and point out the bad guys. This is how we are going to have the ability to find the root causes for terrorism in Iraq and sever the root.

I think it is important for the safety of our troops that we move forward with this and do it as a grant instead of a loan. With all respect for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the best thing to do is to do the grants. We can get it done effectively without throwing their economy into chaos. And the sooner we do that, the sooner we bring our troops home.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), one of the most tenacious Members of the Congress.

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

I asked to speak because I had to respond to so many things that I have heard, especially those that suggest that this attempt, that this amendment has to be defeated because it would send the wrong message if we were to make a loan, that message being that we were losing the moral high ground, that, in fact, we would not be showing the best side of America.

Let me state, I believe we have the highest moral high ground possible. And it was not bought even with the hundreds of billions of dollars already spent on our military and on that war. It was built on the over-300 dead that were a result of our desire to free that nation. That is the high ground we stand on. It is high enough. We do not need any more. And to suggest for a moment that asking them to pay just a tiny bit of this cost in some way diminishes that moral high ground is ridiculous.

We stand on the highest possible ground: the dead Americans that have died and that are still dying and that probably will die. That is high enough for me.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I rise in strong support of the base legislation and in passionate opposition to the Pence amendment.

There is no one on this floor who has fought harder for the American taxpayer than I have, and I defy anyone who makes a claim to the contrary. And there is no one on this floor who has been to Iraq and seen more than I have seen because I spent 3 days in Iraq in August. But I think those who posit this as a taxpayer issue miss the point. There is no one in this debate who is saying that out of concern for our taxpayers we should not give aid to our military.

What they are saying is, rather, out of concern for the taxpayer, we should make the nonmilitary side of this, the reconstruction side of this, a loan. That makes a fundamental error. There is no nonmilitary sides of this.

If you go to Iraq as I went to Iraq, if you talk to the troops on the ground, if you talk to their commanders, they will tell you that they must rebuild that country in order to obtain the cooperation of the people there. The reconstruction money is to ensure the safety of our soldiers. It is that essential, and it is that critical. And no one less than our colleague, the Democrat from the opposite side, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), who regrettably cannot be with us in this debate tonight because he has suffered a health problem, makes the point clear. When he went to Vietnam and he fought in a similar war, he said the most important ally in a war like this are the local people. You need them because they know where the bombs are. They know where the improvised explosive devices are. And if they are on your side, they will come to you and they will tell you. And then you can go find those IEDs, and you can destroy them before they kill an American soldier.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), the Democrat from Georgia, has made that point on this floor and across this Nation. Let me make it clear. There is no nonmilitary portion of this funding effort.

It is absolutely critical that we aid our soldiers by helping to rebuild Iraq. And if we do not do that, make no mistake about it, we are hurting our soldiers. Do not rely on my word; trust the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) who was on the ground in Vietnam and who said, and it is working in Iraq today; our soldiers are being helped by the Iraqi people because they believe in this cause.

Now, let us talk about the other issues that have been discussed here, and that is, well, we should make it a loan because other countries have debts owed to them and we will then be in a better position to negotiate those debts away. That again misses the point. The reality is if we make this a loan, if America who initiated this effort to get rid of a brutal dictator now says we do not believe enough in the cause of protecting our own soldiers and we do not believe enough in the cause of the Iraqi people and of being a friend to an ally in the Middle East to make a grant, to help them rebuild this country so we will make it a loan, I have a flash for you: no country in the world will make a grant of their own. They will instead say, we want to be repaid our loan, and we will only go forward on a loan basis. We will cripple the Iraqi economy. We will fail in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms, if they care about national defense, if they care about the safety of our soldiers, oppose the Pence amendment and support the base bill.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would be the first in line to say that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) has a record unparalleled in the Congress of defending taxpayers' interests. And I am a great admirer of his for that reason. But the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) seem to suggest that those of us who support the Pence amendment would in some way refuse to rebuild and withhold funds. There is no withholding.

The first 50 percent is a direct grant which secures the nation of Iraq; the balance is a loan to this nation which possesses nearly $7 trillion in oil beneath its sand, its surface.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, without whose conceptual leadership and outspoken advocacy of this concept early on, the Pence amendment would not have come into existence.

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

The reason the Pence amendment was given an hour of debate by the leadership is because this is the most important amendment I think considered on the loan proposal because it is really the only one that works. Even the amendment that is being considered in the other body today has got problems in the technicalities of whether it could even be done or carried out. And certainly we do not want to put U.S. tax dollars in the World Bank where we do not even have control of our own resources.

There is a workable proposal. I will say that the developments that happened with the administration in the United Nations today certainly show

me and prove to me that what the President told me last week when I deferred to him and withdrew this amendment at the full Committee on Appropriations is coming true, and that is we are convincing other countries and the United Nations to engage in Iraq. There is great agreement here among conservatives, among patriots and principled people that we have to finish what we started.

□ 1830

The only debate is whether or not we can secure the taxpayers, interest.

Let me just say this. I think we will be back here in a few months for more money. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) may be ahead of his time, but we have got to secure this funding over time for the U.S. taxpayers, and for that reason alone, this is an important debate to speak out to secure the U.S. taxpayers in the future.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) as evidence that support for the Pence amendment is truly bipartisan, my colleague and friend.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Indiana for bringing this amendment and discussing a very important issue in tonight's debate.

This was an amendment that I intended to offer myself because it made sense, one-half grant, one-half loan. Grant money can go out the door right away to keep continuity of the reconstruction effort which is important, but the loan aspect is a fundamental recognition that the Iraqis are sitting on a $7 trillion oil reserve, the second largest in the world, but also, it may leverage our negotiator's position going into Madrid next week that they have $10 billion to put on the table to get other countries to give up the loans that they currently have. It also addresses an issue in regard to whether fiscal responsibility is going to seep into this debate.

We can continue the gifts and the grants to the Iraqi people but continue leaving this tremendous legacy of debt for our children and grandchildren to inherit, or we can try making a statement that it is this generation's obligation to pay the ongoing obligations that we have incurred, not our children and not our grandchildren. That is why this amendment makes sense, and I commend my friend from Indiana for raising this issue this evening.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) bringing this to the floor. All of us here support our troops. To not ultimately vote for these dollars is, first of all, I think a slap in the face to all of the families who have lost a loved one in this battle for independence for Iraq, and it would do a disservice to our principles of freedom for this country. And certainly for the $70 billion for our troops, all of us, I would think, stand united in support.

But there is one fundamental question here as we strive to make Iraq an independent and strong country and we help them out. Why not make that $16 billion a loan to that country like many other countries in the past have loaned?

I would also suggest, I would like to add something to the gentleman's amendment and say, well, maybe more of this should be made a grant, based on the condition that France, Germany, Russia, Saudi Arabia, those countries that will stand first in line for repayment, that when they forgive their loans to Iraq, then this loan can be forgiven. That is what I think this is about.

Americans do not want to stand behind in line from an oil rich country while they pay off other countries while we hold the bag.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire about the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, with an abundance of riches of speakers for the Pence amendment today, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if we go out and we go back to our Districts and talk to the constituents, what they are saying is while our school districts have to apply for loans to build schools, it is only fair that the people of Iraq will eventually pay back to the American public part of this as a loan. The Pence amendment says grant first, loan next.

We have to remember that this is a very oil rich country, and they will someday be able to repay us. I think we owe it to our taxpayers to show some responsibility and some accountability here and to support the Pence amendment. Remember, loan second, grant first.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege for me to yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has often been said that freedom is never free. Deposing the tyrannical regime of Saddam Hussein has indeed proved costly to America in terms of both lives and treasure. While we have joined with the Iraqi people to win their freedom, much remains to be done in order to secure that freedom for generations to come.

This debate is of similar gravity as that of last October, when this Congress authorized the use of force to enforce all relevant U.N. resolutions on Iraq. Today, we debate not the future war, but the future peace of a region.

After much deliberation, I find that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana achieves the best balance between our obligations in Iraq as well as the obligation of the Iraqi people to play a prominent role in securing their own future. The parallel system of grants and loans would first build the foundations for a democratically elected government in Iraq. This new government would then find a willing partner in the United States to help finance needed investments in infrastructure and security. Democracy is not a spectator sport, and the Iraqi people must take the leading role to secure the peace for the long-term.

While I am well aware that this amendment might be ruled out of order on parliamentary grounds, it represents the best policy for our nation and for the Iraqi people. That said, failure in Iraq is simply not an option. It is with serious reservations that I will support this supplemental without the inclusion of the Pence amendment. As such, I urge the Administration to re-examine loans as a means of financing the reconstruction of Iraq.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), a colleague and friend and stalwart conservative.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, my colleague, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, in short, we are talking a lot today about values, a very ambiguous time, from time to time, but in fact, Mr. Chairman, with the blood, sweat and tears of our men and women in uniform, they have bought the freedom of the Iraqi people.

If the Iraqi people do not learn that one invaluable lesson of our American values, then we can throw hundreds of billions of dollars into the restructuring of their country. That is why I think the Pence amendment is a very logical, reasonable, rational approach to the funding of the reconstruction of that country.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), demonstrating the bipartisan support for this concept.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Indiana for this amendment. It may be ruled out of order, but then the real debate will start on the Obey-Lantos amendment which will achieve the same effect. I echo the words of my colleague from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that that is the key debate for us, to say at least half loan, half gift. As a matter of fact, it is a $9 billion loan on an $87 billion bill. Only 10 percent of the money would be a loan, half of the $18 billion that is going to rebuild Iraq.

Secondly, let us remember that Iraqi school children will help our troops, whether there is a promissory note in the American Treasury or not. The schools will be open either way.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Chairman, with some reluctance I rise in opposition to my friend the gentleman from Indiana's (Mr. PENCE) amendment. The gentleman knows that. We spoke about this. I considered it very heavily, but here is where I come down in opposition.

I think we have to go back to thinking about why we got here, how we got here. We got here for the sake of freedom, for the sake of the freedom of our own people. I go back to the morning of September 11 in my own memory, and we have to remind ourselves that we were attacked. This was an act of war, and we went to war for the sake of freedom.

Those that attacked us are in multiple places around the world, certainly not the nation of Iraq, but the people in power in Iraq were part of those, as the President put it, supporting terror, you are either with us or you are against us.

I used to be a banker. I was never able to walk up and down the streets of my communities and force people to sign loan documents: This is the amount that I force you to borrow, and these are the terms and conditions that I am going to force you to repay me on. It does not work that way.

What we are about in this is about freedom, and in this very building that we have the privilege of serving in, there were people once that served here for the sake of freedom who said they would pledge their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor for the sake of freedom. We have the same obligation. They did not say this is the price tag, these are the terms and I expect a check back. We cannot force this upon the people of Iraq. We have to be willing to stand up and pay the price, the price of freedom.

I would love to go home for political reasons and say, oh, we loaned the money, we are going to get a check back. That is not the way it works when the obligation is freedom, an ideal that we pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor for.

So with great reluctance, I am in opposition to the gentleman from Indiana's (Mr. PENCE) amendment, but I know that we are together in spirit in the overall objective to win this war on terror.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

I am deeply humbled by the level of support and utterances of respect even from those who disagree with the Pence amendment tonight, and I close tonight urging my colleagues to give due consideration to the Pence amendment. As the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) said so eloquently, it is the only solution that will work, that will balance the needs of the American taxpayers and the needs of a nation, nation of Iraq, and it does not trouble itself, Mr. Chairman, with the choice between should we make the reconstruction dollars a grant or should we make them a loan.

The Pence amendment is the reasonable middle ground that says that we will speed the first 50 percent of resources urgently to the needs on the ground in Iraq, securing that nation for the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity, but in the balance we will recognize, as millions of Americans do, that this is an oil rich nation, producing 2 million barrels of oil a day, Mr. Chairman, and by the middle of next year their own foreign minister projects 3.5 million barrels a day with revenues in the tens of billions of dollars, a truly creditworthy nation and a nation with whom we should enter into a creditor and debtor relationship.

A partnership is the very core of the Pence amendment between the American people and the people of Iraq, a partnership in their civil society and future.

I urge its consideration. I urge its passage.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for bringing this amendment because I think the debate here has been an important debate and a very worthy debate of this House.

I also want to commend him and many others who have spoken for their attention to the fiscal responsibility of this body. I think all of us feel very strongly about the need for us to exercise fiscal caution, fiscal prudence when American taxpayer dollars are at stake here. I certainly feel very strongly that way myself.

I have never said that I did not believe that in the future that loans could be made available in Iraq, that indeed, in fact, that I believe in the year 2005 in the fiscal year 2005 that moneys there probably should be made available as loans. By then I expect we will have a constituted legal government in the country, but I think, at this moment, it would be the wrong approach, it would be the wrong thing to do. So I would say, Mr. Chairman, this is simply premature to be talking about loans at this very moment.

The last point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make is in response to what many have said: Listen to what people are telling you back in your districts. I think we should listen to what people are telling us back in our districts, but this is also about leadership. It was about leadership when we said yes to the President when we gave him the authority to take action, military action in Iraq. We stood up and took that kind of action even though there was opposition at home.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is about leadership, and I think we, as Members of this body, have a responsibility to exercise leadership. With that, Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I would make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill, and, therefore, violates clause two of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment, in item four, imposes additional duties. I ask for a ruling.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the Pence amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill.

Representative PENCE has offered a reasonable amendment with a balanced approach to financing post-war operations in Iraq. This approach is fiscally responsible, as it withholds fifty percent of funding until certain conditions are met. It encourages Iraq to establish a democratically-elected government. It requires that fifty percent of funds be depleted before the remaining fifty percent may be tapped. And it requires the administration to report to the House and Senate on the use and success of funding dispersed of the initial fifty percent.

I support the President and his initiative in the rebuilding of Iraq, and I also believe that we must do it in a balanced manner. A combination of loans and grants is in the best interest of the American taxpayer, and also in bringing other nations to the table in the rebuilding efforts of Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I support the supplemental appropriations bill because it is an investment. We must build on the accomplishments we have made in Iraq and help bring forth a democratic way of life for the Iraqi people.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the supplemental for the conflict in Iraq and would wholeheartedly have voted in favor of the Pence amendment to grant half the funds for reconstruction and loan the balance once an Iraqi government was in place next year. Unfortunately this amendment was ruled out of order. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his efforts.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the Pence amendment to H.R. 3289, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 2004. Representative PENCE's amendment would make the first 50 percent of Iraq Reconstruction funding available immediately as a grant, and would prioritize that money for the emergency purposes of security, electric sector infrastructure, oil infrastructure, public works, water resources, and transportation and telecommunication infrastructures. The balance of the funding would be made available in the form of loans from the United States Government, under terms determined by the President, once a democratically elected government has been established in Iraq and certified by the Administration. I support the goals of Mr. PENCE's amendment, and am disappointed that it will not be ruled in order.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) make a point of order on the amendment?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I think I have made my point of order. I believe that this does impose additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

It is now in order to consider an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

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 CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

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

□ 1845

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE). He is standing here tonight doing his duty. That is what we are supposed to do. And even though I disagree with his position, we ought to be able to debate these issues. I think the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) should have been able to debate and get a vote on his amendment, and I am happy that we have figured out a way to accomplish the same thing. I would invite the support of those gentlemen who supported the previous amendment.

I think often we have in this place what I would call compulsive statesmanship, a tendency for people to want to do the right thing so badly that they sometimes lean overboard in taking into consideration the interests of other countries and in the process miss opportunities to take into account the interests of our own. I am not so afflicted, at least not on this issue.

I want to make clear I am an internationalist. I believe that it would be irresponsible for us to convert this entire package to loans. I believe that the administration is going to need some money available immediately in order to transact the business associated with trying to restart the Iraqi economy and rebuild the Iraqi society. But I think we have to get past the cliches and past the stereotypes and get into the actual details, into the specifics in assessing our obligation.

What this amendment does, very simply, is to, within the rules of the House, provide that, of the $18.6 billion in the bill available for reconstruction purposes in Iraq, that half of that be provided as a loan. We wanted to also provide that that half would run through the World Bank so that we could specifically require matching by other countries and then use the bank's ability to capitalize in order to expand the amount of aid available in Iraq by a factor of four. We cannot, under the House rules, do that directly; but this amount would still allow the administration to do that. They could still negotiate an international fund. Second, they could still run it through the World Bank with that matching requirement.

Now, I would simply like to say that I know that there are some people who will look at this in stereotypical fashion and assume that because the United States is a wealthy country and Iraq is not, (they are not poor, they are a middle income country) but I think that they will assume that because we are wealthy and Iraq is not, that somehow it is unfair for us to require any portion of this to come back as loans. The reason that people say that we cannot do this to Iraq is because they say Iraq has huge foreign debts. I want to point out that foreign debts cannot be paid off with domestic production. So it is misleading to assume that because the United States is a rich country and Iraq is a somewhat poorer country that we are in a better position to pay off foreign debts than they are. We are not.

This country has run such large trade deficits for so long, and we are going to be running such huge trade deficits in the future, that our country has no realistic possibility anytime in the next decade to be paying off any significant portion of our own foreign debt. And the only way foreign debt can be paid off is by running trade surpluses. So what that means is that the United States' foreign debt on a per capita basis roughly equals Iraq's, and next year Iraq's will probably be somewhat smaller than ours.

The fact is that because Iraq has a long-term prospect of multi-billion dollar benefits from the oil they have in the ground, it in fact means that the United States has less of an ability to pay off foreign debt in the future than Iraq does. And that is why I think it is absolutely legitimate to consider requiring 50 percent of the money that we spend in this reconstruction operation to be provided in the form of loans.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and I are offering this amendment. There are a lot of other Members who I know wanted to do it. I know the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) also has demonstrated a great deal of leadership in this. But what we are trying to do is to provide a way to deliver more assistance on the ground for Iraq at less burden to our taxpayers.

For all the reasons cited by all of the gentlemen who supported the previous amendment, Mr. Chairman, I would urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who has been a leader in national security issues and knows the issues in Iraq very well.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his leadership, and I look forward to this debate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make one simple point. From the period of time in the 1990s, starting with President Bush, Sr., and continuing through President Clinton, our troops were deployed 149 times around the world. Many of these deployments were considered minor deployments. But of the 149 deployments that President Clinton and President Bush got us into, President Bush, Sr., 38 were considered major deployments. One of those deployments, which President Bush, Sr. got us into, was Desert Storm. And he went out, with no requirement legislatively by this body, and was able to bring in over $50 billion of reimbursements from our allies after Desert Storm was over. There was no mandate. There was no loan. He did it.

The other 37 deployments, Mr. Chairman, which President Clinton got us into, which includes Macedonia, East Timor, Somalia, Haiti, Colombia, Kosovo, Bosnia, all of those were paid for after the fact. The President inserted the troops in harm's way, and we were left to foot the bill.

Now, what was the cost of that? Mr. Chairman, those deployments cost well in excess of what we are talking about today. In fact, we passed, under the Republican leadership, 11 emergency supplementals funding President Clinton's deployments after the fact. Eleven. Eleven emergency supplementals. And we cut the defense budget by $43 billion to put that money into those deployments.

All of those supplementals and those cuts in defense spending, which in a bipartisan way we replaced, were to fund what kinds of activities, Mr. Chairman? Well, let us see. We subsidized the troops for other countries, we paid for OSCE observers, we built hundreds of new schools, we trained police departments in these countries, we bought fire engines and sent the fire engines overseas, and we started small businesses. All of those expenditures were funded by the Republican Congress in support of a Democrat President who had gotten us into 37 major deployments.

There was no loan. There was no situation where my colleagues on the other side or this side stood up and said, well, Macedonia should pay us back, Colombia should pay us back, or East Timor

should pay us back, or Bosnia, where we have spent $25 billion and where we were told we would be out of by Christmas of 1996. None of that money was offered in the form of a loan. All of that came out of the taxpayers' pockets.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how all of a sudden, because the President does a legitimate thing, the honorable thing, and tells us up front how much it is going to cost to do the same things we funded in the entire period of the 1990s, how we can say that somehow this is different.

Do I hope that President Bush will negotiate our allies reimbursing us? Absolutely. I hope he will do what his father did in 1991 and what President Clinton did not do in those other 37 deployments. It should not be a mandate. We should fund the President's request and it should be bipartisan, and the Democrats and Republicans in this body and the other body should come together and do what we did time and again in paying for President Clinton's deployments. We should fund this provision, we should support the base bill, and we should oppose the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend for yielding me this time. I am very pleased that he and I are jointly sponsoring this amendment.

I would like all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to note that the Obey-Lantos amendment is one amendment on which we will get a vote, and all of our colleagues who supported the Pence amendment just a few minutes ago should be supporting this amendment and will be able to vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, I have been a strong supporter of regime change in Iraq. I am convinced that the removal of Saddam Hussein is in the interest of the people of Iraq, the people of the region, and the people of the United States. And I believe the day when a civilized regime is in place, in a stable Iraq, is not far off.

This supplemental comes in two parts. I am, of course, totally committed to all of the funds in this bill for the safety and security of the brave men and women of our armed services. Since the reconstruction component of this bill is indispensable to achieving our goal of seeing Iraq become a functioning and independent society, I also support the reconstruction portion of the supplemental, with one key modification. Let me explain.

Iraq is potentially one of the wealthiest nations on this planet. The oil wealth of Iraq is estimated at $7 trillion. My colleagues, that is seven thousand billion dollars. I find it absurd, Mr. Chairman, and so do my constituents, that our taxpayers should fund as a grant necessary infrastructure improvements in Iraq. The stream of Iraq's oil revenue is limited at the moment, but in a few years it will be abundant. I find no reason on Earth why the American people should grant this soon-to-be wealthy nation some $18.6 billion for improvements of its infrastructure.

I want to address, Mr. Chairman, the argument that Iraq's debt burden precludes further loans. Let me deal with this phony argument head on. Iraq's debt is of two types: some $50 billion is owed to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Neither of these countries would be in existence today if we and our allies had not waged the first Gulf War. Their security has been immeasurably increased as a result of our recent military actions against Saddam Hussein. I fully expect that both of those countries will cancel Iraq's debt to them.

Mr. Chairman, the balance of Iraq's debt was incurred for a vast armament procurement program and a nauseating chain of Saddam's presidential palaces which dot the landscape along the Tigris and Euphrates rivers like gaudy and ostentatious and conspicuous versions of Las Vegas hotels.

□ 1900

The countries and companies which were pumping billions to build up Saddam Hussein's military might and his ego should now show humility and remorse and eagerly cancel Iraq's debts. Today, Mr. Chairman, the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution which explodes the flimsy argument that there is no Iraqi Government that can commit to loans. The Security Council adopted a resolution which declares that the Iraqi Governing Council, and I quote, embodies the sovereignty of the State of Iraq.

This U.N. Security Council resolution urges the World Bank and other international institutions, and I quote again, to take immediate steps to provide their full range of loans and other financial assistance to Iraq working with the Governing Council and appropriate Iraqi ministries.

If the Security Council believes that the World Bank can make loans to Iraq, then I believe this administration will find a way to do so as well.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a mistake, particularly at a time when our own economic recovery is still so feeble, to ask the American people to shoulder the financial obligations that, by right, should devolve to the people of Iraq who, in the foreseeable future, will be more than capable of bearing it. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that we have made a national commitment to building a stable and civilized Middle East. I support such a goal. But let us not foist the cost of this struggle entirely onto the backs of the next generation of Americans. That is the result if we adopt the administration's all-grants approach.

For the sake of fairness, good sense and for the sake of the American taxpayer, I urge all of our colleagues to support the Obey-Lantos amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I have the utmost respect for the previous speaker on the floor this evening. He has been a champion throughout his career for freedom and for regime change in this particular instance, and I salute him for that, although I disagree with the amendment that he has offered.

The gentleman from California stated that the issue concerning whether there is a government which can indeed enter into a loan agreement, he considered to be flimsy. I would submit to Members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that that issue has certainly been called into question and is far from settled at this point. The fact remains that a loan can be made only with a binding agreement between an agency of the U.S. Government and a willing borrower with the authority to commit the Iraqi people to repayment. I question whether a binding commitment can be undertaken by the Iraqi Governing Council or by Ambassador Bremer on Iraq's behalf. Certainly members of the administration who have brought this to our attention are not at all convinced that a loan can even be effected in a binding way.

But, Mr. Chairman, beside this technical point, let me make a couple of policy arguments as to why I oppose the amendment and why I support the President in his effort to keep this a grant package. Iraq already has well over $100 billion in outstanding debt. Obviously, we are working to get this debt restructured. But still, the nation will be left with enormous obligations for past borrowing. Creating a new U.S. debt will dampen our efforts to get others to forgive debt. We have seen what has happened in the past few days, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Powell and others are going to Madrid to get donors to contribute to the reconstructing of Iraq. Japan is talking about contributing a substantial amount of money, it may be $1.5 billion, in grants. We are hoping that it will more closely approach the figure of $5 billion in grants. If we were to enter into a policy of loans even for a portion of this, then the Madrid conference would be changed to a loaners conference rather than a donors conference, and we would lose a great opportunity.

Why is Japan considering doing this? They are considering doing this in their national interest. It is in their interest just as it is in the interest of the United States taxpayers to have a stable, peaceful, democratic and economically viable Iraq. I think we are going to approve this money, Mr. Chairman, and I think we will get our repayment. We are going to be repaid in an invaluable way. By getting water, power and infrastructure reestablished in Iraq, we

will help to create a peaceful, stable and democratic Iraq government and a more secure America, and it is hard, Mr. Chairman, to put a price tag on that.

The cost of the Marshall Plan was $13 billion in 1948, or some 5 percent of our gross domestic product. This entire package in front of us, reconstruction for Iraq and Afghanistan, represents only one-fifth of 1 percent of our GDP. The reality is that we are trying to rebuild an Iraq and an Iraqi economy that has suffered from decades of a corrupt Saddam Hussein regime. We must achieve peace in Iraq. We cannot allow Iraq to become a failed state or to disintegrate into several states that foment terrorism and instability.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his work and also the gentleman from California and rise to support their amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us is whether we give the President a blank check for $86 billion or whether we fashion a bill that promotes the best interests both of our troops and the American people. I for one do not intend to write a blank check for a plan that just came here yesterday with no exit strategy, no clear link to this supplemental and no detailed plan after January of this coming year. I do not intend to send $18.6 billion in grants to a country that has the second largest oil reserve in the world valued at over $7 trillion.

Why should we not expect Iraq to pay back some of this money? It is not a poor country, and it will not be a poor country. And for all of my friends who have been deficit hawks, you are just going to add another $18.6 billion to this year's deficit, estimated at over $480 billion. We have a responsibility to the American people to demand an Iraq package that will not in essence bankrupt future generations. That is why the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), his package along with my colleague the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations is the appropriate vehicle, a loan package. They can and should pay back reconstruction costs with future oil revenues. Period.

Finally, this administration has failed to present us with a financially responsible plan for reconstruction in Iraq. Their Iraq request would have invested over $255 per person on electricity in Iraq, when we only spend 71 cents per person in the United States on our own failing electricity grid. Their request would have spent over $38 per person in Iraq for medical infrastructure while we spend about $3.30 per person in the United States. The administration's total request of $87 billion is more than all 50 States combined would need to make up for budget shortfalls in 2004. Their total request is more than the Federal Government hopes to spend next year on elementary and secondary education and on homeland security combined. Combined.

This is clearly not the way that the American people want to see us proceed. They understand that maybe that there are those things that we have to make investments in, but that should be paid back. Our troops should not be held hostage to an outright grant for Iraq's reconstruction, and that is why this amendment should pass. Let us loan the money to Iraq, let us help rebuild it, but let us not mortgage the future of the next generation of Americans.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for giving me the opportunity to state my position on this issue. In fact, it is the position of a large number of people in the United States. I have heard positive reinforcement from my constituency. I stand in support of the supplemental and opposed to the amendment. $67 billion for our troops, $19 billion for reconstruction should be a grant. This is simply the right thing for us to do.

This Congress voted to support the President and our military action in Iraq. The United States does as it usually does and took the lead in freeing the Iraqi people from a tyrannical dictator, and we have succeeded. The job is not complete. We cannot say we did half the job that we decided to do and then ask someone else to pay us to finish the job. We removed Iraq from the list of countries supporting terrorism. We are currently in a struggle to rebuild that country, to help the good people of Iraq to take back their country. Our military, together with our State Department, together with dedicated Iraqis are working together to defeat the remnants of Hussein's regime and to move toward a better future. Already, schools have opened, businesses are opening. People are going back to their lives. They have a hopeful future. They are making great progress.

Last Saturday in Butler County, Pennsylvania, I was the speaker at a dinner. I spoke of this issue. I spoke of the controversy that we have regarding whether or not that $19 billion should be a loan. I explained that it is our responsibility as we have taken the lead, and we here in Congress are leaders. It is our responsibility to talk to our constituents, to discuss with them why we went in, how we have succeeded and what we need to do to finish the job. This $19 billion is what we need to do that. I knew that the talk shows and some of my colleagues were opposed to this. Yet, I stood in front of this group and asked them what they thought. They support this. This is the right thing to do. Sure they are concerned, but their feedback was positive. This is an investment in peace. This is an investment in the defeat of terror. This is an investment in the independence of a too-long terrorized nation and a very strong and proud people. And it is an investment in the return of our troops, and that is key. This is part of the whole project.

If we offer this only as a loan, then we are failing our own military. I stand here in support of the grant. We should help Iraq to rebuild as we have in history, as the United States has chosen to be involved and support freedom. We need to stand strong and support the grant for the rebuilding of Iraq.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) will control the time in opposition.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), a subcommittee chairman.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, those who do not learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to repeat these mistakes. After World War I, we had the Versailles Treaty. It was punitive. It spawned resentment in Germany. The result was World War II. You need only to read William Shirer's book ''The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich'' to realize that the punitive approach to a vanquished foe breeds the poverty and resentment that make people easily led by a demagogue.

□ 1915

Fifty million people died throughout the world because of the mistake of the Versailles treaty at the end of World War I. President Truman and Secretary of State George Marshall had the wisdom and the foresight to not repeat the tragedy of Versailles, and the result was a rebuilt Europe that has given us 50 years of peace.

President Bush, in his policy on this, recognizes that if we want to build a stable, peaceful world where people can enjoy the fruits of freedom that we too have to be a generous people. We too have to follow the pattern of the Marshall Plan that was so effective at the end of World War II. The Iraqi people are already burdened with $200 billion worth of debt. Let us not try to add to that and only spawn the same resentments that generated World War II.

I think we have an opportunity, and President Bush recognizes that, to build a stable Middle East that can be our legacy to the generations that follow us just as we had the legacy of President Truman and Secretary of State George Marshall that gave us the peace in Europe and avoided the mistake of Versailles.

I urge the rejection of this amendment. I urge the support of the President's position. I think it serves not

only the people of Iraq, but it serves the best interests of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

I come out to speak against this amendment. In the global war on terror, Iraq is a major theater of conflict. We chose to take the war to the terrorists, where they live, where they seek refuge, and not allow them to again gather strength and the resources to attack us in the United States. We removed Saddam Hussein's regime. But the job is only partially complete. We must finish our duty by securing and stabilizing Iraq. This rebuilding effort cannot be done on the cheap. It is an investment in the safety and the security of the United States and its allies. It is a long-term investment. Our troops must have the resources necessary to win the war on terror.

This supplemental will enable the American-led coalition the opportunity to leave Iraq under the stable and secure control of the Iraqi people. It will also assist the Iraqi people in rebuilding their country. While Saddam Hussein built dozens of palaces for himself and his family and funded the accumulation of weapons and a massive military buildup, he allowed the infrastructure such as the water and sewer systems and electrical grid to crumble. As a result, Iraq is more than $100 billion in debt and unable to tap the full potential of its resources. As Iraq rebuilds its economy and infrastructure, it will assume more of the costs on its own. The supplemental will provide an important bridge, a bridge that provides the resources necessary to continue rebuilding Iraq and the opportunity to create jobs for Iraqis. The funding cannot be a loan to be paid back with oil revenue, or it will send the message to the world that we removed Saddam Hussein's regime for Iraq's oil. That is not why we did it. We did it to build a model of representative government and freedom and democracy for the rest of the Middle East and the rest of the world to see.

It is important that the United States demonstrate its commitment by passing the supplemental before a donor conference next week. The Coalition is making great progress and has avoided many pitfalls, and it needs funding to complete its job. To date, most major Iraqi cities and most towns have municipal councils and the Iraqi Governing Council has appointed a cabinet. An independent Iraqi Central Bank has been established and a new currency announced. Five thousand small businesses have been opened since the liberation, and foreign banks are competing to get into Iraq. Virtually all major hospitals and universities have been reopened and hundreds of schools, until a few months ago used as weapons caches, have been rebuilt and are ready for the fall semester.

This does not mean that all is well in Iraq. I have been to Iraq twice during the last 2½ months. We know the dangers that our troops face there each and every day. It is a dangerous place. We are making progress. We need to pass this supplemental and continue the good work that is going on.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, over the last few weeks, the issue of loans versus grants has dominated the debate on this supplemental. On the one side we see the administration and some Members of Congress arguing that increasing Iraq's loan burden would hobble its recovery and delay its transformation to a stable democracy. They also look to next week's donor conference in Madrid and worry that the United States move to assist Iraq using loans rather than grants would lead to similar approaches from other international donors, thus hindering Iraqi recovery further.

On the other side, I have talked to many of my colleagues who feel, and they feel on behalf of their districts, that their districts would benefit tremendously from even a small portion of that $87 billion. They believe that we are prepared to give a bonanza to a country with the second largest oil reserve in the world, and they say, should this resource-rich country not pay us back? We need this money as much as they do, for our hospitals, our schools, our neighborhoods.

The Obey-Lantos amendment is an attempt to compromise by providing half of the fund through grants and the other half through loans.

The reason I strongly support this concept is we have seen reports in the last few weeks that only approximately $6 billion can be spent this year. We know because we have gotten all kinds of reports, some from the World Bank, some from others, that the total bill could be upwards of $25 billion, $50 billion in the long run; but this year we have been told by the World Bank that they estimate we cannot spend more than $6 billion.

I want to make it clear that in committee I supported an approach that would provide the loans through the World Bank; and I continue to believe that this is the best approach, allowing the United States to ask for matching funds from other countries and enabling the bank to leverage as much as four times the current funds available for Iraq reconstruction. Unfortunately, this amendment does not use the bank. It does not do so because it was disallowed in the rules process from constructing the amendment in that way. The Obey-Lantos proposal to give half of the reconstruction money in grants and the other half in loans, in my judgment, is still a good approach, even though I would have preferred the World Bank as the vehicle.

I believe this will help Iraq, we will be able to provide the money that is needed for reconstruction, and it will also save the United States taxpayers from the entire burden of reconstruction.

The Obey-Lantos approach, in my judgment, is the right one. I am going to support it, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the Obey-Lantos amendment. The issue here is bringing these young men and women home from Iraq when their mission is done as quickly as possible, as safely as possible, as many of them as possible. And that requires the job of reconstructing Iraq to get done.

But the issue of whether there will be reconstruction is not a grant versus a loan. It is who is going to borrow the money to finish the reconstruction. The choice before us is whether the Iraqi people borrow the money and at the right time repay that money out of the proceeds from their $7 trillion worth of oil assets or whether the children of the United States repay the loan. The question is not a grant versus a loan. It is a loan owed by the citizens of Iraq or a loan owed by the citizens of the United States.

This proposal takes the right approach. It says when the time is right, when the reconstruction will justify such an expenditure, this reconstruction should be in a loan taken out by the Iraqi people. It is the right way to bring the young men and women home safely from Iraq.

I urge my colleagues, most especially those who spoke in favor of the earlier amendment by the gentleman from Indiana, to vote ''yes'' on the Obey-Lantos amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Obey-Lantos amendment, and very few times has anyone ever heard me say those words. And let me note that I will be voting for the $87 billion supplemental bill, whichever form the $18.6 billion reconstruction part of the package takes. However, the fairest way to the American people is to make sure that we do not just give away money that could be repaid to us once Iraq gets back on its feet.

Again, the former speaker said it right. This is whether it is going to be

a loan from our children and repaid by our children or repaid by the Iraqi children once Iraq is on its feet and the wealthiest oil producing country in the world. There is no reason to burden Americans any further. They have paid their debt and met their responsibility with treasure and blood. For Pete's sake, let us think about them and not just think about what is best for the world. Lending the money will get the job done, and they can repay it. That is what it is all about. Anyone who spoke for the Pence amendment should be supporting the Obey-Lantos amendment.

I will be withdrawing my amendment in favor of the Obey-Lantos amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of our committee.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

I too rise to support the Obey-Lantos amendment. It is a good amendment. We do need to make sure that we do what is necessary here, and I believe this amendment is a step in the right direction.

If we do the 50/50 separation now, it gives us a chance to take a look at it and also allows Iraq, which must become a sovereign nation, time so that they can use that $2 trillion worth of oil reserves they have to pay back some of the money that we are now lending and giving to them. It is the proper way to go.

I too have an amendment that I will withdraw and support this Obey-Lantos amendment. We had a good amendment in committee. It did not seem to make its way to the House floor, but this is a good amendment, and I hope that our colleagues would support it.

Iraq is not a poor country. They do have the wherewithal to pay the resources back. We right now need our own schools built better. We need our own roads. We need our judiciary system better financed and funded. So the very same things that we are helping Iraq with, we have got to do it for our own country. This will allow us to do some of that and to recoup some of the moneys that we are giving to Iraq.

As the Members know, this $87 billion builds Iraq better than Iraq was built before. We do have some responsibility there. We must take care of our troops. We must see that they get what they need.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. I rise to withdraw my own amendment and to support the Obey-Lantos amendment and ask that the entire Congress follow.

□ 1930

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, this spring I voted against the war in Iraq for a number of reasons. Principally I was concerned that intervention would prove counterproductive. But all of us must recognize that both Houses of Congress by majority vote authorized this action. Now we, collectively, have to bear the consequences of a constitutionally-sanctioned decision. We have no choice but to work together to get out of the predicament in which we have put ourselves.

It may have been wrong to initiate war, but once American Armed Forces defeated Saddam's army and occupied Iraq, we became obligated to ensure that a more progressive kind of Iraqi society is created.

Prior to the war, the cost of conflict was grossly underestimated by the administration. While, implicitly, cost implications were part and parcel of the decision some of us made against the war in the first place, they are no longer as credible a basis for denying American responsibility today. Great power, when it is unleashed, entails responsibility for actions contemplated and uncontemplated.

I have grave concern about our inability to get Security Council sanction for the original intervention; also for a reluctance to allow greater internationalization of responsibility today.

Nevertheless, the endorsement by the Security Council this afternoon of a resolution legitimizing the Coalition Provisional Authority and calling for a timetable for the drafting of a new Iraqi constitution has to be recognized as a positive step. The administration would be well-advised to build on this new international consensus, so reluctantly arrived at, to expedite the timetable for turning over the powers of government to the Iraqi people, and, in the meantime, to press for greater international responsibility and burden-sharing.

Nothing could be worse for world order and for our budget than a long-term, largely solo American entanglement in Iraq. Hence, votes tonight should not be considered a preview of support next year.

Given the thinness of the patience of the American people and the world community, the case for significant acceleration in the rebuilding of Iraq's political society and domestic economy, which the resources in this bill make possible, is compelling.

While the administration may have been wrong to go to war this past spring, Congress grievously errs if we allow Iraq to disintegrate into chaos today.

The issue is not principally Presidential credibility, although it, frankly, has been damaged. At issue is the American national interest as it now exists. If we refuse to rebuild a society we tore down, Muslims and others around the world will conclude we are a bullying power, uninterested in anybody else's fate but our own.

If we are to deter terrorism in an increasingly anarchistic world, the vocabulary of war must be replaced by a commitment to reconstruction. The sooner we commit to this task, the sooner our troops can come home.

The approach contained in this amendment, which I found quite attractive when it was first broached in the other body last week, appears less persuasive upon thoughtful review. It should be defeated. The right thing to do is to invest in peace today.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Iraq resolution last October. I support our troops. This amendment is the key vote of the evening. If everyone who spoke for the Pence amendment, everyone who spoke in their district about how we should be making loans to Iraq (rather than gifts), if they have the courage to actually vote for this amendment, it will pass.

We are told that somehow this amendment makes us seem to be cheap, ungrateful, unwilling. I say that we have paid in blood and treasure for the freedom of the Iraqi people, and, if this bill passes, we will be spending another $76 billion toward that end. If we need to prove to the world that we are the good guys, another $9 billion is not going to do it.

Look at this bill if we pass this amendment: $87 billion to help the Iraqi people; $9 billion of it is loans. Looked at another way, $18 billion for reconstruction; half loans, half gift.

The money will still be spent. Every school in Iraq that would have been rebuilt, will be rebuilt just as quickly. The only question will be whether there will be a promissory note in the U.S. Treasury so that we get repaid next decade.

Two plans for the Iraqi balance sheet: One is to leave them indebted $100 billion and more to these creditors, chiefly Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, and another $100 billion to Kuwait for reparations, a $200 billion debt load. But some say, oh, we cannot inflict them with another $9 billion in debt to the United States.

Plan two, have them renounce the $200 billion allegedly owed for Saddam's sins and start anew, and then they can pay us $9 billion, and maybe the Europeans will loan them another $1 billion. West Germany never paid Hitler's debts. It is time to wipe the Iraqi balance sheet clean.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations and certainly a gentleman who just recently led a large delegation to Iraq.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I would like to take just a moment of the time given me to respond to my colleague from California about wiping the slate clean.

There is little question that is a piece of what we ought to be about here if we are sincere about playing a role in getting Iraq's economy back on track very quickly. The sooner we do that, the sooner they are going to be able to go forward on their own and further rebuild their oil tapping capabilities, the sooner they are going to be able to go further than they have already progressed with the some 85 percent of the communities within Iraq trying to establish local governments and the like, and the sooner we get their economy back on track.

One step to that involves the donors conference in Spain at the end of October. At that point in time, many of the countries that are key, involved in the lending circumstance, will be present. It is our purpose there to actively encourage others to participate in forgiveness of loans, forgiveness of reparations and the like, so that this country will have a chance to get that economy in order.

If we cannot do that, if we find ourselves by way of extending loans causing this Spain meeting to become a lenders conference, we will hold this country's opportunity to recover back years and years and years.

The people of Iraq have never in modern history had an opportunity for economic growth, private sector growth and the kind of opportunity that is part of a free economy. They have not experienced democracy, the opportunity of freedom. Indeed, a piece of it involves their fundamental economy.

What we are talking about here by way of this lending avenue that causes some people politically to feel good about it sounds great. To me it was quite appealing initially. But when you take a hard look at what it practically does to a quick recovery of the Iraq economy, and then in turn what that means in terms of quickly bringing our troops home, it complicates the problem. Our people will be there longer. It will be tougher to stabilize the country. Indeed, we could quash the hope that many of us have for freedom and democratic growth in Iraq.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe Members of Congress saying the American people are not generous, they are not willing to give. We borrowed $79 billion in the spring to pursue the war in Iraq. We are going to be asked to borrow $87 billion more in the name of the American people tonight.

But what we are saying here is for the money to build the infrastructure, not rebuild, this is not war damage, this is to give the Iraqis a spiffy new state-of-the-art telecommunications system, water and sewer, roads and bridges, all sorts of things the American people would like to have, good projects, public works, but to give it to them free of charge, because Saddam Hussein stole their money and neglected to do it.

Now, this is a country that has seven thousand billion dollars in oil reserves, and we cannot ask them to foot a little bit of the bill?

How about when we talk about welfare people in this country, ''have them bootstrap themselves.'' Well, how about having the Iraqis pick up half of the bill to build their country? Otherwise, we are going to obligate Americans, working Americans, for the next 30 years, to carry the entire tab for building this country, not rebuilding it, and committing the American people to pay for projects there that we need here at home that are being neglected because we do not have enough money.

We cannot borrow the money here in the United States of America to build the roads, bridges, highways, water and sewer systems, to pay extended unemployment benefits out of the trust fund, but we can borrow the money in Iraq to pay for no-show jobs, to build water systems, sewers, state-of-the-art telecommunications and all that, and we cannot ask them to obligate themselves out of a seven thousand billion dollar oil reserve to pay a tiny fraction of that?

One gentleman said it is one-fifth of one percent of our GDP and we should not care. It figures out to one-fifth of one percent of their seven thousand billion dollar oil reserves.

Fair is fair. They should at least pick up half of the bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute here to respond to the previous speaker who alleged barrels of cash were going to be rolling into Iraq at the American taxpayers' expense.

Obviously, he has not taken the time or just does not understand how this process works. But there is not cash that goes to Iraq with this money. This money is appropriated for purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act to be carried out by agencies, organizations of the Federal Government, that are qualified to enter into contracts. That would be the USAID, the Agency for International Development; it would be the Corps of Engineers; it could be the Centers for Disease Control or other Federal agencies that might enter into these kinds of contracts. But there is not cash that is going to be paid by the United States to Iraq.

So it is simply a misunderstanding to assume that this is going to be cash being paid to Iraq. There is not a government to pay the cash to. It is projects that are needed to get the Iraqis on their feet, projects needed to create democracy in that country.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lantos-Obey amendment and in opposition to the underlying bill.

When my mother brought me across the vastness of the Pacific Ocean to America, she did so with the hope that I would become a good citizen, a good American citizen. I doubt that she ever dreamed that I would become a U.S. Congressman as well. Whether as citizen or as Congressman, however, we learn certain fundamental values from parents, from teachers and mentors. Some of the most crucial of those values are responsibility, accountability and having a plan for the future.

By all three of these standards, the administration's request for $87 billion for Iraq fails, and I must reluctantly vote against it. Responsibility, accountability and a plan for the future.

Responsibility: A year ago I stood in this well and expressed my grave concern that we were embarking upon an unnecessary war, and, by so doing, that we were going to lower the barriers to future wars.

We were told that Iraq was an imminent threat to our national security. Well, here we are enmeshed in a quagmire in Iraq, and we have lowered the international threshold for war with this new doctrine of preemption, or first strike. The administration architects for these policies must be held responsible. We need responsibility.

Accountability: We have been asked for over $400 billion in regular appropriations and in supplemental appropriations. We have spent a lot of money on defense and on Iraq. However, we find that our troops are going without the best bulletproof vests. We find that troops are traveling in Humvees with soft canvas backs rather than armored vehicles, because their armored vehicles do not have tracks to take them around.

□ 1945

Where is the accountability? Where has the money gone? Where is the accountability for our troops? Where is the accountability to their spouses, to their parents, and to their children? And where is the accountability to my fellow Oregonians who have been told that there is not enough money to keep their schools open or to pay for their unemployment?

We need accountability. We need a plan for the future. Approving this funding without a plan for the future is nothing less than writing a blank check. We need a plan for proceeding on two fronts. At the one end on the international front, we need to bring the international community into Iraq to share the burden, both in terms of blood and treasure; and at the other end, at the local end, we need as rapidly as possible to restore self-government to the Iraqi people. The administration resists both of these efforts.

There is no cogent plan. Mr. Chairman, we have no responsibility, no accountability, and no plan, because this administration is not listening to either Congress or the American people. Congress has very few tools to influence foreign policy; and today, we only have the power of the purse to make this administration open its ears and listen to this Congress and to the American people. If we fail to use our

limited powers to make this administration listen, then we are nothing more than a rubber stamp. My mother did not bring me across the ocean to be a rubber stamp citizen, and Oregonians did not send me across this continent to be a rubber stamp Congressman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment and against the underlying bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for yielding me this time.

Iraq is in the central front in the war on terrorism. We are not going to get a second chance at doing this right. We face some strong challenges, so we have to be determined and remain focused on establishing a new Iraq.

I might say, incidentally, that in my district back in Michigan, I have some 35,000 Iraqis who have immigrated to America, and they have become solid citizens. They communicate, obviously, very well with the community; and, in fact, they have improved the quality of life in that community. Many are entrepreneurs, and I think they have been a tremendous addition to my own district.

The same thing would be true, I believe, in Iraq. As we work to stabilize this country and strengthen a new Iraqi government, we cannot afford to make our job any harder than it already is.

Yesterday's Washington Post editorial nails the point: ''To make a loan in these circumstances is like swimming out to a drowning man and handing him a 10-pound weight.''

If we turn our assistance into loans, we will be cutting our legs out from under ourselves. Our mission in Iraq is critical to the security of our country, and we cannot afford to undermine ourselves.

Right now the administration is working hard to get foreign governments to contribute to the rebuilding of Iraq. Turning our assistance into loans turns the upcoming donors conference into a loaners conference. We simply cannot afford to make this mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to vote against this unwise amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, it is very simple. This aid package is the largest aid package this country will have ever given to any country with whom it was at war. It is the largest aid package we have provided in the history of the world. I think that is doing something. All we are saying is that we should recognize that because of the oil reserves in the ground, that Iraq, by next year, is expected to have a better ability to pay back its foreign debt on a per capita basis than the United States does; and in 5 years, they will have a substantially better opportunity to pay that debt back than we do.

We face no prospects of trade surpluses over the next 10 years, so we are not going to be paying back our foreign debt. Iraq, with that oil in the ground, if we have any management ability at all in this situation, Iraq will wind up being able to pay back a significant portion of their debt as soon as that oil starts being pumped again.

We are simply asking for a decent balance between long-term burdens placed on their taxpayers and long-term burdens placed on ours. The House would not put the troops first today on the previous amendment, at least a lot of folks do not appear to be comfortable doing that; they would prefer to stay with the committee position. I would ask at least to put the taxpayers first.

This is a balanced amendment. It is fair. It is not in any way punitive. It does not in any way inhibit Mr. Bremer's ability to get the job done. It simply indicates that we are sensitive to the needs of our taxpayers as well as our need to provide leadership in the world in restoring the Iraqi society and the Iraqi country.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and, actually, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for offering this amendment and in prompting this debate. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is a brave and thoughtful leader, and every time he steps on the floor of this House, he brings honesty, courage, and dignity with him. He is a true mensch, and I am proud to call him my friend.

But, Mr. Chairman, I must oppose, strongly oppose this amendment for it flies in the face of our mission in Iraq and everything the war on terror stands for. Of course we want our money back. But the reconstruction of Iraq is not about $20 billion in roads and sewers halfway around the world. It is about freedom: ours, the Iraqis', and all of humanity's.

The moment our Coalition crossed into Iraqi airspace to remove Saddam Hussein from power, we sent a message to the world, friends and foes alike, that the nexus of outlaw regimes, weapons of mass destruction, and international terrorism would no longer be tolerated. We will pay any price and bear any burden to advance the cause of human liberty. And after the shock and awe of major combat, the price and burden of human hope shift from the battlefield to the town hall and the town market. That hope, Mr. Chairman, cannot come in the form of a promissory note. It is our fight, and now it is our job.

Putting aside the practical shortcomings of this specific proposal, it neither stipulates who would receive the loans nor suggests who might be responsible for paying them back. This is a vote about the broader question of the United States' moral responsibility, moral authority in the war on terror. Choking off economic development in Iraq will not foster democracy, prosperity, or security. It will only serve to benefit those who have sought to undermine the very idea of a free Iraq all along.

We did not start this war, but history and providence have called upon us to finish it. And before September 11, if we had debated $20 billion to build a free and independent democracy in Iraq, I would have asked, Given the cost, how could we possibly afford to do it?

But, Mr. Chairman, today, 2 years after 3,000 of our countrymen were lost, as we debate that very thing, I ask all of my colleagues, Given the cost, how could we possibly afford not to?

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the Chair announces that this 15-minute vote on the Obey loans amendment will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the Obey quality-of-life amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 226, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

AYES—200

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Frost
Ackerman	Coble	Gonzalez
Alexander	Conyers	Gordon
Andrews	Cooper	Green (TX)
Baca	Costello	Grijalva
Baird	Crowley	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Cummings	Hall
Ballance	Davis (AL)	Harman
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Bell	Davis (IL)	Hill
Berkley	Davis (TN)	Hinchey
Berman	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Berry	Delahunt	Hoeffel
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Holden
Bishop (GA)	Deutsch	Holt
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Honda
Blumenauer	Doggett	Hooley (OR)
Boswell	Doyle	Hulshof
Boucher	Duncan	Inslee
Boyd	Edwards	Israel
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	Istook
Brown (OH)	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Burton (IN)	Etheridge	Jefferson
Capps	Evans	John
Capuano	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Fattah	Jones (NC)
Cardoza	Feeney	Kanjorski
Carson (IN)	Filner	Kaptur
Carson (OK)	Ford	Kennedy (RI)
Chabot	Frank (MA)	

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
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Solis
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—226

Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Case
Castle
Chocola
Cole
Collins
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
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
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
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
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
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)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stark
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Clay
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Moran (VA)
Oberstar
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2017

Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 546, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 216, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—209

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
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)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
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
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
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
Tancredo
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—216

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
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
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
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
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
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)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
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
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—10

Clay
Cox
Gephardt
Jones (OH)
Marshall
McKeon
Moran (VA)
Oberstar
Putnam
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2027

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 547, I was unavoidably detained from voting. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2003 No. 145

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

We sing praises to You, sustainer of the universe, for the Earth belongs to You. You have set Your glory above the heavens, and Your throne shall endure forever.

Lord, thank You for Your faithfulness and for Your loving providence. You have dealt bountifully with us, and we rejoice because of Your manifold blessings.

Preserve this land we love, as we lean upon Your everlasting arms. Heal our land of the disease of division and deliver us from wickedness. Instruct our Senators today as they grapple with complex issues. May they strive to glorify You with each decision. May the spirit of civility prevail as they guard their speech.

Sustain us with Your right hand until the darkness lifts and the shadows flee.

We pray this in Your strong name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today there will be 60 minutes for morning business prior to resuming consideration of S. 1689, the Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental request. There are a number of amendments that are pending, and we hope to dispose of those over the course of the day and as many as possible this morning.

The ranking member and the manager, Chairman STEVENS, are here and will be reviewing the amendments. It is our expectation that rollcall votes will be held as necessary on these amendments and those other amendments that will be offered over the course of the day.

Last night we made progress and we were able to lock in an amendment list, although that list is much longer than any of us would like to see. I am told many of the amendments on that list will not be offered.

Having said that, we will press on and we will remain as late as necessary with the understanding that we will complete the bill by the end of business this week. I have repeatedly said that goal must be met. It is an urgent supplemental request and the sooner the better in terms of passage of this important piece of legislation.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we started on our side last night with 90 amendments. We are down to 31 now. I am not sure all of those will be offered, but I think the end is in sight. If we work hard today and put in a fairly decent day tomorrow, we will be able to finish this bill. I know the Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore of the Senate, has worked hard and was able, with his wisdom, to get rid of a number of reporting amendments that took a lot of pressure off of everybody. Those will be taken to conference and the decision will be made as to what will be done rather than having 70 different reporting amendments on relatively the same subject. I think we have the opportunity to finish this most important bill in the next day or two.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I want to make just a few comments on the progress that has been made—and it has been real progress over the last 2½ weeks—on the emergency request for Iraq and Afghanistan.

While we will have much more debate over the course of the day and likely tomorrow morning, and discussion on the amendments, I predict this bill will pass with very strong bipartisan support either late tonight or tomorrow. There has been a general understanding in this body that, indeed, we are at war against terrorists in Afghanistan and Iraq and the assistance we are debating—the urgent supplemental request—is absolutely vital and integral to victory and to the safe return of our soldiers.

Replacing the defeated regime of Saddam Hussein with a democratic Iraq is an essential turning point in bringing freedom to a part of the world that has been governed by extremism and by terrorism now for decades.

As General John Abizaid said before the Armed Services Committee, our service men and women are very clear when asked about their commitment to victory in Iraq. He said: ''We can fight them there or we can fight them here.''

What we are doing now very directly affects the security of the American people.

Iraq is a country, as we all know, that is deeply in debt because of Saddam Hussein's many excesses in over more than 20 years. In order to help Iraq, we must absolutely bring a basic level of stability to that country. Although we will discuss it over the course of the day, I believe strongly that loans will not do it. Loans do not

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

accomplish that. Piling more debt on top of a crushing burden that is already in place will simply compound Iraq's problems, and I believe undermine that goal of stability there.

Our allies clearly must be generous with their assistance as well, and they must be prepared to write off debts from bad loans to Saddam Hussein in the past. We are working very hard as a country on this, and I am confident that by our example we will encourage that kind of international cooperation.

We have a strategy for success in Iraq. In recent months, we have made steady progress toward our objectives. We just began over the last several days and weeks to hear about those successes. Essential services are being restored, security is improving, and political transformation is underway. Importantly, as we will see in the United Nations in the next several hours, we are reaching out to expand international participation in the rebuilding of Iraq.

America must continue to build on this progress. We simply cannot afford to fail, and indeed we will not fail. If freedom and progress falter in Iraq, terrorists will be emboldened around the world, in the Middle East and elsewhere, threatening innocent lives around the world and America. With success, a free Iraq will send a clear message to the people of the Middle East and beyond that freedom and democracy—not violence, not terrorism—are the best paths for the future.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes of the time under the control of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, or her designee and the second 30 minutes of time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will say a few words about the supplemental appropriation which the leader just addressed a moment ago and we are addressing all week and also about the ongoing search for weapons of mass destruction.

I was in a Senate Armed Services Committee briefing when Dr. David Kay, one of the leaders of the Iraqi Survey Group, briefed me, and later briefed Congress as a whole, on the ongoing search for weapons of mass destruction. In that briefing and in the published statement he made that is now on the CIA Web site, he says:

> In searching for retained stocks of chemical munitions, the ISG [Iraqi survey group] has had to contend with an almost unbelievable scale of Iraq's conventional weapons armory, which dwarfs by orders of magnitude the physical size of any conceivable stock of chemical weapons. For example, there are approximately 130 known Iraqi Ammunition Storage Points, many of which exceed 50 square miles—

I had to doublecheck that quote to make sure it was accurate because it boggles the mind.

Continuing—

> 50 square miles in size and hold an estimated 600,000 tons of artillery shells, rockets, aviation bombs and other ordnance. Of these 130 ASP's, approximately 120 remain unexamined. As Iraqi practice was not to mark much of their chemical ordnance and to store it the same as they would conventional weapons, the size of the required search effort is enormous.

Dr. Kay has a gift for understatement. Having only in this time since the fall of Saddam Hussein been able to examine 10 out of a possible 130 ammunition sites gives an idea of the tremendous task ahead. Perhaps the critics should give some pause about the ongoing search for weapons of mass destruction and the likelihood—indeed, I would say the probability—that we will find those weapons of mass destruction in the end.

The search is ongoing, but we know for certain that 17 U.N. resolutions and numerous inspection missions by the U.N. weapons inspection team from 1991 to 2003 were not sufficient to stop Saddam Hussein. Even though we have not yet found the degree of weapons we anticipated, it is clear Saddam Hussein lied to the world about his arsenal despite all the steps taken by the international community. There have also been significant finds that indicate we have only grazed the surface of Iraq's weapons capabilities.

According to the same report I quoted a moment ago:

> The home of an Iraqi scientist brought the discovery of strains of biological organisms, one of which can be used to produce biological weapons. The team found new research on [Biological Weapons]-applicable agents, Brucella and Congo Crimean Hemorrhagic Fever (CCHF), and continuing work on ricin and aflatoxin, none of which were made known to the U.N.

It will be many months before we will have a clear picture of the nature and extent of Saddam's weaponry, but already some things are crystal clear.

There are some in this body who have opposed the conflict in Iraq from the beginning. I disagree with them, but they have a right to their views. I am sad to say there are also those who have come close—too close—to exploiting for political gain the hardships we have encountered following Saddam's fall, hardships experienced in serving the cause of freedom. I believe that is wrong and should be repudiated in the strongest terms.

We all know Congress voted overwhelmingly to authorize the President to use necessary force to remove Saddam's regime in Iraq. Subsequent events, including Dr. Kay's report on behalf of the Iraqi Survey Group, have vindicated that decision. I am also glad to see that today France, Germany, and Russia are planning to support the resolution concerning our efforts in Iraq before the U.N. Security Council. I would only hope the administration's critics in this body would express such strong support as well.

We all know that the great efforts and sacrifices made by our brave men in the coalition forces who ignored the beltway echo chamber and suggestions from the outset of quagmire, the cynical prognosticators who claim that our forces were on the brink of collapse, and the handwringing doubters who said Operation Iraqi Freedom was nothing but a pipe dream—we know these critics were wrong. The dedicated men and women of our coalition forces acted as true professionals. They were interested in actions and not words. We all know they liberated Baghdad in a mere 21 days.

Even in the face of that success, there still are naysayers who refuse to acknowledge the tremendous and dramatic accomplishments we have made as well as the necessity that we finish the task ahead. They are urging in so many words that we abandon Iraq, leaving behind an unstable nation still trying desperately to crawl up from under the rubble of destruction by Saddam's ruthless regime. That is a dangerous and an unwise suggestion.

This mission must end when we complete the task of stabilizing Iraq and we are able to hand power over to leaders who are elected by a free Iraqi people—not before. While we all want to return Iraq to the Iraqi people as soon as possible, and at the same time get our troops back home as soon as possible, these well-intentioned desires should not blind us to our duty to finish the job we started. There is no doubt that the enemies of democracy in Iraq, both inside and outside of that country, will exploit any short-lived commitment.

Indeed, I believe the evidence is overwhelming that the events of September 11 were largely caused by the apparent lack of American resolve to defeat terrorism, and what we are doing today—maintaining our strong resolve and finishing the job that we started in the war against terror in Afghanistan and Iraq—is absolutely essential to our success.

If we leave Iraq prematurely, we will play into the hands of the terrorists and Baathist remnants. They are counting on the resolve of the coalition to falter, freeing them to seek to regain control of this fledgling nation. We must not cut and run and, in so doing, leave the Iraqi people as they are, undefended, or we risk the possibility that the sacrifices that have been made by this Nation, and particularly our military and other coalition forces, will all be for naught.

Today in Iraq there is religious freedom and human rights unlike anything seen during Saddam's regime. The Iraqi people now have hope where there was formerly only despair. They have hope for a future that must have seemed like only a dream a few short months ago.

The ''blame America first'' gang is grasping for anything they can to prop up the illusion they were right all along. But the absence, so far, of weapons of mass destruction and stockpiles of biological agents does not mean Saddam's Iraq was some kind of sunny paradise or a thriving garden dictatorship, one long springtime for Saddam. Nothing—nothing—could be further from the truth.

We have not yet found weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, but let me remind all of us what we have found. We have found torture chambers. We have found execution sites. We have found prisons where children were held in order to coerce their parents to bend to Saddam's will. We have found a legacy of fear and terror, the vestiges of years of tyranny and cruelty. We have found as many as 300,000 people—maybe more—buried in mass graves throughout Iraq in nearly 100 reported sites. They stretch from Basrah to Baghdad, from Najaf to Kirkuk. These stand as silent monuments of Saddam's ruthlessness left behind for all to see.

For the Iraqi people living under Saddam, peace—if you can call it that—was far more bloody than the current war.

To those who continue to doubt our mission in Iraq, I say this: Peace is a good thing but at what price is it purchased? By turning our backs on suffering, genocide, and evil? By tolerating those who defy the civilized world and encourage, facilitate, and promote international terrorism?

If the 20th century has taught us anything, it is that if America is to fulfill its role as the guardian of the free world, a beacon of light shining in the darkness, we cannot allow bloodthirsty tyrants such as Saddam Hussein to act with impunity.

Clearly, there are obstacles to overcome in Iraq, and there will be setbacks along the way. Yet we cannot allow the politics of the moment or the upcoming Presidential election to undermine the war on terror and American resolve.

I believe the task that falls to us at this moment in history is spreading the blessings of liberty and bringing the light of freedom to a nation that has, for too long, been imprisoned by darkness.

We must not falter in our efforts. We must not play political games while the world turns inward. We must fulfill our duty to defend America's interests abroad and ensure that the tragedies of September 11 are never repeated.

In the end, if there is one thing certain, it is this: In Iraq the mass murder has stopped. And we stopped it. The Iraqi people and the American people and all the people of the civilized world are better off for it.

Those who would play political games with our mission in Iraq, even while our brave men and women labor to secure and stabilize this fledging nation, risk dishonoring the memories of those who sacrificed all in opposing this bloodthirsty regime.

No, Mr. President, we must not cut and run, leaving the Iraqi people with a promise unfulfilled. Success in Iraq depends enormously on our willingness to stay the course and finishing the job we started, and through it all, we owe our men and women in uniform our unequivocal support as they labor in a dangerous place for an honorable cause.

In summary, America needs from this body and from its leaders less babble and more backbone.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to share some of my thoughts on the administration's request for additional funding for Iraq and Afghanistan.

The majority of our attention has been focused on the situation in Iraq. Certainly this topic merits the attention it has received not only this morning but every morning it has received during morning business. In all of this, however, I would like to ensure that we do not overlook another very important aspect of this bill, which is increased assistance for Afghanistan.

The supplemental includes $11 billion for Operation Enduring Freedom: over $1 billion for training of the Afghan National Army and the construction of roads, schools, and health clinics.

Too often, as we focus on what is transpiring around the world—whether it is events in Iraq, the happenings in North Korea, the situation in Liberia—the news coming out of Afghanistan goes unnoticed: the cooperation between U.S. and Afghan forces in tracking down elements of the Taliban and al-Qaida; the progress USAID is making in strengthening the government; vaccinating Afghan children for measles; expanding educational opportunities for women and girls; and we must also remember the rehabilitation of numerous roads, bridges, tunnels, and related infrastructure.

There is also bad news as to what is happening in Afghanistan: reports of the resurgence of the Taliban and al-Qaida, increased poppy cultivation for opium production, and a yet uncertain relationship between the central and the provincial governments.

Our support for the progress in Afghanistan must continue. Many talk of the need to succeed in Iraq. The high price associated with that, if we fail, will be incredible. And I agree. The same holds true with Afghanistan. So I am pleased this supplemental is not just about Iraq but includes Afghanistan as well.

This past May, during his commencement address at the University of South Carolina, the President spoke to what the biggest accomplishment our presence in these two nations—Iraq and Afghanistan—can be, and that is the opportunity to replace old hatreds with new hope.

As the President said, when citizens have hope—when they feel as if they are invested in the future—then the extreme ideologies of terrorists hold no sway. But if there is no hope, if individuals think the future holds nothing for them or their families, the appeal of extremism is great.

That is the fight the United States faces today. What does the future of Iraq and Afghanistan hold for their citizens?

We have all heard of the recent Gallup poll taken in Iraq, which showed that 67 percent of Iraqis surveyed thought their lives would be better off in 5 years as a result of the U.S.-led invasion. Only 8 percent said their lives would be worse off. The hope for the future is there.

The Iraqi people are not willing to give in to the evil of terrorism, but if the United States fails in its task, if we do not deliver on our promises to get the job done, we have perhaps opened the door to even further terrorism.

Make no mistake about it, if we go about our task in a halfhearted manner and do not provide the resources that are needed, then we are only sentencing our troops to continued danger and longer deployments. The fact is, the sooner we complete the job, the sooner our troops come home.

Despite what may be portrayed in the media, progress is being made. We see that on a daily basis. Towns and municipal councils have been set up.

Fifty-six thousand Iraqis have been trained and armed for the security of their nation. More Iraqis are being trained to serve in the Iraqi Army and the police force. Electricity has been restored to prewar levels. A new Iraqi currency was introduced just this week.

On the education side, on October 1, just a couple weeks ago, the children of Iraq returned to school. And with the assistance of the Coalition Provincial Authority and USAID, nearly 1,600 schools in Iraq have been renovated. Over 5.6 million math and science books, free of Saddam's propaganda, are being printed and will soon be delivered. U.S. universities are partnering with Iraqi universities. This is significant because over 40 percent of Iraq's population is under the age of 15. These are kids who have known nothing but life under Saddam Hussein. These children are Iraq's future. Ensuring access to educational opportunities for both boys and girls is key. This will give the Iraqis the chance to develop the skills they need for their own personal advancement, to diversify Iraq's

economic development, and to provide for the future of their nation and a future with hope, which is what we are all working toward.

I see the good Senator from Missouri is here. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 8 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, it was not really my intention to come down on this particular debate and speak. I would like to give a broader statement on the war at some point. But I thought I would come for a few minutes today because I have been watching from time to time our friends on the Democratic side, particularly the Presidential candidates who seem to be vying with each other to show their base, to show the left how much they are against the war. They are trying to appeal to the left, which is certainly understandable given that they are running in a primary.

That has distressed me because I think the growing opposition to the war on the left is a tremendous historical mistake. People in that movement will view it that way 20 or 30 years from now. I say with all good faith to my friends in that movement that this is not the 1960s. Iraq is not Vietnam. Saddam Hussein is not Ho Chi Minh. The terrorists are not some kind of utopian movement that wants to create a workers paradise around the world. The terrorists stand for everything that this country hates, and in particular, everything the left in this country has always stood against. They are bloodthirsty cutthroats. They don't believe in diversity. They are racial and religious bigots. They are sexists. They hate the idea of international law. They have no respect for international norms. We should all be opposing them.

This is a war in which we should all be involved. We should all get in the same boat and row. I know it is hard to support a war which is led by a President you do not support. I was in that situation when we were involved in Bosnia. We are still there. It is hard to support a war led by a President whose very election you question. I understand what it is like to lose a contested election and, in fact, to lose one, the outcome of which is disputed. I was in that situation when I ran for Governor in 2000.

I believe very strongly that this is an American war. This action in Iraq is part of it. There is a tremendous strategic aspect of this war. We can and will win it, if we pull together, if we get in the same boat and row. There is no reason we should not. I urge both parties and all different parts of the philosophical spectrum to do that.

I want to take a few minutes to talk about this package, and in particular the need for reconstruction. There are three reasons this is very important, why it is in America's interest to spend this money and reconstruct Iraq.

First, we have to get the lights on there so that we can do the job we have set out to do. It is very difficult to hunt people down, hunt the terrorists down, if you can't turn on the lights. We need this infrastructure in order to do our job. Second, we have to create a basic infrastructure in Iraq so that the country can have the stability that will allow us to leave honorably. None of us want to be there. But we have engaged in this war for our interests, and it is now our responsibility to make sure the country is stable enough so there is not chaos when we leave. To do that, they have to have an electricity grid, among other things.

The third point was made powerfully by Prime Minister Blair in the House Chamber. Part of what we have to do in this war is not just defeat the terrorists but vindicate our values against which they stand. It is not enough just to curse the darkness. We have to light a candle.

One of the terrorists' goals is to spread their philosophy and their ideals all throughout the Islamic world, from Morocco to Indonesia. We need to show that the ideals of our democracy—dignity, freedom, the rights of the individual—are not just for us; they are for everybody. They don't just work for us; they will work for everybody. That is why the creation of a stable, benign Iraqi democracy is so crucial an aspect of this war. It would be an enormous strategic victory for us if we could create such a democracy there. I believe we can. I believe we are. We can and will win, if we don't quit.

I don't believe the people are going to quit. I don't believe this Congress is going to quit. This money we are spending today is in our interest to spend. That bears on the loan versus grant problem. Certainly I hope we get this money back. I would love to get this money back. We all should do what we can to enhance the Treasury and FSC and the American taxpayer. But if it is in our interest to do it, we should do it the same way we do everything else that is in our interest—we just spend the money. If it is not in our interest, we should not loan it to them either. I don't want to loan money to a country just to help them. I am representing Missouri and the United States of America. We spend money. We loan money to advance America's interests. If it is in our interest, and we believe that, we ought to be willing to give it to them in the form of a grant, especially since everybody knows, if we give this money in a loan, eventually we will forgive it. We will not get the money back anyway. We are going to urge everybody around the world to forgive it.

This is in America's interest. We can light a candle. We can defeat these terrorists. We can win this war. We ought to do it. I hope we will all pull together in the debate on this bill and get it done.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Would the Chair inform the body as to the amount of time remaining on the Republican side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes 13 seconds remaining on the Republican side.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I do not know if anybody on the other side wishes to use that time, but in the interim, perhaps I might use leader time to make a statement on another matter.

(The remarks of Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. LEAHY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1740 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask that the Chair notify me when I have 3 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, nearly 6 months have elapsed since President Bush flew out to the aircraft carrier and declared ''mission accomplished'' in Iraq. Today, we all know all too well that the war is not over: The war goes on; the mission is not accomplished. An unnecessary war, based on unreliable and inaccurate intelligence, has not brought an end to danger. Instead, it has brought new dangers, imposed new costs, and taken more and more American lives each week.

We all agree that Saddam Hussein was a murderous tyrant, and his brutal regime was an affront to basic human decency. But Iraq was not a breeding ground for terrorism. Our invasion has made it one.

The trumped-up reasons for going to war have collapsed. All the administration's rationalizations as we prepared to go to war now stand revealed as ''double-talk.'' The American people were told Saddam Hussein was building nuclear weapons. He was not. We were told he had stockpiles of other weapons of mass destruction. He did not. We were told he was involved in 9/11. He was not. We were told Iraq was attracting terrorists from al-Qaida. It was not. We were told our soldiers would be viewed as liberators. They are not. We were told Iraq could pay for its own reconstruction. It cannot. We were told the war would make America safer. It has not.

Before the war, week after week after week after week, we were told lie after lie after lie after lie.

And now, despite the increasingly restless Iraqi population, despite the continuing talk of sabotage, despite the foreign terrorists crossing thousands of miles of border to attack U.S. service men and women in Iraq, the administration still refuses to face the truth or tell the truth. Instead the White House responds by covering up its failures and trying to sell its rosy

version of events by repeating it with maximum frequency and volume, and minimum regard for realities on the ground.

No PR campaign by the increasingly desperate White House can redress the painful loss of a young American soldier almost every day. Instead of greater stability and order, the forces arrayed against us are steadily increasing the intensity and sophistication of their assaults on our troops. Bombs that were once set off by trip wires are now being set off by remote control. The threat of shoulder fired missiles makes it unsafe for civilian planes to land at Baghdad Airport.

No foreign policy in our free society can succeed for long unless it is supported by our people. Our men and women in uniform fought bravely and brilliantly, but the President's war has been revealed as mindless, needless, senseless, and reckless. The American people know all this. Our allies know it. Our soldiers know it. We should never have gone to war in Iraq when we did, in the way we did, for the false reasons we were given. But now that we are there, two imperatives are absolutely clear: America cannot withdraw now, leaving Iraq to chaos or civil war, becoming a danger to us far greater than it did before. The misguided policy of the past is no excuse for a misguided policy for the future.

We need a realistic and specific plan to bring stability to Iraq, to bring genuine self-government to Iraq, to bring our soldiers home with dignity and honor.

Until the administration genuinely changes course, I cannot in good conscience vote to fund a failed policy that endangers our troops in the field and our strategic objectives in the world instead of protecting them. The greatest mistake we can make in Congress as the people's elected representatives is to support and finance a ''go-it-alone, do-it-because-I-say-so'' policy that leaves young Americans increasingly at risk in Iraq.

So when the roll is called on this $87 billion legislation, which provides no effective conditions for genuine international participation and a clear change in policy in Iraq, I intend to vote no. A no vote is not a vote against supporting our troops. It is a vote to send the administration back to the drawing board. It is a vote for a new policy—policy worthy of the sacrifice our soldiers are making, a policy that restores America as a respected member of the family of nations, a policy that will make it easier, not far more difficult, to win the war against terrorism.

The amount of money is huge.

It is 87 times what the Federal Government spends annually on after-school programs.

It is 7 times what President Bush proposed to spend on education for low-income schools in 2004.

It is 9 times what the Federal Government spends on special education each year.

It is 8 times what the Government spends to help middle and low-income students go to college.

It is 15 times what the Government spends on cancer research.

It is 27 times what the Government spends on substance abuse and mental health treatment.

It is 58 times what the Government spends on community health centers.

If our Iraq policy is to be successful, it must take into account what history teaches us about the use of military power to solve politically inspired violence. A new policy must provide the security that is essential for any nation-building effort. A new policy must genuinely internationalize the reconstruction of Iraq and end our occupation. And a successful new policy must give ownership to Iraqis for their political future.

Surely, in this day and age, at the beginning of the 21st century, we do not have to re-learn the lesson that every colonial power in history has learned. We do not want to be—we cannot afford to be—either in terms of character or in terms of cost, an occupier of other lands. We must not become the next failed empire in the world.

The administration seeks to write a new history that defies the lessons of history. The most basic of those lessons is that we cannot rely primarily on military means as a solution to politically-inspired violence. In those circumstances, the tide of history rises squarely against military occupation.

The British learned that lesson in Northern Ireland. The French learned it in Algeria. The Russians learned it in Afghanistan and are re-learning it every day in Chechnya. America learned it in Vietnam, and we must not re-learn it in Iraq.

Our men and women in uniform are the finest in world, and all Americans admire and honor their ability and their courage. In Iraq, they are now being forced to do an extraordinary job they were never trained for, and they are doing it under extreme and unpredictable circumstances.

Even with the best forces in the history of the world, our military cannot succeed if the mission is not achievable, if they are viewed as occupiers, and if we do not have a clearly defined and realistic strategy.

In recent weeks, in Massachusetts, at Fort Stewart in Georgia, and at Walter Reed Hospital, I have met with American troops who fought in Iraq. I am profoundly moved by the price they pay to serve our country, and profoundly impressed by their professionalism and commitment. They are willing to endure great hardship and great danger in Iraq to complete their mission. But they want to know when their mission will be complete, and when they will be able to come home.

They are resourceful and strong. But more and more they are frustrated—especially by the faceless nature of the threat. Individuals intent on killing Americans are firing from behind the cover of crowds, to provoke our soldiers into firing back on civilians. Many of our troops say they were never trained to be police officers or to fight a guerrilla war.

They want to help the Iraqi people. But the increasing casualties make them feel unsafe. They want to respond militarily to attacks. But they often don't know who the attacker is.

They tell me that at first, their convoys were welcomed. But after time, children began to throw rocks at them, and then came the bullets. They tell me that far too many in Iraq believe we are there to take their oil, and that we will stay forever.

They have no clear sense about their post-war mission. Some see it as winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. Some believe it is security. Some feel it is to obtain intelligence about opposition forces and weapons caches. Others think it is to prevent sabotage of the oil pipelines and other vital infrastructure. Still others say it is to build sidewalks and soccer fields and schools and hospitals, and other local facilities. Not one of the soldiers told me their mission was to achieve Iraq's transition to democracy.

We read today in the Washington Post about a survey of our troops. Their morale is low. They believe their mission lacks clear definition. They are getting worn down.

The ongoing occupation of Iraq has imposed a heavy burden on our forces and created a crisis for the military. It is now stretched precariously thin. We do not have enough active duty soldiers to sustain their presence in Iraq and also meet security needs in Afghanistan and other parts of the world.

The crisis is coming to a head now. Two of our divisions are scheduled to return from Iraq in the spring. If the administration is unsuccessful in recruiting forces from other nations, it will have to send in at least another division of American troops—and we don't have enough active duty forces to do the job. That means even more call-ups from the National Guard and Reserves. In fact, if international troops aren't coming, the administration must notify reservists by the end of this very month to guarantee that they will be available by spring.

Already, close to half our troops in Iraq are members of the Guard or Reserves; 13,000 have been on active duty for at least a year. Others have recently returned home from deployments, only to turn around and head overseas for another tour.

One reservist I recently spoke to had only 17 days off between tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. The average reservist now spends 13 times longer on active duty today than during the 1990s. Many cannot go home when their scheduled time is finished, and are repeatedly sent instead on new deployments overseas.

In Iraq, our reservists are being pressed into duty as the first line of defense. They need 120 to 150 days to

train before being sent to Iraq. The Army needs to let them know now to begin this crucial training. It typically takes 8 years under the current peacetime system for a Reserve combat unit to reach the level of readiness of an active unit. But we don't have 8 years. They are needed in Iraq this spring.

Even worse, reservists are being sent into combat with inferior equipment. They have told me they had to rely on Vietnam-era night vision goggles that obscure more than they reveal, even though the latest technology is used by the regular military. They told me they had to use outdated and less-effective flak jackets, not the latest models with bulletproof ceramic inserts. They told me they had to wait three months for other current gear. Many units did not have armored Humvees. Instead, they had to hang flak jackets in the windows to protect themselves from attack.

I visited some of our wounded soldiers last week at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. More than 1,800 American service men and women have been wounded in this war, and an average of 7 new patients arrive at Walter Reed from Iraq each day. Many were ambushed driving along a road. Many lost limbs because their Humvees did not have the armor to protect them from the blast of a rocket-propelled grenade or a booby trap in the road.

Their families feel the strain of their deployment both emotionally and financially. Many members of the Guard or Reserves give up higher civilian salaries when they go on active duty. Even though the law prohibits discrimination against reservists, increasingly, they are unwilling to tell possible employers about their military obligation, for fear they will not be hired or kept on the job. It is a sad day for patriotism when service to our Nation is a negative factor in civilian employment.

Far more American soldiers and marines have been killed since the end of major combat operations in May than during the 3-week war itself. These are not just statistics. Each name on the list has many who mourn, whether parents, spouses, children, brothers or sisters.

We cannot go on this way. We should have known that military victory would be quick, and that winning the peace would be the challenge.

I support our troops. It is the administration's policy that has failed them. Their perceptions demonstrate the wider failure of our policy and the need for the administration to move in a decisively different direction.

The administration ignores the lesson of history that nation building cannot succeed in a cauldron of insecurity. Iraq is America's sixth major nation-building challenge in the past 10 years—Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and now Iraq.

Security was indispensable to nation building in each case. But in Iraq, we seem incapable of meeting the basic security needs of our own Armed Forces, let alone the Iraqi people.

When America intervened in Haiti in 1994, large numbers of international armed police were brought in to support our military and achieve a greater measure of safety for the Haitian people. The first task was to establish security in a country that did not even have a civilian police force. We responded by recruiting a large multinational police force from 20 different countries.

When America intervened in Bosnia in 1995 and Kosovo in 1998 we understood that security for local citizens was essential for resuming economic growth and reaching our nation-building goals. In Kosovo, our allies offered highly trained police, including some heavily armed, which were critical to minimizing violence after the conflict ended and enabling reconstruction and political progress to be made.

In Kosovo, our soldiers were given training in controlling crowds, establishing security cordons, and searching vehicles. But when I visited the soldiers of the Third Infantry Division last week, they told me they did not receive such training, even though it would have served them well in the cities of Iraq.

The Pentagon assumed we would be able to draw on thousands of Saddam's police officers to provide security, but in the critical early weeks that followed the war, they were nowhere to be found, and too many of them were thugs and torturers.

Six months later, there is still confusion. At the end of August, the former New York City Police Commissioner in charge of police training program in Iraq announced that he had reached an agreement to train 28,000 Iraqi police in a camp in Hungary. Within a week, the Prime Minister of Hungary announced that he knew of no such agreement. He said that Hungary had no appropriate training facility, and that someone should inform his government of what was going on. Now, we hear that the administration has organized a training camp in Jordan.

The Pentagon also assumed that the bulk of the Iraqi armed forces could be used to supplement our forces. But soon after the war began, the Iraqi army melted away. Its members went home, and the army was formally disbanded by our Government before they were screened and before they were disarmed. We lost the decent ones who could have helped provide security, and we let Hussein's true believers get away with their weapons.

Countries such as France, Germany, Sweden, Argentina, the European Union, or Spain could provide well-trained police to prevent saboteurs from undermining the extensive reconstruction effort and to advance our broader nation-building objectives. But so far, we have been unable to persuade additional nations to share the burden and the cost.

The Bush administration's continuing arrogance in Iraq has forced the best-trained military in the world to act as police officers in a shooting gallery, to carry out police functions for which they are ill-prepared and ill-equipped. For Iraq now and for future crises elsewhere, we need to build support in the international community for a reserve police identified and trained for post-conflict deployments.

It is shocking that the White House is only now beginning to coordinate which agency should be responsible for various tasks. This should not have waited 6 months. It should have been standard operating procedure from the outset to outline an integrated strategy that meets our military needs, the needs for local policing and reconstruction, and the need for progress in achieving a free and legitimate Iraqi government. They go hand-in-hand. But none can succeed unless basic security is guaranteed.

The administration's policy of rushing to put large multibillion-dollar contracts in the hands of American firms ignores not only the lesson of history but also the lesson of human nature—the Iraqi people need to be the real partners in the reconstruction effort.

The administration is wrongly working from the top down, rather than the bottom up, to rebuild Iraq. A new Iraq will emerge neighborhood by neighborhood, town by town, province by province. How can any Republican President of the United States disagree that government must be of the people, by the people, and for the people?

We need closer alignment between military units working on reconstruction and the civilians working at the Coalition Provisional Authority. Our soldiers in the field are surveying the damage and identifying priorities for repair. They need local counterparts. We cannot solve every problem from Saddam's palace in Baghdad.

Why not scale back the lavish resources being provided to U.S. contractors and consultants and provide larger sums directly to the Iraqi people? We could do so in many cases by developing ties between local councils and the Iraqi Governing Council. We could work more with local non-governmental organizations and local businesses. In all cases, we need to insist on transparency in the process, so we know where the funding is going.

It is the Iraqi people's country. They have the greatest stake in the success of the reconstruction, and involving them now will enhance the prospects for success.

In some areas of Iraq, we already have been able to achieve impressive results with small amounts of money. In one case, we funded the building of a cement factory for less than $100,000, when the bid by an American contractor for the same project was in the millions. Why not do more of this with schools, medical clinics, roads and countless other projects?

Iraq has many of the best-trained petroleum engineers in the world. Why

not give them—rather than American companies—a larger role in rebuilding the industry? Why not create jobs for Iraqis and give them ownership of their reconstruction?

If we insist on saying Halliburton rules, because to the victor belong the spoils, we won't be the victor for very long.

The administration's policy in Iraq ignores the indisputable lesson of history that building democracy is complex and difficult.

When the British accepted responsibility for the new nation of Iraq after the fall of the Ottoman Empire after World War I, they encountered enormous difficulties in creating a stable government across Sunni, Shia, Kurd and other ethnic and religious groups. Many Kurds wanted their own state—and still do. Tensions have existed between Sunni and Shia for 13 centuries. Iraq had no history of unity.

In the words of one tribal chieftain, ''History did not die; the tribes and notables who emerged in 1920 and created our modern state in 1921 are here to stay with all the others who came into being thereafter.''

Instead of learning from this painful history, we condemned ourselves to repeat it. Instead of anticipating the obviously similar and predictable divisions and demands when Saddam's regime fell, the Bush administration believed that a few favored Iraqi exile leaders, many of them in exile for years, could return to Iraq, rally the population and lead the new government. That was another failure. The Iraqi people rejected them from the start and resisted their domination.

The administration believed that once a few hundred top advisers to Saddam were removed from power, large numbers of local officials would remain to run the government. Instead the collapse of government in Baghdad rippled across the country.

If history is any guide, America will not be able to impose our vision of democracy on the Iraqi people on our current terms and our timetable. Our overarching interest is the development of a government that has legitimacy in the eyes of its citizens, so that the longer process of building durable democratic institutions can proceed effectively in the years to come. This process will not be finished swiftly, or easily, and it will not take place according to our will.

Iraq is a society where, for the full 30 years of Saddam's rule, politics ruled from the top. It will take time for the Iraqi people to adjust to the new decentralization of power and to understand how the multiple levels of a working democratic government can function effectively.

The administration clings to the hope that the Iraqi Governing Council—25 people, many of whom have never worked together before—can adopt a constitution in time to hold successful elections next year.

On July 23, Ambassador Bremer said that it ''should be possible'' to have elections next year.

On September 26, Secretary of State Powell gave the Iraqis 6 months to write a constitution.

In Bosnia, the United States pressed for national elections the first year, before viable local democratic political institutions were developed, and it made the development of democracy more difficult. Based on the historical precedents, a recent RAND publication suggests holding national elections roughly 2 years after reconstruction begins. The International Crisis Group also reached the conclusion that it could take 2 years before national elections should be held.

The lesson is clear. We cannot rush. It is not surprising that our insistence on such speed is alienating the many Iraqis who know the process needs more time. The date of their national election should not be determined by the date of ours.

Imposing our will and our timetable on the Iraqi people will undermine our all-important long-term goal of achieving a legitimate Iraqi government committed to remaining on the path to democracy. Already, the Interim Governing Council lacks credibility in the eyes of many Iraqis. On paper, it has broad power, but that fools no one. It is controlled by the United States, and it lacks sufficient power to meet the Iraqi people's needs.

The administration needs to give greater priority to restoring sovereignty and help lay the groundwork for approving a constitution and holding national elections. In Afghanistan, we obtained the support of the international community for an interim government that was not under American occupation. That process can still work in Iraq, although it would have clearly worked better from the start. As we did in Afghanistan, we need a process to transfer sovereignty to the Iraqis, who in turn, can ask the U.S. and U.N. for assistance.

If the United States is seen as controlling the new government in Baghdad, it will fail—if not now, then later; if not while our forces are still there, then as soon as they are gone. Those who work with such a government are easily dismissed by the Iraqi people as American puppets. We must take the time necessary to give Iraqis the ownership of their government, if we expect it to have any credibility and staying power.

Whether the Bush administration likes it or not, they need a central role for the United Nations to help accomplish this goal. Before becoming National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice seemed to understand this.

In a January 2000 article in Foreign Affairs, she wrote: ''U.S. interests are served by having strong alliances and can be promoted within the U.N. and other multilateral organizations . . . ''.

She wrote: ''The president must remember that the military is a special instrument. It is lethal, and it is meant to be. It is not a civilian police force. It is not a political referee, and it is most certainly not designed to build a civilian society.''

Condi Rice's words indict the administration's own policy now. It is essential to involve the international community as an active and equal partner in the political transition of Iraq.

We need to give the U.N. a central role. The administration's decision to go back to the United Nations is a first step, but it is meaningful only if the administration is genuinely changing its policy. The real test will be whether the administration is now willing to make the compromises necessary to persuade other countries to contribute troops to relieve our soldiers and to bring stability to Iraq. The jury is still out on whether the U.N. resolution will mark a real shift by the administration.

We know from experience of the past decade in this post-cold war world, in Bosnia, in Kosovo, and in other devastated lands, that we can enlist the international community in a major way. We can share responsibility and authority, draw on the strengths and the diversity of the United Nations, achieve security and reconstruction, and an end to the occupation. For many months, the administration has been wrong to try to bypass the United Nations by enticing a few receptive nations to join us if the price is right.

No one doubts that the United States should remain in charge of the military operation. But internationalizing the reconstruction is not a luxury; it is an imperative. Sharing authority with the United Nations to manage the transition to democracy will give the process legitimacy and gradually dispel the current stigma of occupation—especially if it is accompanied by the creation of a more fully representative interim governing council to deal with day-to-day administrative responsibilities.

As soon as possible, we need to redouble the effort to bring in forces with regional faces—especially Muslim faces. Nations such as Jordan, Pakistan, and Egypt could immediately transform this mission with both their diversity and their expertise. The United Arab Emirates contributed effectively to the effort in Kosovo. Morocco and Albania have worked with us in Bosnia. That strategy can work for us in Iraq now as well.

In their joint memoir, ''A World Transformed,'' President George H.W. Bush and his National Security Adviser, Brent Scowcroft, reflected on their own experiences with Iraq and the Gulf War in 1991. They had been criticized in some quarters for halting that war after their dramatic victory in Kuwait, instead of going on to Baghdad to depose Saddam Hussein.

Here is what they wrote:

Trying to eliminate Saddam, extending the ground war into an occupation of Iraq, would have violated our guideline about not changing objectives in midstream, engaging in

'mission creep,' and 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. The coalition would instantly have collapsed, the Arabs deserting it in anger and other allies pulling out as well. Under those circumstances, there was no viable 'exit strategy' we could see . . . Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land. It would have been a dramatically different—and perhaps barren—outcome.

They were right.

It is time for this administration to admit that it was wrong, and turn in a new direction. We need a genuine plan that acknowledges the realities on the ground. We need a plan that gives real authority to the United Nations, so that other nations truly will share the burden. We need to actively engage the Iraqi people in governing and rebuilding their country. Our soldiers now risking their lives in Iraq deserve no less.

Here at home, all Americans are being asked to bear the burden, too—and they deserve more than a phony summons to support our troops by pursuing policies that will only condemn them to greater and greater danger. Yes, we must stay the course—but not the wrong course.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I understand there are 2 minutes left for morning business on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes fifteen seconds.

Mr. SPECTER. Parliamentary inquiry: At that point, does the schedule call for going to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 50 seconds remaining on the Democratic side.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when we go to the bill, I be recognized to speak first on the bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object. I say this respectfully: We worked very hard last night to get a routine set up here this morning. Senators STEVENS and BYRD agreed to it. Senator BYRD is coming to speak and to offer an amendment. I would be happy to yield our 50 seconds, and after the 3 minutes expires, we should call on Senator BYRD.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended so that I might speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, that would be extended by 7 minutes on their side; is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. We will extend it by 7 minutes on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition to comment on a vote that will be coming up on the $20 billion in the form of loans or grants.

Two weeks ago yesterday, on October 1, I spoke at some length in favor of having loans. I believe that is the correct position and focus on the $20 billion in the context of viewing what is happening in Iraq, which is essentially a bankrupt country where in general bankruptcy proceedings all existing debt would be extinguished and the activities of rebuilding Iraq would be a new day; and, in light of the United Nations resolution in May of this year authorizing the United States and the United Kingdom to use Iraqi oil to rebuild Iraq, that is the appropriate course with the narrow focus on this $20 billion.

In the intervening 2 weeks, I have consulted with my colleagues and with members of the administration and have rethought the issue. It is my view that in a broader context there ought to be a grant instead of loans. I have come to that conclusion after having, as I said, talked to my colleagues and having met with a group on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats, who are looking for a structure at least in part for loans, and having talked to the President the day before yesterday and Secretary of State Powell and other members of the administration.

As I am viewing this $20 billion in the much broader context of the overall strategy, it is my judgment that we ought to give the President leeway to carry out his plan.

The day before yesterday, a group of Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, met with President Bush and with Secretary of State Colin Powell. I have not seen the President with such fervor and such determination and such intensity since I saw him 2 days after 9/11 when he called in some Members from the impacted States. One of the planes went down in Pennsylvania. And he had blood in his eye when he said he was not going to send a $1 million missile to an empty tent.

The President and the Secretary of State spoke in terms of the broader objectives of the administration beyond this $20 billion. The Secretary of State talked about the efforts to get a United Nations resolution which would give broader support to the United States' position in an effort to bring in Pakistan, Turkey, and Muslim countries to give the Arabs more confidence. I believe this type of multilateral approach is really necessary.

I tried back on October 11 of last year to carry forward the Lugar-Biden amendment which would have done more to have a multilateral approach before the use of force. But that was yesterday. Today, we are looking at a very different picture.

The funds for the rebuilding of Iraq could be necessary far beyond this $20 billion. I believe the narrow focus of using the Iraqi oil as authorized by the United Nations resolution is sound. Ambassador Bremer is considering the long-range plan. I think the sentiment which is fairly strong in this body for loans as opposed to grants ought to be taken into consideration and, if the President's policy is successful on having this as a grant, that there is a strong underlying fervor that there ought to be a repayment and a funding of the rebuilding of Iraq from the Iraqi resources, which is the second biggest pool of oil in the world.

I am not unmindful of the arguments about how much money will be spent by the Federal Government on rebuilding schools in Iowa contrasted to rebuilding schools in Iraq; or how much money will be spent in Vermont building hospitals as opposed to spending money in Baghdad. I am not unmindful of the role of the Congress and the primacy under the Constitution on the appropriations process. In listening to the President as he outlines his broader strategy, I do believe he bears the lion's share of the responsibility.

We are going to have the donor's conference in Madrid later this month. The President is emphatic in his view that we will have a better chance to get more donors if we make a grant instead of a loan, that there will be a better chance to have other countries forgive debt and that, as he is setting out to a trip to the Far East, we ought to be in a position to be supportive as to where he thinks he can best lead the country.

In so doing, I do not relinquish my vote and the authority which I have as a Senator, a Member of Congress, on our appropriations process as we will be looking at very substantial funding in the future. When I think about the issue and reflect on it and rethink beyond the narrower focus of the $20 billion to the broader strategy, I think of the metaphor of too many cooks spoil the broth. The President has a very heavy responsibility as he moves ahead to the donor's conference through his representatives and on his trip to the Far East.

When I look at the delegation of authority which we have given him on appropriations, the defense budget, the foreign operations budget, and the State Department budget, it proximates in excess of $400 billion. This is about 5 percent. As I take a look at our overall Federal budget of $2.2 trillion, the $20 billion is less than 1 percent. I believe this vote, which we will cast later today, is a very important vote as to how the administration and how Secretary Powell will approach the United Nations and multilateralisism. We cast a great many votes in this body but relatively few are really important votes. This is an important vote.

That is why I believe the validity of treating this as a loan is solid on the narrow focus for the $20 billion as a loan, but on the broader picture of the strategy which the President is trying to carry forward, I am prepared today to defer to him on this and to vote for a grant instead of a loan.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is still on the floor, and I wonder how long he wishes to speak on the bill. Senator BYRD is here.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his inquiry.

During the course of my remarks, I abbreviated them and cut them short. As I have said to the Senator, I do not appear very often to ask for time. I see Senator BYRD approaching.

In response to the Senator from Nevada, there was one other line of contention which I had intended to make. I can make it in a moment or two.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania 4 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. That will do it. When the Senator says a minute or 2—my remarks are easily in excess of 4 minutes but I can limit them to 4 minutes.

The other consideration which I had intended to offer in the course of the remarks I have just made, in a broader focus beyond the confines of the $20 billion debt, is the issue of what is happening day in and day out in Iraq where we are spending, it is estimated, some $4 billion a month and we are sustaining casualties and fatalities which are very devastating for our country, the men and women in the armed services who are being wounded, suffering fatalities, their relatives and friends.

If we move ahead with greater speed, which we will be able to do on a grant instead of a loan, it may well be that we can cut down the time we will be in Iraq, that it will facilitate the starting of electricity and the infrastructure of Iraq so we can move out and allow the Iraqi Government to take over. With the very heavy costs in casualties, fatalities and dollars, the speed that these grants can help is another factor in consideration so that on the totality of the matter in the broader picture, I am prepared to defer to the President's judgment on this matter, on this vote.

The issue has created enough focus so that the administration will know when the additional funding is to be undertaken that there will be a very strong sentiment in the Congress that Iraqi resources ought to pay for the rebuilding of Iraq and that this decision to have grants instead of loans will further support the good faith and bona fides of the United States that we have not gone into Iraq for their oil but have gone into Iraq to liberate the Iraqi people from the despotism of Saddam Hussein and to build a democracy in that country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back our time for morning business so we can get to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN SECURITY AND RECONSTRUCTION ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1689, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1689) making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30th, 2004, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Byrd amendment No. 1818, to impose a limitation on the use of sums appropriated for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

Byrd/Durbin amendment No. 1819, to prohibit the use of Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Funds for low priority activities that should not be the responsibility of U.S. taxpayers, and shift $600 million from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund to Defense Operations and Maintenance, Army, for significantly improving efforts to secure and destroy conventional weapons, such as bombs, bomb materials, small arms, rocket propelled grenades, and shoulder-launched missiles, in Iraq.

Bond/Mikulski amendment No. 1825, to provide additional VA Medical Care Funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Dubin amendment No. 1837, to ensure that a Federal employee who takes leave without pay in order to perform certain service as a member of the uniformed services or member of the National Guard shall continue to receive pay in an amount which, when taken together with the pay and allowances such individual is receiving for such service, will be no less than the basic pay such individual would then be receiving if no interruption in employment had occurred.

Reed/Hagel amendment No. 1834, to increase the end strength of the Army and to structure the additional forces for constabulary duty. (By 45 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 382), Senate failed to table the amendment.)

Feingold amendment No. 1852, to enable military family members to take leave to attend to deployment-related business and tasks.

Daschle amendment No. 1854, to achieve the most effective means of reconstructing Iraq and to reduce the future costs to the American taxpayer of such reconstruction by ensuring broad-based international cooperation for this effort.

Feinstein amendment No. 1848, to require reports on the United States strategy for relief and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, and to limit the availability of certain funds for those efforts pending determinations by the President that the objectives and deadlines for those efforts will be substantially achieved.

Nelson (FL) amendment No. 1858, to set aside from certain amounts available for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, $10,000,000 for the Family Readiness Program of the National Guard.

Reid (for Landrieu) amendment No. 1859, to promote the establishment of an Iraq Reconstruction Finance Authority and the use of Iraqi oil revenues to pay for reconstruction in Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, we urge Senators to contact the managers of this bill to try to work out a time when their amendments might be considered, and to see if we have any possibility of dealing with the several amendments at one time. We tried to do that last night with regard to reporting requirements, and I stated to the Senate it is our hope we can blend all of the reporting requirements along with those that are already in the House bill and work out a logical sequence for the reporting and the activities of an inspector general, if that is required as far as the Iraq operation is concerned.

We will be hopeful that today we can look at—there are additional amendments being suggested on the list that was approved last night for reporting requirements, and I would be pleased to consider taking any of those and adding them to the package that is already in the bill for reporting requirements and for details regarding the inspector general. But my purpose for seeking the floor right now is to urge Senators to contact the managers of the bill, and let us work out some logical sequence in terms of the amendments that are pending or will be offered.

This is going to be a long day. We still have the commitment that we will do our utmost to finish by tomorrow. I congratulate my good friend from Nevada, the Democratic assistant leader, for all his efforts in getting us to where we are now in terms of knowing the amendments that are possible to be considered.

But within the timeframe we have, we cannot consider them all without really a great deal of consideration on both sides in terms of the amount of time a Senator takes to explain the amendment and particularly in terms of Senators being willing to cooperate with us to blend amendments so we can deal with one subject maybe in one or two amendments. That is possible. I look forward to working with Senator REID, who is actively involved in trying to reduce the number of these amendments, as well as I am, with our joint staffs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). The Senator from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 1818

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1818.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending under the previous order.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He is always on the job. And he is effective. He is characteristically courteous. I commend him on the progress he has made already on the bill.

There are several cosponsors of this amendment. I hope they will come to the floor and join in the debate concerning the amendment. I need their voices to blend with my own, mine being the weakest of all. But I need the cosponsors to join and make this supreme effort here to have the Senate adopt this extremely worthwhile amendment.

In all the discussion surrounding the President's request for $20.3 billion for reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan—in the question of whether the funding should be in the form of a grant or a loan, in the revelation of a series of frivolous proposed expenditures, in the dispute over whether reconstruction funding is a gold-plated add-on or an integral part of the occupation strategy—there is an overriding issue that we must not allow to be lost in the noise of the debate.

That issue involves the fact that American taxpayers—American taxpayers—are being presented virtually the entire bill for the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq because of decisions that were made by the President before the war began, decisions to embrace an unprecedented doctrine of preemption and to invade Iraq without the support of the United Nations or the international community.

Those decisions are coming home to haunt us today. The chickens are coming home to roost. Because of the President's obstinance and go-it-alone mentality, it is American soldiers who are patrolling the most dangerous streets and cities of Iraq, and it is American taxpayers who are being asked to foot the bill for the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq—American soldiers and American taxpayers.

It appears there is little relief in sight. After seesawing back and forth, the United Nations Security Council is now expected to accept a revised U.S. resolution on Iraq, but the resolution on the table is little more than a fancy fig leaf designed to camouflage an empty gesture. The resolution proposed by the United States cedes no meaningful authority to the United Nations and is likely to have little impact on the number of foreign troops or the amount of international financial assistance the United Nations will provide for the stabilization and the reconstruction of Iraq.

American troops in Iraq and American taxpayers at home need real help from the international community. The President needs to reach out to the United Nations, not merely attempt to paper over the glaring lack of support from the international community with a resolution that, as some Texans are wont to say, is all hat and no cattle.

The administration's reckless misadventure in Iraq is exacting a high price in lost lives, lost respect for our Nation in the world, and lost ground in the war on terrorism. And yet, in the past week, the only visible response from the President to the continuing chaos in Iraq has been to reshuffle the chain of command in Washington by creating a new entity to consolidate Iraq's reconstruction in the White House instead of the Pentagon.

The President misses the point. Instead of rearranging the chairs on the deck, the President should be changing direction. Creating a new Iraq policy shop in the White House will not bring relief to American soldiers on the ground, and it will not save American taxpayers from having to shoulder, virtually alone, the staggering financial burden of rebuilding Iraq.

Now, the American people, in the first place, did not buy on to this idea that we were going to rebuild Iraq. They were not told that. They were not told we were going to rebuild a nation there. They were not told about the staggering costs of rebuilding Iraq.

If there is any shift in the balance of power over the reconstruction of Iraq—and there should be—it must be across oceans, not just across the Potomac. It is long past time to bring in the United Nations as a full partner with shared responsibility and shared decisionmaking for the future of Iraq. The President does not need another inhouse committee to advise him on the future of Iraq. He needs to internationalize the stabilization and the reconstruction effort.

Instead of instituting meaningful change in his Iraq policy, the President presented a bait-and-switch proposition to the American people: Don't look too closely at the policy, just keep your attention on the policy shop.

We cannot undo what has been done in Iraq. But we can chart a better course for the future.

First and foremost, the Bush administration should drop its stubborn insistence that the world community not have any authority in the political reconstruction of Iraq. The resolution that will be considered at the United Nations Security Council this morning makes some progress in promoting cooperation between the United Nations and the Iraqi Governing Council but keeps the United Nations at an arm's length from the Coalition Provisional Authority. It is this authority, headed by Paul Bremer, that exercises total authority in postwar Iraq.

If you don't believe what I have said about total authority, just listen. Ambassador Bremer's first regulation as head of the Coalition Provisional Authority reads in part as follows:

> The CPA is vested with all executive, legislative, and judicial authority—

How about that? ''The CPA is vested with all,'' not just an itty-bitty part—

> executive, legislative, and judicial authority necessary to achieve its objectives. . . .

Take a look at the first sentence in article I of the Constitution of the United States which I hold in my hands. The first sentence in this Constitution, article I, section 1:

> All legislative Powers granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

What a sweeping investiture of power that first sentence makes—''all legislative power.'' It doesn't say anything about executive or judicial power, ''all legislative power.'' But listen to this, Ambassador Bremer's first regulation as head of the Coalition Provisional Authority:

> The CPA is vested with all executive, legislative, and judicial authority necessary to achieve its objectives, to be exercised under relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions, including Resolution 1483 (2003), and the laws and usages of war. This authority shall be exercised by the CPA administrator.

What an enormous grant of power that is. The new resolution that will be voted on today at the United Nations will not change the supreme authority claimed by Paul Bremer who was installed in his post by the President without offering his nomination to the U.S. Senate for its advice and consent.

There is power—power. Remember the old song: There is power, power, wonder working power.

Well, if the international community is going to continue to be squeezed out of the political decisionmaking in the Coalition Provisional Authority, there is little incentive for the world to mobilize to come to the aid of postwar Iraq. The President's ''my way or the highway'' approach to the governance of Iraq undermines the mission in Iraq and ignores the will of the American people. The United Nations is willing to help, but only if the administration drops its false pride and its bravado.

''Bring them on,'' the President said. That is bravado.

Before coming into office, then-candidate Bush talked of a humble approach to foreign policy. ''Let us reject the blinders of isolationism, just as we refuse the crown of empire,'' he said. ''Let us not dominate others with our power or betray them with our indifference,'' he said. ''And let us have an American foreign policy that reflects American character,'' he said. ''The modesty of true strength, the humility of real greatness,'' the President said.

Those were the words of candidate George W. Bush, but they have been far from the practice of President George W. Bush.

Similarly, the administration ought to rethink its extreme good-versus-evil mantra that seems to be running this Nation's foreign policy into a morass of confusion and danger. The administration's obstinance continues to strain America's relationship with other countries and undermines our credibility with other foreign powers.

President Bush committed the United States to war without broad international support. He said: If you don't do it, we will. He said: If the United Nations doesn't do it, we will.

He refused to go back to the United Nations prior to launching military attacks and continues to stiff-arm the international community even today, when that help is so vital to the long-term interests of Iraq.

Instead, the Bush administration has adopted a go-it-alone mentality that threatens the stability of the Middle East and could spill over into other global areas.

The United States needs help in Iraq. The United States needs a plan that will bring relief to our overburdened soldiers by attracting significantly more foreign troops to Iraq and bring relief to our overburdened taxpayers by attracting financial assistance from the international community for reconstruction.

The President's proposal does neither. His $87 billion spending request places the entire burden of securing and rebuilding Iraq squarely on the shoulders of the American forces and American taxpayers. That burden ought not be carried by the United States alone. That is why Senator KENNEDY, Senator LEAHY, other Senators and I have proposed an alternative.

What Senator KENNEDY, Senator LEAHY, and other Senators and I have offered is more than an invitation to the international community to assume a large and vital role in the reconstruction of Iraq; it is a demand, on behalf of the American people, that the President go to the nations of the world and work in partnership with those other nations of the world. It is a mandate for a new policy in Iraq, a policy that will bring peace more quickly and stability more assuredly.

The amendment, in effect, says: Mr. President, your plan for Iraq has not worked. It is costing lives every day and it is jeopardizing the long-term security of the Middle East. We need to share political power in Iraq with the United Nations, and we must be willing to listen to the rest of the world, share the responsibility, attract new partners for peace, and protect our men and women in Iraq.

That is what this amendment would require. It is a commonsense approach to what is quickly becoming an American quagmire in Iraq. These are dangerous times, Mr. President. These are dangerous times—times that demand determined, disciplined leadership.

The path ahead is not a certain one, but what is certain is that the United States cannot afford to blaze this path alone. America relied on strong alliances, diplomacy, and, only when necessary, armed force to lead the world in the 20th century. But the Bush administration's 21st century America seems all too ready to focus solely on armed force rather than on strong alliances and diplomacy.

Simply put, we need a plan that would bring relief to the American soldiers, to help U.S. troops by attracting significantly more foreign military troops to Iraq; and we need a plan that will bring relief to the overburdened American taxpayers by attracting meaningful financial assistance from the international community for the reconstruction of Iraq. We need a framework to begin to bring American troops home, supplemented by international forces on the ground—not just on paper—in Iraq.

Currently, the United States has approximately 120,000 troops in Iraq. They are augmented by about 20,000 foreign forces, primarily from Great Britain. Another 10,000 troops from Turkey would help, but it would still leave more than 100,000 American troops in Iraq for the foreseeable future.

In an interview published in the Chicago Tribune on October 5, LTG Ricardo Sanchez, the head of the coalition forces in Iraq, predicted that it would be years—years—not months, before the United States can draw down its forces from Iraq.

The American people were not told that, were they, when we went into this war? No, they were not told that. The men and women in the National Guard and Reserves were not told that, were they—that it would be years, not months, before the United States could draw down its forces from Iraq?

Until a new Iraqi Army is trained and ready to assume command, the only relief for American soldiers is to build up foreign troop presence in Iraq.

International financial assistance is equally important. The American taxpayers cannot afford to bear the full cost of the reconstruction of Iraq. We all know that the $20.3 billion requested by the President in this supplemental is just the beginning, just a downpayment. It is not the alpha and the omega of American taxpayers' dollars that will be asked by the administration in this enterprise.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported that rebuilding Iraq is expected to cost $56 billion over the next 4 years, according to an estimate reached by the World Bank, the United Nations, and the Coalition Provisional Authority. So far, other countries have pledged less than $2 billion to the effort.

The amendment that Senators KENNEDY, LEAHY, and I are offering would require the President to reach out to other nations for both military and financial support—reach out, reach out to other nations.

Our amendment provides that, after April 1, 2004, Iraq relief and reconstruction funds can only be obligated if, one, the President certifies to Congress that the U.N. has adopted a new resolution authorizing a multinational security force under U.S. leadership in Iraq and providing a central role for the U.N. in the political and economic development of Iraq; two, the President certifies that he has a detailed plan in place for the reconstruction of Iraq, including a significant commitment of financial assistance from other nations; three, Congress approves the release of the rest of the funds for the reconstruction of Iraq in another appropriations bill.

As part of his certification to Congress, the President must establish a plan; he must establish a timetable for withdrawing American troops from Iraq. This is the way to get the U.N. in and the U.S. out. It is a real alternative to the administration's bull-rush approach, and it is a significant gesture to the Iraqi people that America is not an occupier but a real liberator.

The Byrd-Kennedy-Leahy amendment limits the funds for the reconstruction of Iraq that may be obligated prior to April 1, 2004, to the $5.1 billion fund for Iraqi security and $5 billion for economic reconstruction.

Our amendment compels the President to work with the United Nations. Our amendment requires Congress to evaluate the progress of the reconstruction effort at the halfway mark next year. Most important, our amendment changes the course of the Iraq relief and reconstruction effort from a unilateral burden to an international obligation.

It is important to note that the full $5.1 billion that the administration has requested for the Iraq Defense Corps and for improving the Iraqi national security force is exempted from this amendment. Only the nonsecurity portion of the reconstruction program is subject to a second vote.

It seems to me that this is the least we can do to provide relief to American soldiers in Iraq—to have a timetable to bring those American soldiers home to once again reunite with their families—and to safeguard the interests of the American taxpayers in the administration's program to finance the rebuilding of Iraq.

We have a far clearer vision today of the cost of rebuilding Iraq than we did 6 months ago. I think we have a right to assume that we will have an even better assessment—or we certainly should have—6 months from now.

This amendment gives the President 6 months to round up international military and financial support for Iraq and gives his administration 6 months to demonstrate that the reconstruction program is working. Most importantly, the amendment gives the American people—the American people who are bearing the burden in the heat of the day—it gives the American people some assurance that Congress is not walking away from its responsibility to provide oversight of the hard-earned tax dollars that are going to Iraq.

If all goes as planned, Congress can quickly and in good conscience release the remainder of the money, but if unforeseen problems or serious shortfalls in expectations emerge, Congress has an opportunity to make a midcourse correction in America's involvement in postwar Iraq. It is the American taxpayers money, you who are out there in the plains, the mountains, and the valleys of America looking through these electronic lenses. It is your money, your money—deserve no less.

This is not an anti-reconstruction amendment. It does not affect any of the money being appropriated for American military operations in Iraq. It requires, rather, a progress report and a certification from the President of the United States at the halfway mark, and it provides for a vote—another vote—a vote from the people's representatives in Congress on whether the remaining funds for Iraq reconstruction are needed and are justified.

This is a simple amendment to interject congressional oversight into the expenditure of United States taxpayer dollars for the reconstruction of Iraq. I urge my colleagues to accept the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I think we have been here before. This is another amendment—it reminds me of Yogi Berra: It is deja vu all over again. We are looking at the same problem. The problem is the disagreement of the Senator from West Virginia with the President's action with regard to Iraq.

I read the Constitution, too. The President is Commander in Chief. He selected an ambassador who, in fact, has been confirmed by the Senate and gave him the powers to execute the actions necessary to move toward establishing a new government in Iraq.

I was interested in the editorial in the Washington Post yesterday: ''Stay Resolute on Rebuilding.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full editorial be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. The editorial starts off by saying:

> This is a critical week for the U.S. mission in Iraq. The test won't be overseas but in the House and the Senate, where lawmakers are to vote on the administration's request for $87 billion in emergency funding. It's imperative that this spending be approved—not only the money required for military operations but the smaller, more controversial, amount for reconstruction aid. We omit an exact dollar figure from the previous sentence because that's a legitimate subject for debate. The Bush administration is asking for $20.3 billion in reconstruction spending; the House Appropriations Committee trimmed $1.7 billion from that amount. What's important is not the precise number but the underlying premise: that reconstruction is in the best interests of both the United States and Iraq.

The editorial goes on:

> One of the biggest temptations for lawmakers will be to lend the money rather than spend it outright. This approach has particular traction in the Senate, where a number of Republicans are endorsing it. They argue that oil-rich Iraq can pay for its own reconstruction; giving it the money outright will just allow it to pay off existing debt more quickly to countries that shirked the reconstruction task, at U.S. taxpayer expense. This may play well back home, but it's the wrong way to go.

This amendment will cap reconstruction funds for Iraq at $5 billion and require Congress to enact yet another appropriations bill to spend the remainder of the funds. It attempts to sweeten the amendment with $5 billion for security-rated activities that is excluded from the cap, but it is still a very bitter pill for those in charge of our troops in Iraq to swallow.

As this editorial I just mentioned stated:

> Paying to improve life for Iraqis will help create a safer environment for U.S. troops and will hasten the day when they can leave. Rebuilding the electricity grid, fixing the water supply, getting the oil flowing, maintaining public safety—all this is central to hopes for stability and representative government.

In addition to untenable funding restraints, this amendment requires a Presidential certification that the U.N. Security Council has adopted a resolution authorizing a multinational force under United States leadership for Iraq and that reconstruction efforts are being successfully implemented according to a detailed plan before additional funds can be appropriated.

I know of nothing in the Constitution that says the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces has to give Congress a plan. He did give us a plan. There is a plan, and it is being executed. But to put it in law that the Commander in Chief cannot spend money for our troops or for reconstruction efforts without a detailed plan is going too far.

Ambassador Bremer has a plan, and we are funding it. The President has a plan, and we are following it, and he is the Commander in Chief. I think it is high time we recognize that the Commander in Chief has powers abroad, particularly when we have men and women in the field still under security restraints. There are people over there still being killed daily, and that bothers me greatly.

What I fear most is the loss of momentum in the program being pursued by the amendments being offered that will derail the plan, derail the operations, and put in restrictions so we cannot go forward. I believe the President has a plan and the Bremer plan will work. If it does not, they will be back, I am sure. But if it does, it will be the first time in history where we went from the concept of a victory in the field militarily to establishing a new government in a country that has really been totally destroyed by its former government, the Saddam Hussein regime. It will be the first time we went from a military victory to a new government without a long period of occupation.

The result of the Byrd amendment is that it will assure we will have increased forces over there occupying Iraq for years and years. I don't know where the Senator got that quote from, but no one told me we are going to be there years and years. As a matter of fact, our goal is not that. We have already withdrawn some troops. The general the Senator quoted has already withdrawn some troops. We are not predicting they are going to be there for years and years. There may well be a United States presence there for some time, whether or not the Iraqi people ask for it. I hope they reach a point where they think they can provide for their own security.

We have this ongoing problem in Afghanistan very clearly that is going to take some time to establish a government there. We do have some international cooperation but not much really in the long run.

The Senator from West Virginia mentions the U.N. Just yesterday, the Secretary of State told us about the improved circumstance in the U.N. today.

We are pursuing a resolution in the U.N. but to make expenditure of our funds conditioned upon the resolution passing in the U.N. is absolutely wrong. This amendment holds reconstruction efforts hostage to the passage of other appropriations bills and hostage to action by the U.N.

Now, I would hope that Senators will read what I consider to be a very appropriate editorial from the Washington Post that I have just placed in the RECORD. It says:

> The debate over reconstruction aid has become a means for expressing frustration, much of it legitimate, about the administration's Iraq policy. Why wasn't the administration more honest from the outset about the costs? Why can't it do a better job of getting other countries to help pay? What's the plan for future years? How will it be paid for? Lawmakers are right to use the leverage of debate to seek clearer answers . . .

But debate is one thing; restrictions in the law is an entirely different thing. I do not believe Congress has the power and should not try to exercise the power to put restraints on the Commander in Chief when we have forces in the field. Our job is to provide the money to keep those men and women safe, and that is what this bill does. Sixty-six-plus billion dollars is to maintain our troops. The balance is one of the most distinct things the President has done as a leader, to say let's move forward now. Let's give them a chance to create a new government. Let's help them set up their security. Let's help them restore their means of living. Let's help them restore their energy. Let's help them restore their oilfields. Let's help them restore safety in the streets. Let's work with them so they can take over their own government.

I received a letter this morning from the Coalition Provisional Authority, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Ambassador Bremer be printed in the RECORD. I will make copies available for every Senator.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY,
Baghdad, October 16, 2003.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to express my personal appreciation to you for your superb

efforts in managing, S. 1689 the President's Emergency Supplemental Appropriation. All of us in the Coalition Provisional Authority are especially pleased with the expeditious manner in which the legislation has moved through the Committee and now in the Senate.

The Supplemental the President has submitted provides a clear strategy for achieving our goal of an early restoration of full sovereignty to the Iraqi people and for making additional progress in the war on terrorism.

I want you and your colleagues to know that we are making every endeavor to operate in a transparent and accountable manner. But any major cuts of specific portions of the President's request will impact the scope and pace of reconstruction efforts, which in turn will delay the return home of the U.S. troops. There is no doubt that these funds will help contribute to the peace and stability of not only Iraq but eventually of the entire region.

Likewise efforts to link U.S. restructuring funds to contributions from the International community would be counter productive. Such linkage would send the wrong message to our allies that either they match the U.S. dollar for dollar or America will abandon Iraq.

I understand there are various proposals being offered which would convert portions of the funding request to a loan mechanism of some type. Any such proposal would merely add further debt to the already huge debt currently owed by Iraqis. As you know from my testimony three weeks ago, I am concerned that as was the case in the young fragile democracy in Weimar Germany, such a situation could destabilize the young Iraqi democracy before it even gets off the ground. Moreover, if the United States makes its contribution in the form of a loan, we will encourage other nations to follow that example at the Madrid Donors' conference next week, further exacerbating Iraq's debt situation, and I might add, complicating the eventual process of restructuring the country's overall debt burden.

The sooner Iraq is stable and headed toward prosperity, the sooner the American troops can return home. The U.S. stands to gain a great deal of moral capital for deposing the tyrannical Saddam Hussein and then helping to create a stable, democratic and prosperous Iraqi state. Such moral capital would be diminished, if not undercut entirely, if the U.S. forced Iraq to pay the U.S. for its work. Further it would lend credence to the view that the U.S. is an occupier and not a liberator.

All in the coalition are grateful to you and your Senate colleagues for your efforts and it is our hope that you continue to resist any debilitating amendments which will set back our many successes so far.

Sincerely,

L. PAUL BREMER.

Mr. STEVENS. It says:

The supplemental the President has submitted provides a clear strategy for achieving our goal of an early restoration of full sovereignty to the Iraqi people and for making additional progress on the war on terrorism. I want you and your colleagues to know that we are making every endeavor to operate in a transparent and accountable manner. But any major cuts of specific portions of the President's request will impact the scope and pace of reconstruction efforts, which in turn will delay the return home of the U.S. troops. There is no doubt that these funds will help contribute to the peace and stability of not only Iraq but eventually the entire region.

That is the dream the Secretary of State explained to us yesterday, that we are moving forward in a region that has had instability for a century, and what has been needed is a key country such as Iraq turning toward a democracy, turning toward involving people. Just listening to the people who have seen and talked to the young people in school, we now know that young women in Iraq are going to school for the first time because of this country. A whole new generation will not just have men educated but will have men and women, who are going to participate in their own government. They want to do that. There has been an overwhelming reaction in Iraq toward freedom.

We want to hold it back? We want to put up some gates and say you can go just this far, but you have to come back to Congress for more money? When? In February, and then more money later.

The whole idea is to put the money up and let the Iraqi people know we are assisting them to move forward. We are going to assist them.

Debate is one thing, but gates, obstruction, is another. This amendment is obstructionism. It is intended to require a return to this floor before the money the President has requested in the supplemental can be spent. I think that is absolutely wrong, and when the appropriate time comes I will move to table this amendment.

EXHIBIT 1—STAY RESOLUTE ON REBUILDING

This is a critical week for the U.S. mission in Iraq. The test won't be overseas but in the House and Senate, where lawmakers are to vote on the administration's request for $87 billion in emergency funding. It's imperative that this spending be approved—not only the money required for military operations but the smaller, more controversial, amount for reconstruction aid. We omit an exact dollar figure from the previous sentence because that's a legitimate subject for debate. The Bush administration is asking for $20.3 billion in reconstruction spending; the House Appropriations Committee trimmed $1.7 billion from that amount. What's important is not the precise number but the underlying premise: that reconstruction is in the interests of both the United States and Iraq.

It would be intellectually consistent, though wrong, to argue against both military and reconstruction funding. But to present oneself as a supporter of money ''for our troops'' and an opponent of reconstruction is contradictory and counterproductive. Paying to improve life for Iraqis will help create a safer environment for U.S. troops and will hasten the day when they can leave. Rebuilding the electricity grid, fixing the water supply, getting the oil flowing, maintaining public safety—all this is central to hopes for stability and representative government.

One of the biggest temptations for lawmakers will be to lend the money rather than spend it outright. This approach has particular traction in the Senate, where a number of Republicans are endorsing it. They argue that oil-rich Iraq can pay for its own reconstruction; giving it the money outright will just allow it to pay off existing debt more quickly to countries that shirked the reconstruction task, at U.S. taxpayer expense. This may play well back home, but it's the wrong way to go.

Iraq is already burdened with about $200 billion in debt. Either much of that will be forgiven, in which case a U.S. reconstruction loan will prove most symbolic, or Iraq will struggle for years under a crushing debt burden, in which case another loan only adds to the misery. To make a loan in these circumstances is like swimming out to a drowning man and handing him a ten-pound weight. As a practical matter, no Iraqi entity has the legal authority to enter into a binding agreement. Lending the money will harm the U.S. effort to persuade other countries to donate. And forcing Iraq to encumber itself with debt to the United States, with U.S. companies reaping the reconstruction profits, plays into the hands of those who suspect U.S. motives.

The debate over reconstruction aid has become a means for expressing frustration, much of it legitimate, about the administration's Iraq policy. Why wasn't the administration more honest from the outset about costs? Why can't it do a better job of getting other countries to help pay? What's the plan for future years? How will it be paid for? Lawmakers are right to use the leverage of debate to seek clearer answers and improved performance from the administration. But a failure to obtain satisfaction on these points doesn't justify a vote against needed funding. One of the Democratic presidential candidates who will be called on to vote on the request, Sen. John Edwards (N.C.), said yesterday that he will vote against the aid for this reason, and Sen. John F. Kerry (Mass.) seems inclined to follow this irresponsible course. Former Vermont governor Howard Dean's position—yes, but only if the president comes up with a way to pay for it—is similarly faulty. As much as we would like to see some tax cuts rolled back, that's not going to happen, at least as part of the current debate. Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman (Conn.) had it right the other day, saying that, despite misgivings and his desire to undo some of the tax cuts to pay for it: ''We have no choice but to finance this program.''

Helping rebuild Iraq is right as a matter of morality and self-interest. Refusing to pay what's needed because the administration's performance has been lacking simply piles error on top of error. Whatever the Bush Administration's failings, it makes no sense to punish the people of Iraq—and, ultimately, of the United States—as a result.

Mr. STEVENS. I want to be courteous to the people on the other side, and I will try to see if we cannot find some time limit. It would be within my right to move to table right now, but I want to be cooperative. The Senator from West Virginia has asked for other Senators to be allowed to speak, so I will seek to find some way to delineate some time limits. I have spoken for about 8 minutes. I know Senator DURBIN, Senator HARKIN, Senator KENNEDY, and I believe Senator BOXER want to speak. I ask unanimous consent that each be recognized for 10 minutes and that I then be allowed the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I urge my friend to please not put such severe time limits on this because for some of us this is an extremely important amendment that goes to the heart of how we feel about the issue. I know my friend vehemently objects. Just the way he vehemently objects, I vehemently support

the Senator. I have not spoken much in this debate thus far and feel that it is extremely important to my constituents, who do not want the status quo, who want a change, to hear my views.

I ask my friend if he could withhold a particular time. My own view is I probably need about 15, 20 minutes, max, but I do not know for sure.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator has the right to object, and I have the right to move to table. I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. I object to the 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are going to work out some time limit on this amendment or I am going to move to table. As a matter of fact, right now I believe we have 45 or more amendments remaining. We have an agreement of the Senate, a handshake agreement for a change. It was not a unanimous consent agreement. It was just a handshake between everyone on the floor that we will finish this bill by tomorrow. We are not going to finish this if we have people speaking at length on every amendment.

Now, I have been informed we have 58 amendments remaining. This is the first one. I ask the Senator, what is a reasonable limitation on the Senator's comments?

Mrs. BOXER. For myself, I would like to speak up to 20 minutes. I may only take 15.

Mr. STEVENS. Twenty minutes for the Senator from California, 20 minutes for the Senator from Illinois, 20 minutes for the Senator from Iowa, and 20 minutes for the Senator from Massachusetts, and I assume the Senator from West Virginia wants recognition again. That is more than an hour on 1 out of 58 amendments. I think that is excessive.

I am willing to change it to 15 minutes for each Senator. I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURBIN, Senator HARKIN, Senator KENNEDY, Senator BOXER, and Senator BYRD be recognized not to exceed 15 minutes before I retain the floor to make a motion to table.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I hope my chairman will not press this request at this time. As far as I know, there is no intention on this side of the aisle to lengthen the process by which the Senator would consider this amendment. This is a very important amendment. I hope the distinguished Senator would not press for any time limitation on the amendment at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent request pending. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have reserved the right to object and expressed the hope that the distinguished chairman would not press this request at this time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will be glad to debate a little bit what is important and what is not important. I have before me 58 amendments, and I do not know of any Senator who says his or her amendment is not important. This amendment is important. I think the amendment of any Senator is important. With 58 amendments pending, we have to find some way to limit debate. The only way I know to limit it is by making a motion to table.

I again seek the guidance of the Members on the other side. I think we really have eight amendments, other than a reservation of amendments to be able to be offered in the second degree. Of the basic amendments that are now here, there are, what, 31?

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. Without losing the right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada for a comment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I state to the distinguished manager of the bill, Senator DURBIN is not going to be able to come. I think if we just proceeded with this, it may move more quickly than one would think. Senator DURBIN is not going to come. Senator KENNEDY will speak. Senator BOXER will speak. I think it would move more quickly than one would think.

Mr. STEVENS. Senator LEAHY now; that's a sixth one. If each one takes 20 minutes, we are going to be at 2 o'clock before we vote on this.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we have already taken 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I have taken 7 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has not been alone taking time. I am hoping his sweet nature will prevail and allow Senators to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The gallery will remain quiet.

Mr. BYRD. I hope the Senator will not press for an agreement this early in the morning. We can move right along. Senators are here. Senator LEAHY is here; Senator KENNEDY is here; Senator BOXER is here. We are prepared to move along. We are not attempting to drag out the time.

I hope the Senator will allow Senators to go forward with this debate. We will save time in the long run by so doing.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the minority, are they willing to set a firm time for the vote on this amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Not yet, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. REID. I do really think this will move more quickly. We don't need to allocate 20 minutes on this. If we just go forward, things will work out. You still have the right, after somebody completes a statement, to get the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Let me try this. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to yield the floor to Senator BOXER to make such remarks as she wishes to make, and when she is finished her remarks, I regain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, he would get the floor, anyway. He is the manager of the bill. I have no objection to that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I assure the Senator from Alaska my remarks are really not as long as 20 minutes. I certainly will try to get my points across in short order.

Mr. President, I am very proud to stand with the senior Democratic Senator on the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, and support his amendment to require the administration to develop a plan for Iraq, to share the burden of Iraqi reconstruction and security, and provide Congress with the information it deserves to have, not only as a coequal branch of Government but in behalf of our constituents.

I view this amendment as a very strong alternative to the underlying bill, an alternative that is better for our troops, that is better for our taxpayers, and will finally give us a plan and an exit strategy we should have had a long time ago.

The Byrd amendment withholds half of the money requested for reconstruction until the President certifies and reports to Congress that the U.N. Security Council has adopted a new resolution authorizing a multinational force under U.S. leadership. That would result in more funding and more troops from other nations to relieve our heavy burden. And the burden is, indeed, heavy.

I am very happy the U.N. Security Council just passed a resolution. But, if I might say, what that resolution does—and I am glad they passed it—is it essentially puts them on record as recognizing the United States as the transition power in Iraq. But it does not give one dollar toward the effort of reconstruction. It does not give even one soldier more from another country.

So we have a long way to go. I think in many ways the Senator from West Virginia was prescient, because he put in his amendment not just that the U.N. pass any old resolution, but that the U.N. pass a resolution that will in fact relieve the burden on our troops and on our taxpayers.

Senator BYRD and those of us supporting his amendment also say the administration must certify and report to Congress that our reconstruction efforts are being carried out in accordance with a detailed plan that includes

significant financial assistance from other nations. In short, the Byrd amendment requires leadership from this administration—leadership from this administration—and the American people deserve no less. It is time for leadership.

In addition, the Byrd amendment requires reports to the Congress on efforts to protect our troops. I made a visit to Walter Reed Hospital yesterday. It was a very emotional visit. Our troops are extraordinary. They are incredibly optimistic young people. Each one of them I visited said had they been in a different type of vehicle, they wouldn't have lost their limbs, they wouldn't have lost colleagues. Because, as we have said many times, after the President landed on the aircraft carrier and he said the major hostilities were over, we did not have a plan in place and a lot of our people have paid the price of that.

So we are essentially demanding, asking, requesting, that the President report to the Congress on efforts to protect our troops. We asked for an estimate of the duration and cost of the military mission in Iraq. I might say, for many of us who supported the Levin resolution, we have been asking for that since day one and we really never had it.

Why do you think the American people took a deep breath when they heard $87 billion for Iraq? They don't even realize, most of them, because it slipped through here with a unanimous vote—and at that time I think rightly so—we already gave $70 billion for Iraq in an emergency supplemental. So there was $70 billion, now there is $87 billion, and if anyone thinks this is the last of it you are mistaken. If we do not get a grip on this, this is a policy that is not in anybody's control. They don't even know who is in control over at the White House. They sent out a press release that Condi Rice was in charge of reconstruction. Then Rumsfeld got mad. Then she came out and said, Well, gee, no, that really wasn't so.

I think Senator BYRD, with all his many years here, his many years living, and his many years witnessing other administrations, has done us all a favor by putting together this very important amendment. Many of us helped put the finishing touches on it. I am very proud of this amendment.

So we ask the President to send a report to Congress on efforts to protect our troops, an estimate of the duration and cost of the military mission in Iraq, an estimated long-term schedule for the withdrawal of U.S. and foreign troops, and a schedule with timetables and costs for the establishment of a fully trained and equipped Iraqi security force.

Why is the Byrd amendment an alternative to be strongly supported? To me it is clear. It is time to end a blank-check policy. It is time to end a blank-check policy. Again, we gave $70 billion with absolutely no strings attached. We didn't stop it. We didn't say anything. We expected the President at that point would use those dollars and use the trust the Congress placed in him with that $70 billion to come up with a plan. We still don't have it.

So clearly we should support this very important amendment as an alternative to the underlying bill.

Let me give you other reasons. We were misled about post-Saddam Iraq. There is not one person who is civilized and has a heart and a pulse that beat who isn't glad Saddam is out of the picture. That has never been the issue. That has never been the question. The question is, did we have the right policy so that in the future that part of the world will be more secure, that we will not have a vacuum where terrorists move in, and where the United States is not the only country that is bearing the cost of a post-Saddam Iraq?

The American people—I know I speak for the people of California who have spoken with me about this and, by the way, I have had well over 1,000 calls on this and it is heavily against the $87 billion—feel for the Iraqi people, and they want to do their share—underline ''share.'' But they were told the post-war situation would be quite different from what we are seeing.

Let me quote President Bush's press secretary, Ari Fleischer, who was press secretary up until recently. This is what he said about reconstruction:

> Well, the reconstruction costs remain . . . an issue for the future, and Iraq, unlike Afghanistan, is a rather wealthy country.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle and my friends on this side of the aisle that the spokesperson for the President of the United States said:

> . . . unlike Afghanistan, Iraq is a rather wealthy country.

Still quoting, he 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.

My friends, that was this year. Ari Fleischer was speaking for the President of the United States who is now putting pressure on us not to see this reconstruction money become loans. Ari Fleischer said:

> . . . Iraq has to be able to shoulder much of the burden for their own reconstruction.

What did Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz say? I sit on the Foreign Relations Committee. Let us hear what he said. He said:

> There's a lot of money to pay for this that doesn't have to be U.S. taxpayer money, and it starts with the assets of the Iraqi people . . . and on a rough recollection, the oil revenues of that country could bring between $50 and $100 billion over the course of the next two or three years.

Going on, Mr. Wolfowitz, No. 1 in the Defense Department, said:

> We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon.

What are we being told by the manager of this amendment, Senator STEVENS? He is saying the Byrd amendment is awful; it is terrible; it is going to stop everything; it is a terrible thing. If you think the Byrd amendment is destructive, why not call Paul Wolfowitz and find out why on March 27, 2003 he said, ''We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon''?

Why not call up Ari Fleischer, who spoke to the President and said, ''. . . unlike Afghanistan, Iraq can pay for its own reconstruction''?

But it doesn't stop there. There is Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld. I am quoting him.

> I don't believe that the United States has the responsibility for reconstruction.

My colleagues, I want to reiterate this. Donald Rumsfeld, No. 1 in the Department of Defense, said in March of this year:

> I don't believe the United States has the responsibility for reconstruction.

He said:

> [Reconstruction] funds can come from . . . frozen assets, oil revenues and a variety of other things, including the Oil for Food, which has very substantial number of billions of dollars in it.

I could have quoted 10 other people from this administration, but from Secretary Rumsfeld who is a key member of this administration, to Ari Fleischer who spoke for the President, to Paul Wolfowitz, second in command at the Department of Defense, they all told us and they told the American people Iraq could pay for its own reconstruction.

I think the underlying bill is very much another blank check based on more statements and promises from an administration that led a brilliant military campaign but was wrong on the weapons of mass destruction, wrong on what would happen after the war, wrong on what the rebuilding would cost, wrong on how many troops would be needed, wrong on oil revenues, and wrong on how much other countries would contribute. That is just a partial list.

My constituents are very leery of another blank check, given this history and given the need here at home.

I could not believe this U.S. Senate couldn't walk down the aisle together, Republicans and Democrats, and take a month's worth of money for Iraq and spend it in this country of ours. We weren't asking for much. The Senator from Michigan wrote a brilliant amendment. In it, she said, All right, we are spending $5 billion in Iraq. The World Bank tells us they can't really absorb all the money we are budgeting now. Let us take just 1 month and let us keep our promises to our veterans. Let us take just 1 month. That is all—$5 billion. We can take care of our veterans' health. We can take care of our school construction needs. We can help some people who need health care here in the United States of America.

No. That went down in flames. We can't do that. We can't afford that. We can't afford it. After all, we have a deficit. We had a deficit only after this

President took office. We had a surplus before he took office. Now this body won't even pay for this war. They won't even pay for this war. They make ringing speeches about America, the greatest leader in the world. And I agree with every speech. But every time America led the world, we didn't tell the wealthiest few that we will give you more tax breaks so our sons and daughters can go off.

This amendment says to me everything that needs to be said. It puts an end to a blank-check mentality. We can't afford another blank check. We have these pressing needs at home with a deficit that is racing out of control.

I thank Senator BYRD for his leadership. I have enjoyed working with him and with his staff, as well as the staff of Senators LEAHY and KENNEDY, to put forward an alternative that puts our troops and our taxpayers ahead of a blank-check policy. I hope we will have a strong vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have a management problem. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on this amendment not occur before 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am an original cosponsor of this amendment, and I strongly support it. I will not take a great deal of time. But Senator BYRD and Senator KENNEDY, two senior Members of the Senate—actually the two most senior Members of this Senate—have been such resolute voices of reason and caution concerning our actions in Iraq. Senator KENNEDY and Senator BYRD have done a thorough job of explaining what this amendment does and why it is important.

There is no secret that I did not support the resolution authorizing the use of military force against Iraq. I felt it gave the President authority that should be reserved to the Congress. It was used by the President to justify abandoning the United Nations prematurely, rejecting the recommendation of our allies, and launching a unilateral preemptive attack against Iraq with dubious justification.

Since then, almost everything the White House and the Pentagon have said about Iraq has turned out to be wrong. The justification for the war, that Saddam Hussein was on the verge of having nuclear weapons, has evaporated. There was no link between Saddam Hussein and the September 11 attacks despite what the President said—until recently. While the Vice President continues to try to make the connection, at least the President has finally said there is no connection.

Is Saddam Hussein a bad man? Of course, one of the most evil people I have ever read or heard about. Amazingly enough, it is the same Saddam Hussein we strongly supported in many ways in previous administrations. Is he a tyrant? Certainly. Did he carry out torture and genocide? Of course he did. He gassed the Kurds. The then Reagan-Bush administration continued to send military aid. Is he a bad man? Yes, we all agree on that.

Did he have nuclear weapons? Of course not. Was he an imminent threat to the United States? Of course not. Was he worse than some of dictators we actively support around the world today? That is an open question.

Now we have a different question, as the senior Senator from West Virginia and the senior Senator from Massachusetts and others have pointed out: The cost to the United States taxpayers in rebuilding Iraq. We were told that would be paid with Iraqi oil revenues. But suddenly that cost has skyrocketed. Our troops, we were told, would be greeted as liberators. They are under constant attack and threat of attack.

I remember when the administration came before the Congress and said the costs of rebuilding would be under a couple billion dollars. They assured Members, assured the Appropriations Committee of that. They had to know they were not being truthful.

Look at what has happened. Hundreds of our service personnel have been killed, many more have been wounded, something the administration prefers not to talk about. The wounded are brought back after midnight, making sure the press does not see the planes coming in with the wounded. They were not talking about wounded. These are not a broken wrist or scratched leg. These are terrible wounds—lost limbs, lost eyesight, lifetime disabilities. I think of the soldier who fought bravely for the United States who is back in Walter Reed now finally getting his citizenship. He raised his right hand to take the oath. That was the only limb he could raise. He lost his other arm and both legs, like our former colleague, Senator Cleland, in Vietnam. These are terrible wounds.

We have lost more of our military since the President said the mission was accomplished, the war is over, than we did before. We have lost more of our soldiers since the President said: Bring it on. Unfortunately, they must have listened because they brought it on and more Americans have died since then than died before.

Having said that, I am not one of those who say everything in Iraq is a failure. I do not say that at all. We are far from that. We are making progress in Iraq on many fronts. But the situation is dangerous. We are there virtually alone. Contributions of troops and money from other nations have been a pittance. But who can blame them? We ignored the words of caution from our allies. We dismissed our allies as irrelevant. We called them ''Old Europe,'' and we refused to give them any meaningful say in the political development or economic reconstruction of Iraq. Now, having insulted them, having ignored them, having not consulted them, having brushed them aside as irrelevant, we expect them to jump behind a policy they opposed when they find that so many of the things we said to justify our policy turned out not to be true? It is not surprising they are not hurrying to get in line behind us.

This amendment of Senator BYRD, Senator KENNEDY, myself and others, acknowledges what is obvious to everyone except perhaps those in the White House who are so convinced of their own version of reality that they only see what they want to see. We need help. We need the active involvement of the international community. In order to get that active involvement of the international community, we need to give these nations a bigger say in rebuilding Iraq and doing so to take the targets off the backs of our soldiers and defray the financial cost to the American taxpayers. We cannot take the attitude that uncle knows best and only uncle knows. We want others to help us if we want to be in a position to take our brave young men and women out of the line of fire.

This is essential, not only for the success of our policy in Iraq but for our ability to work constructively with other nations in all the other fights we have in fighting terrorism, in combating poverty, in stopping disease, in protecting the environment, in dealing with so many other global problems. We are the wealthiest, most powerful nation history has ever known. It is almost inconceivable—even when I was born, 1940—that we would have any nation as powerful as we are. But we have responsibilities around the world that go with that. It is not just Iraq.

There is an AIDS epidemic; there are contagious diseases, including ebola; there is ignorance, poverty, environmental damage. All of these things need U.S. leadership—not leadership arrogance but U.S. leadership. The American people are good people. The American people have the heart and the will to do what is best.

The American people do not need to have leaders who show arrogance. That is not the American way. I think of the young people who go in the Peace Corps; I think of the young missionaries who go abroad; I think of the teachers, of the older retired people going to other parts of the world to help out. They do not go with arrogance, they do not go with simplistic answers; they go with humbleness, respect, and love.

This amendment allows half the Iraq reconstruction funds, $10.1 billion, more than can be spent next year, to be made available immediately. In other words, this amendment would get that money out the door with no strings attached. Putting this in perspective, $10.1 billion is equal to more than half the amount of foreign aid we give to

the rest of the world, and we will give that amount of money to one country immediately. The $10.1 billion includes $5.1 billion for security, public safety, border enforcement, and justice activities. The balance of the $10 billion will be released after April 1, 2004, if the President certifies that the United Nations adopted a new resolution authorizing a multinational military force of the United States command and a central role for the U.N. in the political and economic development of Iraq, but the Congress would have to vote to release the balance of the funds.

Over a quarter of a century ago, I went on the Appropriations Committee because I believed very strongly—and I don't have to tell the senior Senator from West Virginia who has forgotten more about this than all the rest of us would know—I believe very strongly the Congress has the power of the purse. It is one of those wonderful, brilliant acts done by our Founders to have these checks and balances—our judiciary, executive, our Congress. It has served us in good stead.

Has the Congress always been right? Of course not. Has the executive or judiciary always been right? No. But generally it stays in balance and it works very well. The big mistake would be if we just gave it away, if we said that the American people do not have a voice so we would have to vote to release the balance of these funds.

This is extremely generous. But the reason I mentioned the power of the purse is that we have a duty to protect the taxpayers' money.

In this Senate, there are only 100 of us who have the privilege to serve—and it is a privilege—at any given time. We have 270 million Americans. We have a responsibility—a responsibility—not just to Americans from Vermont or West Virginia or anywhere else but to all Americans. It is their money.

Now, none of us could predict what is going to happen in Iraq between now and April first. It makes no sense to bundle up this $21 billion and toss it out the door, without ever asking questions—whether the funds are being used wisely, whether other nations are contributing, and whether it makes sense to release another $10 billion.

It is absurd. It is totally unnecessary. It is not only absurd, it is unnecessary. This is the thing I cannot understand: Why are we rushing pell-mell to give away $21 billion lock, stock, and barrel, all at once? Every one of the administration's own people say they cannot spend it. They want it, but they cannot spend it. It is like ''give me, give me, give me, and I will make up my mind when I want to spend it.'' I would hate to run my household finances that way.

We should not run the Nation's finances that way. It is not the way it was done with the Marshall plan. Everyone comes up here from the administration and talks about the Marshall plan, the Marshall plan, the Marshall plan. I wish one of them would pick up a history book and read about the Marshall plan. The way they describe it, I don't think they could even spell it.

There was far more detailed justification for the Marshall plan, far more opportunity for review, far more oversight. Let's learn from history, especially if we are going to claim to repeat it.

I am tired of historical sloganeering by people who obviously have no idea what the heck they are talking about. For the Marshall plan, we had hundreds of witnesses. That was several years after the end of World War II. We had special bipartisan committees that really worked at overseeing that plan.

When I first came to the Senate, I talked to some of the Members who had been here at that time. They were watching what was going on. They knew what was going on. And it was not a blank check. It was not a blank check. It was, however, one thing: We worked with other countries. We led the effort, of course. We worked with other countries.

I think it is long past time that we should reach out to our friends and allies, not with this fig-leaf resolution being discussed at the U.N. this week—and that is all it is; it is a PR fig leaf—but in a way that builds a genuine coalition that is no longer a unilateral policy.

I want to be fair. The U.N. resolution to be voted on today is welcome. It sets the stage. That is what it does. It is a stage-setting piece for what should have been months ago, by recognizing the key role that other nations can and should play in Iraq.

It would authorize a multinational military force. It would encourage other nations to participate and make contributions to the force and to the costs of reconstruction in Iraq.

It also makes clear that the Coalition Provisional Authority is temporary. That is something on which I believe all Members of the Senate, Republican and Democrat alike, would agree. It has to be temporary.

So it is a step in the right direction, but it is basically a statement of good intentions. There is nothing wrong with good intentions, but I think some of us who have been here for a few years would like more than just good intentions. We have no idea how it is going to be interpreted by the White House, which has resisted meaningful input from other nations, nor how it is going to be implemented.

Will the multinational force be anything more than a fig leaf for an indefinite U.S. military operation involving more than 100,000 troops, as it is today—100,000 American troops over there facing the danger of being killed every single day? Will other nations contribute or will U.S. taxpayers continue to shoulder 99 percent of the cost?

Mr. President, save me the stories I hear from the administration about 30 countries, 40 countries joining us. I think there is one country that has sent over two people. Of course, we had to pay their way. Others were willing to send a few thousand dollars. But as ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I know we are going to have to pay more than that in foreign aid they all want. I do not want fig leaves. I do not want rhetoric. I want reality.

Right now, the reality is, we are paying 99 percent of the cost. Is the administration going to give us a detailed plan, including timetables and cost? How about an exit strategy for when our troops will come home? That is what I would like to know. We do not know. We do not know what is going to come out of that.

It is good to have, at least, a resolution that says nice things. It does not do an awful lot, but it says a lot of nice things at the United Nations. But I am not a member of the United Nations. I am not a delegate to the United Nations. I am the senior Senator from the State of Vermont. I am here to speak on behalf of the people of the United States in the U.S. Senate. That is my role. I have one vote here out of 100. I take that very seriously.

This amendment is extremely important. It builds on the U.N. resolution. It requires tangible results, not just good intentions. If the U.N. resolution accomplishes what it says, the President should have no difficulty making the certifications called for in this amendment.

We need to know if the U.N. resolution represents the ''internationalization'' of policy long overdue or if it is nothing more than political cover to maintain the status quo, to continue along as we are today—alone, with our troops under fire and U.S. taxpayers paying through the nose.

And then we need to vote on whether to release the remaining $10 billion. There is no reason—there is none—there is not one word in all the testimony before the other body or before ours that says they need this other $10 billion right now—not one word that says we should not have another chance to review this policy and vote again in 6 months. That is the responsible thing to do. Again, they cannot spend the money now.

So our amendment steers a middle ground. It releases half of the aid up front, but it tells the administration we want a multilateral approach. We want other nations involved, and not just nations that can only contribute enough troops for a small town police force or provide a handful of second-hand jeeps.

I admire the political will of some of these small countries in sending people over. From my own State of Vermont, we have sheriffs departments that are bigger than some of the forces they are sending. That does not detract from their political will in doing it. It is a nice symbol, but let's not fool anybody.

I think the administration takes a strange view of Americans if they think we are going to be fooled by this.

Virtually every American knows who is paying the bill. We Americans are.

So this amendment is in Iraq's interest. It is certainly in the interest of the American taxpayers, something we should be concerned about.

I am very proud of my friend, the senior Senator from West Virginia, for offering the amendment. I have had the privilege of serving with him for 29 years. I have learned as much from him as any one in the hundreds of people I have served with in this body, right from the very first day I met him as a young Senator elect, as a former prosecutor.

I think of my good friend from New England, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, a man I first met back when he was a brand-new Senator and I was a seminew prosecutor in Vermont.

I think what the two Senators have done is go back to history and back to reality and set a good course. Our country will actually be stronger and better and, ironically, the Iraq reconstruction will be done better, if we follow their course.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join in thanking our good friend and cosponsor, the Senator from Vermont, for his excellent presentation and compelling argument. And I, once again, thank our leader on this issue, and someone who has been such an eloquent voice for sane and responsible foreign policy for so many years, and particularly in the whole debate on Iraq, our friend from West Virginia, Senator BYRD.

I think it is important at this time to understand exactly what this amendment is and what it is not.

The Byrd amendment is not cutting the $20 billion. There have been other amendments that have suggested that and have done so. This amendment is not doing that. The purpose of this amendment is plain and simple: This is the only amendment that has been offered—and I believe will be offered—that is going to require a change of course in our policy in Iraq and give us the opportunity in 6 months to have a chance to review the administration.

As pointed out by the Senator from California, otherwise, with this $87 billion, we are effectively giving a blank check and a statement that we support the current policy, which I believe is a bankrupt policy, one that is being made up every day. I spoke earlier on it.

One of the reasons the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia is so responsible and compelling is, first, the World Bank has estimated that Iraq could only use $6 billion over the next year. He is letting $10 billion go, $5 billion for security, but the other $5 billion. Over a 6-month period the World Bank says the most Iraq could use is $6 billion. This is going to let $10 billion go for 6 months. All we are saying is, perhaps after that 6 months, the rest of the money would be freed up as well. But at least we here, as the people's representatives, will have a chance to review the bidding at that particular time.

I listened to our friend—and he is our friend—from Alaska say we ought to stay the course. I believe we ought to stay the right course. That is what we are talking about—staying the right course which is in the interest of the security of our troops and of the United States. Others are saying: Why not just give us a blank check?

The Senator from West Virginia remembers clearly, as ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, it was not long ago when administration officials said: We don't need any money at all in terms of reconstruction. Iraq is a wealthy country. The oil revenues will be able to handle it. Three months ago they said: We think maybe $1.7 billion will be able to handle it over the next year. Now they ask for $20 billion and say: Stay the course; why are you trying to interfere with us?

They have been moving these numbers all around and failing to give a full plan. Yes, they gave us some working documents from last year and, yes, they gave us a budget but not the plan. The wisdom of the Senator from West Virginia is the fact that it is going to require that the administration come back in 6 months and give us an opportunity to review.

Finally, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, the $20 billion for reconstruction is what the United States provides for economic aid for the rest of the countries all over the world. This is not an insignificant amount. The American people understand that. It is 20 times what the Federal Government spends annually on afterschool programs, 20 times. This $20 billion is 20 times what we spend on afterschool programs that reach hundreds of thousands of children, helping them get the supplementary services which are so important in terms of their education, giving them outlets in terms of participation in sports. This $20 billion is 20 times that amount.

It is also double the amount that this President proposed on education to assist the schools. This $20 billion is effectively twice as much as we are providing in K–12 federal spending on the title I education program for disadvantaged children. We know how important that is.

It is over two times the amount we spend in helping those who have special needs. It is four times what the Government spends on cancer research. This is not an insignificant amount of resources.

The only thing the Senator from West Virginia is saying is: Let's get another look at it in 6 months. Why should the administration be so opposed to that? Doesn't it make sense, in terms of our national interests, to galvanize the country in support of foreign policy? Are the people who are allegedly supporting whatever this policy is so uncertain about what is going to happen in 6 months from now, they say, don't do that; you are going to interfere and obstruct our whole effort by coming back to the Congress and permitting them to make a judgment in 6 months? That is apparently what they are prepared to do.

I commend the Senator from West Virginia. I know from personal experience the amount of time and effort and energy and thought that has gone into this amendment. This is the one amendment that says: We are giving you 6 months to move ahead. That is sufficient to meet the vital needs at the present time. And we are prepared to give you 6 months after that, in March–April of next year, when the Congress will be back and prepared to vote. But at that time at least we will know, at that time the American people will know that there are going to be other nations that will be a part of the team, that are going to be supplying resources, that are going to be supplying additional troops. We will be able to indicate to the American service men and women an end strategy, an exit strategy.

I was asked a couple of hours ago about mentioning the exit strategy; doesn't this just suggest we are talking about cutting and running? That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about being sensible and responsible.

Actually the words ''exit strategy'' were included in the foreign affairs article that was written by Brent Scowcroft and former President Bush, Bush 1, to which I referred earlier. He was talking about what the alternatives were at the end of the first gulf war. He was pointing out that this was a world transformed, President George H.W. Bush and his National Security Adviser, Brent Scowcroft, in their joint memoir on the experiences of the gulf war in 1991.

> There was no viable exit strategy that we could see.

That was former President Bush 1, ''no viable exit strategy that we could see.''

He believed at the time of the first gulf war we ought to have an exit strategy that we could see.

We haven't got that. It is not in the $87 billion. What the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia is saying is, OK, it is not in there. OK, it is not in the $20 billion. But let's come back in 6 months and we will have a chance to see where we are.

I commend the Senator for offering his amendment. I hope our colleagues will give it strong support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to the other Senators who have spoken in support of this amendment: Senator KENNEDY, Senator LEAHY, Senator BOXER. There are some other cosponsors of the

amendment who may or may not wish to speak on it: Senators HARKIN, DURBIN, JEFFORDS, and KERRY.

The amendment provides that not more than $5 billion may be obligated or expended before April 1, 2004, from the total of $20.3 billion.

It provides that the excess of the total amount so appropriated over $5 billion may not be obligated or expended after April 1, 2004. We are talking about $10 billion of the $20 billion—$10 billion may not be obligated or expended after April 1, unless, 1, the President submits to Congress in writing certain certifications and unless Congress enacts an appropriations law, other than this act, that authorizes the expenditure of such funds.

Keep in mind, I say to Senators, the $5.1 billion provided under the heading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund for Security,'' including public safety requirements, national security, and justice, which includes funds for Iraqi border enforcement, and so on—keep in mind that these moneys are not affected. They will go forward to Iraq—the $5.1 billion for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund for Security. They will go forward immediately, and $5 billion of the remaining $15 billion may be spent before April 1, 2004. The passage of this bill would provide for such expenditures. But the remaining $10 billion would not, could not be obligated before April 1, 2004, and may not be obligated or expended after April 1, 2004, unless the President submits to Congress in writing certain certifications described in the amendment and Congress enacts an appropriations law, other than this act, that authorizes the obligation and expenditure of the remainder of the fund.

Now, the certifications that have to be provided by the President of the United States before the remaining $10 billion may be expended are as follows, in brief: a certification that the U.N. Security Council has adopted a resolution that authorizes a multinational security force under United States leadership for post-Saddam Hussein Iraq and provides for a central role for the U.N. in the political and economic development and reconstruction of Iraq; and the President must also certify that there must result a substantially increased contribution of military forces and amounts of money by other countries to assist in the restoration of security in Iraq and the reconstruction of Iraq. There must be a certification by the President that the United States reconstruction activities in Iraq are being successfully implemented in accordance with a detailed plan, which includes fixed timetables and costs and with a significant commitment of financial assistance from other countries, so that the American taxpayer does not have to continue to bear all the burden; a detailed plan that provides for the establishment of economic and political stability in Iraq, including prompt restoration of basic services, such as water and electrical services; the adoption of a democratic constitution in Iraq, the holding of local and national elections in Iraq, the establishment of a democratically elected government in Iraq that has broad public support, and the establishment of Iraqi security and armed forces that are fully trained and appropriately equipped and are able to defend Iraq and carry out other security duties without the involvement of the United States Armed Forces—so that American men and women who are bearing the military burden there today can come home.

Additionally, not later than March 1, 2004, the President shall submit to Congress a report on United States and foreign country involvement in Iraq that includes the following information:

1, the number of military personnel from other countries that are supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, together with an estimate of the number of such personnel to be in place in Iraq for that purpose on May 1, 2004;

2, the total amounts of financial donations pledged and paid by other countries for the reconstruction of Iraq;

3, a description of the economic, political, and military situation in Iraq, including the number, the type, and location of attacks on coalition, U.N., and Iraqi military public safety and civilian personnel in the 60 days preceding the date of the report;

4, a description of the measures taken to protect United States military personnel serving in Iraq;

5, a detailed plan containing fixed timetables and costs for establishing civil, economic, and political security in Iraq, including restoration of basic services, such as water and electricity services;

6, an estimate of the total number of United States and foreign military personnel that are necessary in the short term and in the long term to bring to Iraq stability and security for its reconstruction, including the prevention of sabotage that impedes the reconstruction efforts;

7, an estimate of the duration of the United States military presence in Iraq and the levels of United States military personnel strength that will be necessary for that presence for each of the future 6-month periods, together with a rotation plan for combat divisions, combat support units, and combat service support units;

8, an estimate of the total cost to the United States of the military presence in Iraq that includes, A, the estimated incremental cost of the United States Active-Duty Forces deployed in Iraq and neighboring countries; B, the estimated cost of United States Reserve component forces mobilized for service in Iraq and in neighboring countries; C, the estimated cost of replacing United States military equipment being used in Iraq; D, the estimated cost of support to be provided by the United States to foreign troops in Iraq;

Furthermore, an estimate of the total financial cost of the reconstruction of Iraq together with, A, an estimate of the percentage of such costs that would be paid by the United States and a detailed accounting specified for major categories of cost and, B, the amounts of contributions pledged and paid by other countries, specified in major categories;

10, a strategy for securing significant additional international financial support for the construction of Iraq, including a discussion of the plan for implementing the strategy;

11, a schedule including fixed timetables and costs for the establishment of Iraqi security and armed forces that are fully trained and appropriately equiped and are able to defend Iraq and carry out other security duties without the involvement of the United States Armed Forces;

12, an estimated schedule for the withdrawal of United States and foreign armed forces from Iraq; so here we have a requirement in the report that is to be submitted by the President, an estimated schedule for the withdrawal of United States and foreign armed forces from Iraq;

13, an estimated schedule for the adoption of a democratic constitution in Iraq, the holding of democratic local and national elections in Iraq, the establishment of a democratically elected government in Iraq that has broad public support;

And, finally, the timely withdrawal of United States and foreign armed forces from Iraq.

Every 90 days, after the submission of this report, under subsection C, the President shall submit to Congress an update of that report. The requirement for updates under the preceding sentence shall terminate upon the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces other than diplomatic security detachment personnel from Iraq. The report and updates shall be submitted in unclassified form.

Here at last is a requirement that the President provide a report to the Congress and to the American people, information the Congress has needed and requested but which has been denied thus far.

This amendment would require that the President make these certifications I have mentioned and that he submit a report which outlines the various provisions I have read and, in the final analysis, he has to submit a timetable for the withdrawal of American men and women from Iraq.

It is time for the U.N. to get in and the U.S. to get out. That is what this amendment would require, in essence. The amendment would help save American lives. It would ease the Iraqi fears that America is following a policy of compassionate colonialism. This amendment moves reconstruction forward. This amendment moves Iraq forward. This amendment brings the world together in the overall peace effort on those distant sands.

This amendment would put in motion a plan—a real plan—that would bring

peace more quickly and stability more assuredly, and it would say to the people of Iraq that the United States is your friend, not your sovereign.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the pending amendment offered by the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, Senator KENNEDY, myself, and others, I believe is key as to whether this bill includes any real measure of accountability to Congress and, thus, to the American people for this country's policy in Iraq.

This is essentially similar to an amendment I had offered during the committee markup. We had an excellent substantive debate in the committee, and we are having I hope again today a debate on accountability of this administration.

I thank Senator BYRD for his tremendous leadership on this issue. I thank the chairman of our full committee, Senator STEVENS, for permitting us again—I know at some point he will want to move to table, but I thank him for allowing us to have this time to have our say and make our points about why we feel so strongly that this amendment should be adopted.

The amendment allows funding for our military needs in Iraq and Afghanistan. The amendment we are debating allows $10.1 billion for Iraqi relief and reconstruction over the next 6 months, until April of 2004; $5.1 billion of that is set aside for police and military training in Iraq and about $5 billion would be for reconstruction aid. I note the $5 billion is the amount of reconstruction aid the World Bank believes Iraq can absorb over the next full year, let alone in just 6 months.

Further taxpayer funding for Iraq beyond that $10.1 billion would be contingent on important accountability to Congress and the American public. In order to receive Iraqi relief reconstruction funding beyond the $10.1 billion, the President would have to certify to Congress that the U.N. has adopted a new resolution authorizing a multinational military force in Iraq under U.S. command. The President would also have to certify that he has a concrete plan for stabilization and democracy in Iraq, with fixed timetables and cost estimates, and the President would have to submit a report to Congress detailing the international support for our efforts in Iraq, both in terms of money and troops, as well as a report indicating troop levels and duration for our involvement in Iraq. In other words, what is our exit strategy?

Finally, and most important, this amendment would say there must be an additional vote taken by Congress before we spend any more money.

Again, I have listened to our ranking member, my good friend from West Virginia, many times in this Chamber talk about the Founding Fathers and how smart they were and how they wanted to balance the powers in this country so we did not have a dictator or king or someone who could run amok with the public treasury. That is why the clause in the Constitution that gives us control over the purse strings is so important.

The intention of the Founding Fathers, at least as far as I have come to understand and read in my history books, is they did not mean to give us the purse strings so we could open it up and dump money into the White House. They wanted us to be accountable to the American people for every dime that was spent; that we had to keep a tight pull on those purse strings, parcel that money out in a deliberative manner so that no President—Democrat, Republican, Independent, or whatever—would be given a blank check with the taxpayers' dollars.

This amendment is in keeping with the best traditions and intentions of our Founding Fathers and keeping our faith with the Constitution of the United States in being diligent at controlling the purse strings of taxpayers' dollars.

I just cannot explain why the administration is so stubborn in resisting even this most commonsense accountability. They are insisting on a blank check. Again, even the World Bank says we cannot spend any more money than that $5 billion in a year. Yet they want $21 billion. When people like me and the Senator from West Virginia and others raise questions about accountability, the administration, in effect, is saying: Trust me. That is exactly the line we heard before the war in Iraq.

I admit publicly—it is on the record—one year ago I voted for the Iraq war resolution because I opted to trust the President. I opted to give him the benefit of the doubt. In the lead-up to the war, the President's approach boiled down to two words: Trust me. Trust me that Saddam is in cahoots with al-Qaida because we have that information, he said.

Trust me that Iraq has vast stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them.

Trust me, said the President, that postwar reconstruction will be self-financing because Iraq has fabulous oil wells.

Trust me, said the President, that we have a serious plan to manage postwar Iraq.

And today the administration dares to say one more time: Trust me that this $20 billion for reconstruction is absolutely necessary, and that if you will only give us a blank check, we will spend it wisely.

There was a story on the front section of the business section of today's New York Times which illustrates how this vast amount of money—if not diligently looked at, if we don't keep a tight rein on those purse strings—can boil down to what in World War I and World War II was called war profiteering.

The business section of the New York Times this morning showed that Halliburton, for example, was making over 66 cents a gallon on fuel that it was selling to the United States government for use in Iraq, and we were paying them for it. We are paying them these profits. It showed how much Halliburton was spending, up to $1.70 a gallon for fuel when they could have gotten the same fuel in the region for basically 66 cents less a gallon. Where is that money going? We don't know.

That is the problem with all of this money floating around: Trust me, the administration says. As the old saying goes, there is no education in the second kick of a mule. Quite frankly, I admit publicly I have been kicked repeatedly by this administration's mule saying, Trust me.

A few years ago, the administration pushed through this No Child Left Behind bill for education. The President said: Trust me, we will come up with the resources to make sure it works. Now we have the mandates but we do not have the resources.

Trust me, they said, that we will have the evidence that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons, the means to deliver them, that he had connections with al-Qaida. We now know none of this is true.

I am basically here today saying, Not this time around; I am not willing to give a blank check; I insist on a measure of basic accountability.

I recall President Reagan's policy with regard to arms control. Remember what he said? He said, Trust but verify, and that is exactly the purpose of this amendment. It allows $10.1 billion for Iraqi reconstruction through the end of March 2004. Further funding would be contingent on two things: The President must certify to Congress that the U.N. has adopted a new resolution authorizing a multinational military force in Iraq under United States command; and, two, the President must certify that he has a coherent plan for the reconstruction of Iraq, including a significant commitment of financial assistance from other nations. In short, trust but verify, no blank check.

The administration will be on notice that additional money for Iraq reconstruction will not be automatic. The President first must come forward with a coherent plan to internationalize the occupation of Iraq, to stabilize and democratize Iraq, and then bring our troops home as soon as possible.

Everyone is talking about ''supporting our troops,'' and certainly we want to do everything we can to support our troops. At issue is, how do we best support the troops?

The Stars and Stripes, the newspaper all of us relied upon during our tenure in the military, has just released a poll showing that one-half of the troops surveyed say their unit's morale is low in Iraq. Almost 50 percent say it is very unlikely or not likely that they will reenlist when their term is up. According

to Stars and Stripes, a key reason for this dissatisfaction is:

Uncertainty about when they will be returning home.

Let me be clear, nothing will be better in terms of support for our troops than to compel this administration at long last to internationalize the reconstruction efforts in Iraq, to internationalize the military involvement in Iraq. As the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has said many times, it is time to get the U.N. in and the U.S. out. That, along with a clear and credible exit strategy from Iraq, is how we best support our troops, who are risking their lives every day, separated from their friends and their families, many of them not continuing with their education, not knowing when they are going to come home, performing duties for which really they were not trained.

The Byrd amendment is the amendment that supports our troops, and that is why it should be adopted.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1832, 1853, 1865, AND 1866

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, both sides have cleared for approval four amendments that I ask be considered en bloc. The first is amendment No. 1832 by Senator FEINGOLD. The second is amendment No. 1853. The other two have not been filed. I send the amendments to the desk on behalf of Senator HOLLINGS and Senator DURBIN, and I ask unanimous consent that these four amendments be considered en bloc. They are primarily technical in nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. HOLLINGS, proposes an amendment numbered 1865.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1866.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1832

(Purpose: To require reports on Iraqi oil production and revenues to be made available to the public in English and in Arabic)

On page 35, line 14, strike ''available,'' and insert ''available in both English and Arabic,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1853

On page 6, before the period on line 12, insert the following:

: *Provided further,* not less than $4,000,000 shall be transferred to ''Office of the Inspector General'' for financial and performance audits of funds apportioned to the Department of Defense from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund''

On page 24, line 14, insert after $4,000,000 the following:

''of which not less than $4,000,000 shall be transferred to and merged with ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General'' for financial and performance audits of the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund and other assistance to Iraq''

On page 38, after line 20, insert the following:

''SEC. 2313. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REVIEW.

(a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) review the effectiveness of relief and reconstruction activities conducted by the Coalition Provisional Authority (hereafter in this section ''CPA'') from funds made available under the ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' in this title, including by providing analyses of—

(A) the degree to which the CPA is meeting the relief and reconstruction goals and objectives in the major sectors funded under this title, and is enhancing indigenous capabilities:

(B) compliance by the CPA and the government departments with federal laws governing competition in contracting; and

(C) the degree to which the CPA is expending funds economically and efficiently, including through use of local contractors;

(2) report quarterly to the appropriate congressional committees on the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1).

(b) In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committees of Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committees of Appropriations, Armed Services, and International Relations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1865

(Purpose: To clarify the fiscal year limitation in a provision of the Public Law 108–11)

Paragraph (1) of section 1314 of Public Law 108–11 is amended by inserting ''without fiscal year limitation'' after ''available'' the first place it appears.

AMENDMENT NO. 1866

(Purpose: To require quarterly reports on the status of the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group to account for the Iraq weapons of mass destruction programs)

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 316. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Iraq Survey Group is charged with investigating the weapons of mass destruction programs of Iraq.

(2) The Special Advisor to the Director of Central Intelligence for Strategy and Iraq heads the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON STATUS OF EFFORTS OF IRAQ SURVEY GROUP.—Not later than January 1, 2004, and every three months thereafter through September 30, 2004, the Special Advisor to the Director of Central Intelligence for Strategy and Iraq shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive written report on the status of the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group to account for the programs of Iraq on weapons of mass destruction and related delivery systems.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Subcommittee on defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are trying to go back and forth here. Senator WARNER has an amendment he would like to offer. After that, I understand Senator LAUTENBERG has an amendment to offer.

At the moment, there is another Senator on the floor. I see that the current occupant of the chair might be interested in a comment he wishes to make about some Cubs. I asked him if they were little bears, but he said no.

I yield 5 minutes of our time to the Senator from Illinois, if he would agree to that amount of time, to talk about the Cubs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. STEVENS. The current occupant of the chair may not consent to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do I have a right to object?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that Senator DURBIN is going to speak for 5 minutes. We are going to move to set aside for Senator WARNER and, following that, move to set aside for Senator LAUTENBERG. Is that right?

Mr. STEVENS. That is right. I do not know if he is going to call up his amendment or just file it, but in any event, yes, we are prepared to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. REID. Before we go to Senator DURBIN, will the Chair approve the unanimous consent request that was propounded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from New York also wants to do something.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I know is not yet in the queue, but after Senator DURBIN speaks, I would also like to speak for 5 minutes about the tragedy that happened in New York. I was going to ask to do that later but it seems an appropriate time, and I ask unanimous consent to be able to do that, and only that, for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. We would have no objection to a statement about that very serious accident that happened in the Senator's State.

It is my understanding it would be 5 minutes for Senator DURBIN, 5 minutes for Senator SCHUMER, and then we return to Senator WARNER. Following Senator WARNER, we would go to Senator LAUTENBERG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the only thing I would like to ask before we get started is, does the Senator from Alaska think the Presiding Officer is qualified to speak about baseball?

Mr. STEVENS. I would say to the Senator from Nevada, I have heard the current occupant of the chair talk about some of his experiences in baseball and one of these days we ought to convene the Senate and listen to him for a while.

Mr. REID. I would like that very much.

Mr. STEVENS. There is some marvelous history we could learn from the Senator about baseball, but I am out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. Has the unanimous consent request been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Chair recount, for the benefit of the Senate, the order that has just been accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order that has just been accepted is Senator DURBIN has 5 minutes, Senator SCHUMER has 5 minutes. Then it is the Senator from Virginia's turn to offer an amendment.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

Mr. STEVENS. Followed by the Senator from New Jersey?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Followed by the Senator from New Jersey.

The Senator from Illinois.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN and Mr. SCHUMER are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1867

(Purpose: To increase the Federal share of the cost of disaster relief provided in connection with Hurricane Isabel; and to provide for repair or replacement of Department of Defense infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], for himself, and Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. DOLE proposes an amendment numbered 1867:

On page 39, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 3002. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of the cost of any disaster relief payment made under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) for damage caused by Hurricane Isabel shall be 90 percent.

SEC. 3003. Of the funds appropriated by this Act, $500,000,000 shall be available for repair or replacement of Department of Defense and National Aeronautics and Space Administration infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel, related flooding, or other related natural forces.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I purposely desired the clerk to read the short amendment because this affects the interests in 6 States. This tragic hurricane struck North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

Those are the States that were declared by the President as Federal disaster areas. The technical decision has been made by the appropriate authorities that these States suffered severe damage.

On the 19th of September, the hurricane caused 45 deaths, and approximately $1.7 billion of total damages, of which approximately $450 million was sustained in Virginia and $410 million in Maryland.

I offer this amendment on behalf of colleagues in all of those States. I have listed thus far myself, Senator ALLEN, Senator SARBANES, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator DOLE. I expect other Senators from those States will desire to add their names at their own initiative.

Why on this particular bill should this funding be provided? It is a legitimate question.

No. 1, it is taken out of the funds in this bill for the Department of Defense. It is not an add-on or an end run. It is straightforward from the Department of Defense. In consultation with the individual military services, it was relayed to me that the functioning of these military facilities in the States enumerated is essential to the current operations of the United States military.

Senator ALLEN, members of the Virginia delegation, and I, together with the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security went down to these hard-hit communities. We spent at least 1 day with the Secretary of Homeland Security looking at the damage in the Commonwealth of Virginia; and specifically, to the Langley Air Force Base and NASA facility. It is a relatively modest sum, but the Langley facility has a dual purpose. It serves both for the Department of Air Force and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We simply couldn't have the construction and repairs eligible for one part of the facility and not the other. Of course, the debate was primarily for the Department of Air Force. That is one very modest and minor technical aspect of this.

But the Department of Defense is willing to take those funds necessary for NASA from the funds I put in here, the reason being you simply cannot take a water line, for example, for a flood-damaged area and stop at the arbitrary line between where NASA operates and where the Department of Air Force operates.

I am hopeful colleagues will not look upon that as any significant departure from the managers' effort to contain this legislation to expenditures related to the military. I really urge colleagues to support this. Our colleagues from these 6 States support it. I cannot speak for those who are not on here. I intend to visit with the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia on this matter in the course of the day as well as the junior Senator from West Virginia. It is my hope this Chamber will accept this amendment.

Again, there was a Presidential designation of areas of destruction, and here in the Nation's Capital some of our military installations suffered damage.

I point out that in the course of my trips—I think I made seven trips back to my State in connection with this very frightful hurricane—I worked with FEMA. I commend FEMA. The FEMA people came in, as well as the Small Business Administration, and helped tremendously. I recall being in Alexandria along with the Small Business Administration people, and we walked in and out of the various places of business—small restaurants and shops where water had come up waist high the previous evening. You can't imagine the despair on the faces and in the minds of a shopkeeper who was there amidst all of this mud, debris, foul-smelling effects of the flood; and then also trying to get briefed on the pathogens that could flow from the mold that will come forward.

But I found the Small Business Administration people, and particularly FEMA, to be very reassuring to those people who were overcome with emotion and dispair. Senator ALLEN and myself on this particular day, and FEMA and the Small Business Administration people, gave assurance that the Federal Government would give a measure of help: Here are the forms, here is the instruction book, there will be a representative from FEMA and SBA at this location. You can go to that entity and seek assistance.

That all worked quite well in my State. However, SBA or FEMA is not available to provide assistance to the military installations who were damaged. It is left up to the commander of those bases to finance these costs. I spent considerable time with the commander at Langley Air Force Base. I commend him. He stayed throughout the storm even though the base was largely evacuated. It was important to get the military equipment out of the path of the storm and locate that equipment in a remote area so they could continue to function. There was no gap in the fulfillment of the military mission. That commander and indeed the general officer in charge of that base and others are to be commended.

I could recite other bases and installations, including Fort Story, the same thing: The commander and senior officers and enlisted personnel stayed throughout the storm. By and large, they helped save property and lives, no question about it. Had everyone departed and tried to get back—in some instances the roads were severed and

you could not get back and more destruction would occur in that passage of time.

There was considerable bravery from military and civilians on the military installations. FEMA cannot by law step in, nor can the Small Business Administration. Who is to fill the vacuum? The Congress. That is why I am asking the support for this amendment.

Again, this includes six States. I have an evaluation of the various damages assessed by the military department in the several States. As far as I can determine, they are good, hard substantiated figures. There is no padding that I know of nor would I permit it.

For example, in the U.S. Marine Corps, $16.5 million, primarily in North Carolina and right here below the District of Columbia, Quantico; the U.S. Army, $92 million; the Navy, $185 million; and the Air Force, $210 million.

Mr. President, this amendment will provide approximately $500 million to repair and replace military and NASA facilities along the east coast that were damaged by Hurricane Isabel. These are the facilities in which our military personnel and their families live and work. The Air Force alone suffered approximately $210 million, much of that was the result of flooding at Langley Air Force Base. Damage at Naval facilities is estimated to exceed $180 million, while damage at Army and Marine Corps facilities is estimated to exceed $100 million. There was also an estimated $5 million in damage at the NASA facility in Langley.

Make no mistake, this damage will have to be repaired and unless we provide the funding in this bill, it will come at the expense of operations and training.

I am hopeful colleagues will support this amendment.

I will leave it to the managers of the bill to decide how and when this matter is addressed formally, either by voice or recorded vote.

I ask unanimous consent this be the pending business subject to the managers, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment offered by my colleague, Senator WARNER, which seeks to address the damages at Department of Defense installations in those States impacted by Hurricane Isabel.

The State of Maryland was particularly hard hit by Hurricane Isabel and the strong winds and flooding that accompanied it. Entire communities were submerged, power was lost in some areas for a week and countless individuals sustained damage to their homes, businesses and property. A number of Maryland's military facilities were similarly affected.

Perhaps the hardest hit was the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis which suffered approximately $39 million in damage. Several weeks ago, I met with the Academy's Superintendent, Vice Admiral Rodney Rempt, who shared with me photographs of the destruction brought on by the hurricane. Hurricane-related swelling of the Chesapeake Bay, the Severn River and the Annapolis Harbor resulted in the flooding of academic buildings and laboratories, the submerging of athletic fields and the destruction of electrical systems. Our future Naval officers are now forced to take classes wherever they can be offered in the chapel, on a Navy barge, in administrative offices.

Hurricane destruction was not limited to Annapolis alone. Officials at the Army's Aberdeen Proving Ground, Patuxent River Naval Air Station and the Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head Division, among others, also report significant amounts totaling in the millions of dollars to repair roofs and buildings, replace piers, and clean up debris related to the storms.

As you know, Operation and Maintenance funding at our bases is routinely among the most thinly stretched. And that is in years without a major natural disaster. This amendment provides $500 million to cover the much-needed cost of repair at facilities along the East Coast facilities whose continued operation are vital to our national defense. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am going to talk about an amendment that I will be sending to the desk, and that is why I sought recognition. However, I also take just a couple of minutes to commend Senator BYRD for his leadership on this issue, for reminding Members we have an obligation to examine the conditions under which we operate to make certain funds that are expended—I served with Senator BYRD in the Appropriations Committee for many years, and he is just as diligent on the floor as he is in the committee—to make sure the funds we expend, our taxpayer funds, are clearly examined and clearly understood before we make the commitment to send those funds on their way.

For the almost 19 years I have served in the Senate, I am always impressed when I hear Senator BYRD stand up and act as the conscience of the Senate, reminding all Members of our responsibilities in such eloquent ways. I am grateful to him for the time he has allowed me to speak today as we discuss the supplemental appropriations bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1868

I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration, and I ask the pending amendment be laid aside to accommodate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. LAUTENBERG], for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CORZINE, proposes an amendment numbered 1868.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for any contract or other financial agreement or arrangement with any entity that pays compensation in the form of deferred salary to certain United States Government officials)

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 2313. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Ethics in Government Contracting Act of 2003''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN ENTITIES.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended for any contract, any financial agreement, or any other arrangement between the United States and any entity that—

(1) at the time of such obligation or expenditure, is obligated under an agreement or otherwise to pay deferred compensation to any individual who holds a position listed in subsection (c); or

(2) has issued to such an individual one or more options for such individual to purchase a total of more than 1,000 shares of stock of such entity.

(c) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—The positions referred to in subsection (b) are—

(1) President;
(2) Vice President;
(3) Secretary of State;
(4) Secretary of the Treasury;
(5) Secretary of Defense;
(6) Attorney General;
(7) Secretary of the Interior;
(8) Secretary of Agriculture;
(9) Secretary of Commerce;
(10) Secretary of Labor;
(11) Secretary of Health and Human Services;
(12) Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;
(13) Secretary of Transportation;
(14) Secretary of Energy;
(15) Secretary of Education;
(16) Secretary of Veterans Affairs;
(17) Secretary of Homeland Security;
(18) Director of the Office of Management and Budget;
(19) United States Trade Representative;
(20) Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;
(21) Director of National Drug Control Policy; and
(22) Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, along with Senators SCHUMER and CORZINE, I offer an amendment to this supplemental called the Ethics in Government Contracting Act. We must ensure that taxpayer-funded contracts in Iraq are of the highest ethical standards for contracting that we can achieve.

The question arises as a result of a contract that is now worth over $1.4 billion and was awarded without competitive bidding or public notice. The contract was given to the Halliburton Corporation, a company in which Vice President CHENEY maintains a financial interest. The definition of the ''financial interest'' is confirmed by the

Congressional Research Service, which is the nonpartisan research arm we turn to when we have questions. They have a great deal of skill and ability, and they agreed with me that despite the Vice President's claim to the contrary, that he had no financial interest, in fact, the conditions under which he is operating in connection with Halliburton do indicate a financial interest.

Now, there is no accusation here of any wrongdoing. But I have got to ask, Is the taxpayer best served by the award of a lucrative contract to a company formerly headed by the Vice President and from which he still draws compensation?

It is well known that the standard for ethics is not just to avoid wrongdoing but also to avoid the appearance of impropriety because public perception of insider deals can be just as damaging as a wrongdoing itself.

Right now we are looking at a stark example of activity that gives rise to the appearance of impropriety. To put it simply, the largest recipient of reconstruction contracts in Iraq is currently paying a salary directly to the Vice President of the United States. In addition, the Vice President holds hundreds of thousands of unexercised stock options in this company.

We toppled a corrupt dictatorship to instill democratic principles in Iraq, but what does it say to the Iraqi people when the largest recipient of United States reconstruction contracts in Iraq is paying compensation to the second highest official in the U.S. Government? I say it sends the wrong message to the people of Iraq and certainly sends the wrong message to the people in our country.

Also, in an untimely fashion, it sends a message to those who are serving in our military in Iraq. Today's Washington Post, on the front page, has the result of a poll that was taken by the Stars and Stripes, the bible all of us use when we are serving our country, in which there is considerable criticism about the way they are being asked to serve and the conditions under which they do it. Many say they do not plan to reenlist, and that is a terrible condemnation of what is going on.

Now, these are brave souls. These are good, loyal people. And the one thing we are not discussing in this $87 billion supplemental is whether or not the troops are being supported, because outside of the $20 billion that is under discussion now, there is unanimous support, in my view, for just getting those funds out there that can help protect, that can help make our military more efficient, make their living conditions better. No question about that.

So when those who are serving see that it appears there is an inside relationship, that Halliburton got this fantastically fat contract, estimated to be worth a lot less than is now being spent—the American people are already skeptical about the pricetag of this supplemental appropriations bill, and if we are going to spend such a massive amount of their money, we have to help reassure them we are following the highest ethical standards with these funds.

My amendment would make the ethics standards very clear. It says that none of the Iraq reconstruction funds may be used to award a contract with a company that currently pays compensation, including stock options, to the President, Vice President, or any member of the President's Cabinet.

Ideally, there should not be a need for such an amendment, but over the last few weeks it has become clear we need to draw some very visible ethical lines.

As I mentioned, the most controversial contract in Iraq is the one that was awarded to the Vice President's former company, Halliburton, to repair and maintain oil fields. This contract was negotiated in private, with no competition from other bidders.

Last winter, we heard that this no-bid contract with Halliburton might cost $50 million and was there for the exclusive mission of putting out oil well fires. Then we were told that the contract was for much more than putting out fires; that it would be operating and maintaining oil facilities across Iraq. And now this sole source, no-bid Halliburton contract is growing at an accelerating rate.

Halliburton has been billing taxpayers at a furious pace under this no-bid contract. In September, the amount of money billed by Halliburton under this contract rose to $1.4 billion. That was estimated to be a $50 million contract, done in the dark of night—from $50 million up to $1.4 billion.

If we just look at this chart, we see what has happened. If you go back to January 2003, it was just starting. And these are amounts in millions on the chart. The acceleration, the shape of the curve, tells you just what has happened. Look at where we are on October 1, 2003—10 months after this contract began—and we are up to $1.4 billion. Look at the spike in just September alone. The contract doubled over that 1-month period.

This no-bid, exclusive contract for Halliburton was negotiated in private and not revealed to the public until Members of Congress demanded information. And now the Army Corps has finally agreed to open this contract for competitive bidding, but it is unclear when the new contract will be effective.

Rather than offer reassurance to the American people that the no-bid Halliburton contract was above board, the Vice President raised suspicion with his recent comments. On national television, the Vice President recently said, regarding Halliburton, that he—and I quote—''severed all of my ties with the company, gotten rid of all my financial interest.''

He went on to say—and I quote again—''I have no financial interest in Halliburton of any kind and haven't had, now, for over three years.''

The problem is that the Vice President's own financial disclosure reports contradict that claim. His financial disclosures reveal that he has received over $205,000 from Halliburton in deferred salary in 2001—more than his salary as Vice President. In 2002, he received $162,000 in deferred salary from Halliburton. His financial disclosure forms indicate that he expects to receive similar compensation this year, and in 2004 and 2005.

The Vice President's statements regarding his ties to Halliburton were not correct. And I called on him to correct the record. He did not do that.

The Vice President is currently receiving salary payments from Halliburton worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, as this administration doles out billions of dollars in contracts to Halliburton.

In addition, the Vice President holds 433,000 unexercised Halliburton stock options. And even though the exercise price is above the current market price, the options extend to 2009, and any option holder—Mr. President, I come out of the corporate world—has to hope that the stock price surges so the value of the options increase. One way this can happen is to be sure that lucrative contracts keep coming from the U.S. Government.

Halliburton's stock value has increased 75 percent over the last year, even though the rest of the oil services industry has remained relatively flat. And we know that the biggest boost Halliburton has gotten is the multibillion-dollar Government contract in Iraq. This has an unwholesome appearance.

We want to change the environment in which we are presently operating. I offer this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the ethics in government contracting amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment has more than a whiff of politics in it. If I had the power to do so, I would close the room and turn on some fans. This is the most outrageous amendment I have heard in my time in the Senate in 35 years. As a practical matter, it is also wrong.

Contracts were bid. Brown and Root contracts were bid. The December contracts were entered into for Bosnia, Kosovo, by the last administration.

The Vice President stated what the Senator from New Jersey said in part. He did not say fully what the Vice President said. Let me say what the Vice President said on September 14:

> I have no financial interest in Halliburton of any kind and haven't had now for over three years. And as Vice President, I have absolutely no influence of, involvement of, knowledge of in any way, shape or form, of contracts let by the Corps of Engineers or anybody else in the federal government . . .

The Vice President has a deferred compensation obligation from his

former employer. He has no financial interest in Halliburton. The Senator's amendment cleverly works through a connection to the Vice President because he does have a deferred compensation concept. He has a right to receive money that was owed to him by Halliburton before he left that company for work he did before he left that company. The deferred compensation is money the Vice President earned as part of his monthly salary while he was at Halliburton but elected not to receive until he left the firm. This is done in many cases. It is a fixed amount that is being paid out over a period of time. The amount is not tied to the success or failure of Halliburton in any way. It is money owed by Halliburton to the Vice President for the time he was employed by the company before he left the company.

While employed by Halliburton, the Vice President routinely deferred a portion of his salary. That was his right to do. And each year he had the option of electing to receive a deferred salary in a lump sum payment when he left the firm or in a stream of payments over a period of time. In December of 1998, long before he contemplated returning to public life, Vice President CHENEY elected to defer a portion of his 1999 compensation and receive it over a period of years following his departure from the company. Once he made that election in 1998, it was irrevocable.

When the Vice President left Halliburton some 2 years later, he was not able to change this election, and Halliburton was required to distribute the 1999 compensation in five annual payments. To avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest, the Vice President voluntary complied with the practice then required by the Office of Government Ethics and purchased an insurance policy to ensure that he had no financial interest in the future of Halliburton. The Vice President purchased this policy out of his own pocket. He paid the premium himself. The insurance policy guarantees the Vice President will receive the deferred compensation owed to him, whether Halliburton is successful or goes bankrupt. The insurance policy ensures the Vice President has no financial interest in the success or failure of this company.

The Vice President eliminated any potential conflict of interest related to his deferred compensation arrangement and he resolved any financial interest he had in Halliburton. The Vice President reported the deferred compensation arrangement in his 2001 and 2002 public financial disclosure forms.

On January 18, 2001, the Vice President signed an irrevocable agreement donating to charity the after-tax proceeds from the exercise of his Halliburton stock options. Again, this is something the Senator from New Jersey could have found very easily.

Under the agreement, the Vice President divested himself of all economic benefits of the options and gave them to charity. The three charities named in the agreement are the Capital Partners for Education, the George Washington University Medical Faculty Associates, and the University of Wyoming. The Vice President has no control over the remaining stock options. This agreement gave the administrative agent the power to exercise the stock options and pay the proceeds to the charities. The administrative agent has total discretion to decide when to exercise the options without consultation with Mr. CHENEY.

Under the agreement, the Vice President will owe not a penny more or a penny less in taxes. The Vice President reported his gift arrangement on his 2001 and 2002 public financial disclosure forms.

If you read this amendment, it covers every official of the executive branch on a senior level. Beyond that, it covers assistants to the President, the director of national drug policy. I wonder why the Senator didn't include every Senator in the United States. I have never had the honor to own 1,000 shares of stock in anything. Some Senators do. I just wonder what is going on here in terms of this concept. We already accepted an amendment that requires any contract entered into using the funds in this bill to be full and open competition. But this contract was full and open. It is competed approximately every 5 years. It is a Brown and Root company to which Halliburton is related.

This is a slur against the Vice President of the United States. I have known him now since he was over in the House of Representatives as assistant to former President Ford. I have known this man for years and years and years. I know no more honorable man who has served in government than DICK CHENEY. That is why I am here. I heard about this amendment.

I am sad to say that I am here to respond to it. I never expected this from the Senator from New Jersey. It would unfairly and unwisely punish those who have been successful in the private sector and then voluntarily enter into the service of the United States in the executive branch. It doesn't touch the legislative branch or the judicial branch, only executive, and it does so very unfairly.

I move to table the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1868.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the quorum be rescinded.

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on or in relation to the Byrd amendment occur at 3 p.m., without any amendments being in order to the Byrd amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that following the Byrd amendment there be a vote on my motion to table the Lautenberg amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could, would it be appropriate to have 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the Lautenberg amendment?

Mr. STEVENS. That is all right with me. I thought we had a standing order that there are 2 minutes on either side.

Mr. REID. Also, I ask that Senator BYRD have 2 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes on either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot hear what the Senators are saying. Please talk one at a time.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that when we order a vote on this bill, there be 2 minutes of debate on either side on amendments prior to a vote.

Mr. REID. I ask that it be 1 minute on each side. OK, 2 minutes is fine.

Mr. STEVENS. Two minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have the Warner amendment also. I would like to have scheduled for a vote following the Lautenberg amendment, the vote on the motion to table.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I think we have come close to clearing that amendment on this side. I don't think it will require a vote. I don't know if we need to waste the time on that.

Mr. STEVENS. I will withdraw that. I thought there would be a necessity for a vote.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask also if the second vote—the one on the motion to table the Lautenberg amendment—can be a 10-minute vote. I don't see why we cannot speed this up a little.

Mr. STEVENS. I have no objection to that. I ask unanimous consent that the second vote be a 10-minute vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second vote will be 10 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. The Warner amendment is still pending, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask it be scheduled for a vote. It may not require a vote or the yeas and nays, but I want to dispose of it now before the Lautenberg amendment.

Mr. REID. If I may say to my dear friend, we have a number of amendments at the desk that are entitled to consideration before that one. I will do my best to get Warner cleared, but I would rather not have a vote on that because we have some at the desk also that have been offered and debated. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1863, 1814, AS MODIFIED, AND 1855, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have amendments Nos. 1863, 1814, and 1855. The first amendment is by Senator MCCONNELL, which I will send to the desk. The second is an amendment by Senator LEAHY, No. 1814, as modified. The third is No. 1855 by Senator HARKIN. I send them to the desk and ask that they be considered en bloc.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I haven't had the opportunity to talk to Senator BYRD or his staff.

Mr. STEVENS. We rely on our staffs and they have been cleared.

Mr. REID. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 1863.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 1814, as modified.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. HARKIN, for himself and Mrs. CLINTON, proposes an amendment numbered 1855.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1863

On page 34, line 1, strike everything after ''proviso,'' through ''Iraq''; on line 5, and insert in lieu thereof:

striking the first proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof:

Provided, That subject to the determination and notification requirements of this section, exports are authorized to Iraq of lethal military equipment designated by the Secretary of State for use by a reconstituted (or interim) Iraqi military, private security force, other official Iraqi security forces or police forces, or forces from other countries in Iraq that support United States efforts in Iraq:

AMENDMENT NO. 1814, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: to require the Coalition Provisional Authority to provide additional information justifying allocations for capital projects in Iraq)

On page 25, line 21, before the colon, insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated for any capital project, including construction of a prison, hospital, housing community, railroad, or government building, until the Coalition Provisional Authority submits a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing in detail the estimated costs (including the costs of consultants, design, materials, shipping, and labor) on which the request for funds for such project is based: *Provided further*, That in order to control costs, to the maximum extent practicable Iraqis with the necessary qualifications should be consulted and utilized in the design and implementation of programs, projects, and activities funded under this heading

AMENDMENT NO. 1855

(Purpose: To provide for a report by the Comptroller General on certain contracts performed in, or relating to, Iraq, and for other purposes)

On page 39, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 3002. (a) The Comptroller General shall conduct studies on the effectiveness and efficiency of the administration and performance of contracts in excess of $40,000,000 that are performed or are to be performed in, or relating to, Iraq and are paid out of funds made available under this Act or the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11). The studies shall specifically examine the profits, administrative overhead, management fees, and related expenditures for the management of subcontracts (and further subcontracting) under any such contract. In conducting studies under this section, the Comptroller General shall have access to any information and records created or maintained by the United States, or by any entity receiving funds for contracts studied under this section that the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(b) Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and again 4 months thereafter, the Comptroller Government shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) an evaluation of the studies conducted under this section; and

(2) any recommendations for the improvement of the contracting process for contracts performed or to be performed in Iraq and for contracts generally, including the selection process, contract content, and oversight of the administration and performance of contracts.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the administration's justification materials for the $20 billion in reconstruction funds for Iraq, which we received just last week, contains broad categories of projects with no supporting details about how the administration arrived at the expected costs of those projects.

For example, they want $400 million for two prisons, at a cost of $50,000 per bed. How is that possible? Are we going to ship the cement over there?

They budget $150 million for a tertiary care, pediatric hospital, with no details about how they arrived at that number and no explanation of why this is the best use of these funds in Iraq, versus far less costly public health clinics and immunization programs.

They want to spend $100 million for seven housing communities. Housing is short in Iraq, but should American taxpayers really pay $100 million?

We simply do not have nearly enough information to justify these exorbitant expenditures.

My amendment says that before funds are allocated for capital projects like prisons, hospitals, railroads, and government buildings, the Coalition Provisional Authority must submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing the estimated cost on which the request for funds for the project is based.

The amendment also says, that in order to control costs, to the maximum extent practicable, Iraqis with the necessary qualifications should be consulted and utilized in the design and implementation of reconstruction projects. We want to employ Iraqis, not $500 and hour consultants.

I don't doubt that Iraq needs new prisons, government buildings, and housing, although I am not yet convinced the American people should pay for these things. This amendment does not prevent any project from being built.

But we hear about spending millions of dollars in Iraq for things—from vehicles to cement factories—that with a minimum of frugality could be bought or built for a fraction of the price.

Before we spend 5 or 10 times more than we need to, let's find out what we are paying for to be sure it is the best use of the money.

That is what my amendment does. It requires the administration to give us the information that justifies these costs, before the funds are allocated. The American people deserve to know what their money is paying for, before it is spent.

I thank the managers for agreeing to this amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senate's passage of the amendment Senator CLINTON and I proposed today that requires the General Accounting Office to report to the Congress in 6 and 10 months about the contracting and subcontracting process in Iraq. I appreciate Chairman STEVENS' support.

The GAO would study the effectiveness and efficiency of those contracts, particularly looking at profit and things like administrative overhead as the contracts turn into subcontracts and subsubcontracts.

It calls for the GAO to make recommendations on how to improve the process. I believe we must do a lot of work to improve how we are doing things before the Congress gets the next large request for funds for Iraqi reconstruction.

I would like to insert into the RECORD at the end of my remarks a letter of support for the amendment from Taxpayers for Common Sense, a nonpartisan watchdog group.

I fear that there is a lot of very poor performance and clear waste going around for the grants already let. I fear we may be seeing some of the worst taxpayer wastes in decades. That is saying an awful lot.

I would note that there are press report that U.S. AID only has 14 employees in Iraq overseeing $3 billion in contracts. That is maladministration.

The first Iraqi military battalion has just been trained under a $49 million contract to Vennel, a subsidiary of Northrup Grumman. The work got subcontracted to something called MPRI. The interesting thing is that first battalion was not detailed to work in areas where there are difficulties in Iraq. Instead of taking a load off of American troops, they have been assigned to the desert to defend against Iran. It smells like nobody trusts the quality of that work and we are hiding the result.

It looks like Halliburton is charging the U.S. $1.62 for gasoline that can be bought and transported to Iraq for about 96 cents. Price gouging would be a kind way of saying it.

The budget documents indicated that $50,000 is being budgeted for the creation of 8,000 new prison cells. I fear contracts will be issued at that level when the real cost of construction in Iraq is far, far less. Given the cost of construction, it makes one wonder why the price is so high. It is, I believe more than it would cost to build such facilities in the United States, where labor costs are far higher.

There is a plan for an $800 million Iraqi police training facility. I am told there is likely to be a $26 million per month ''management fee'' associated with this project.

We need to understand what the reality is on expenditures like these. We need to have real examination of what is going on and make sure that the structure is in place that U.S. taxpayers' money is well used and not wasted.

I ask unanimous consent that the following letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCREASE CONTRACT ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IRAQI RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS

TAXPAYERS FOR COMMON $ENSE ACTION,

October 15, 2003.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: Taxpayers for Common Sense Action, a non-partisan budget watchdog group, strongly supports your amendment to require the Comptroller General to conduct a review of the effectiveness and efficiency of all contracts in excess of $40,000,000 that are performed in Iraq and paid out the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act.

With a $20 billion pot of available funds, Congress must ensure that federal taxpayer dollars are spent wisely on Iraqi reconstruction efforts. Current oversight of Iraqi reconstruction contracts has been virtually nonexistent. We need to reintroduce accountability and transparency into the process to ensure that federal tax dollars are spent judiciously. This is especially true in light of current skyrocketing budget deficits.

Your amendment is essential to ensure the American people that the federal government is not improperly wasting Iraqi reconstruction dollars.

Sincerely,

JILL LANCELOT,
President.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate passed the Harkin-Clinton amendment.

The Constitution gives the responsibility for appropriating taxpayer funds to the Congress. Thus, Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the taxpayers' money is well spent. However, the size and scope of the administration's $87 billion request makes it harder for Congress to exercise its oversight responsibilities.

Our amendment ensures that Congress will have the information that it needs to track expenditures and monitor the use of taxpayer funds. It would require the Comptroller General to conduct studies on the effectiveness and efficiency of the administration and performance of contracts in excess of $40 million that are paid out of this bill or the previous supplemental. The studies would specifically examine the profits, administrative overhead, management fees, and related expenditures for the management of subcontracts, and further subcontracting, under any such contract. The Comptroller General would be required to submit a report to Congress within 6 months that includes this evaluation and any recommendations for improving the contracting process.

Thus, we will know if companies are making reasonable profits or are simply exploiting the situation for huge profits. In almost every major war in our country's history, there have been instances of war profiteering where companies take advantage of the rush to get the job done to gouge the taxpayer. Usually, instances of war profiteering are discovered after the war is over and the damage has already been done. Here is an opportunity to be ahead of the curve and ensure that this abuse does not take place at all.

With the huge sums being expended in Iraq, we need to ensure that there is a level of accountability. As my colleague Senator Johnson pointed out, there are literally plane loads of cash being flown into Iraq. According to a Wall Street Journal story from August, the United States has already sent a billion dollars in cash to Iraq. As the story says, ''the U.S. has improvised a money pipeline that runs from a New Jersey warehouse, to a Maryland air base, down Baghdad's Ambush Alley, and even, at times, underneath the black burkas of two middle-age female accountants—until it ends up in the pockets of ordinary Iraqis.'' The story details how the United States is currently flying planes full of cash to Baghdad, and that these banknotes are ''seeping'' into the economy through cash payments to guards, pensioners, and other Iraqis.

With an additional $87 billion being added to the mix, $20 billion of which will be spent on Iraq reconstruction, it is critical that we understand how these funds are being spent. Furthermore, we need to know how much of these taxpayer funds are actually going to rebuilding Iraq and how much is filling the coffers of U.S. contractors?

I certainly hope that the General Accounting Office study called for in this amendment will reveal that contractors are not raking in outside profits or hiding profits in user and management fees. However, if we discover that there are abuses by contractors receiving taxpayer funds, it will be incumbent upon the Congress, which has the Constitutional authority to appropriate these funds, to take steps to prevent profiteering. This $87 billion appropriation is not the end of Congress's responsibilities to safeguard taxpayer funds, it is only the beginning.

I thank my colleagues for supporting the Harkin-Clinton amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1872

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an amendment I will be offering shortly. First, I am going to discuss it for a little bit to inform colleagues about it. The amendment I will offer expresses a sense of the Congress that the Attorney General should appoint a special counsel to conduct an independent investigation of the leak of a CIA agent's identity. The bottom line is this—and we have been through this on the floor, so I will not go over the basic facts, other than to say that, to me, this act—disclosing the name of an undercover agent—is dastardly. It places a gun to the head of that agent; it puts in grave danger operatives that agent may have had while he or she was undercover and, of course, perhaps most important of all, it says to every member of our intelligence community who puts themselves on the line, just as our soldiers do, if you go seek the truth, report the truth as you see it, and somebody upstairs doesn't like it, you are putting yourself or your spouse in real danger.

To me, this is something that is not befitting of a great power, not befitting not only because of its immorality—and I believe it is immoral to do such a thing—but also for practical reasons, because when great powers, as history shows us, lose touch with what is actually happening and begin to delude themselves one way or another, they lose power.

This country has had as its hallmark truth, open debate, and has had as its hallmark, if you disagree, speak out. That, by the way, has been one of the great things about our intelligence services, certainly since World War II. The CIA, the DIA, and many of the other intelligence services are known for reporting the truth. That is why they are somewhat insulated. That is why the CIA was separated and made its own agency. The day this country cannot gather the truth, at least as seen by the brave men and women representing us in the intelligence services, is the day we begin to decline. Yet that seems to be what has happened here.

Ambassador Wilson went to Niger and reported the truth, as he saw it, on a mission he was asked to undertake, and somebody didn't like what he said. First, they tried to suppress it, and then when they couldn't because Ambassador Wilson had the courage to go

forward, it seems that somebody—it seems likely maliciously this was done but perhaps not; we don't know; we don't know all the facts—gave to Mr. Novak the name of his wife and identified her as an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency.

That, in itself, is a crime. It doesn't matter what the motivation is. That is a serious crime punishable by up to 10 years in prison. So it is a very serious act.

Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives—people from every corner of the country—are totally aghast that this happened.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I will after I finish my basic outline. I have great respect for my friend from Arizona and will yield for a question at the conclusion of what I have to say.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHUMER. I may be a little while. He might want to take his seat. He is a strong man. He can stand if he likes. I just want to inform him.

There was a view that we ought to get to the bottom of this situation. I think, again, that was universally held. Our President himself stated it. However, when we looked at the mechanism to get to the bottom of this, there didn't seem to be a very good one. You couldn't go to the inspector general of either the Justice Department or the Defense Department because they can't look at the White House. The independent counsel law had lapsed, and to allow the Justice Department itself to conduct the investigation seemed to many of us at the outset to pose, at the very least, an apparent conflict of interest that now seems to be a very real conflict of interest given the facts that have come out about the Attorney General's relationship with Karl Rove and some of the others who, it is bandied about with no backing in the sense there is proof, but there are signs, have said that he was involved. So many of us called for a special counsel. A special counsel is still allowed.

Special counsel was the type of law that allowed Archibald Cox and Leon Jaworski to get to the bottom of Watergate. A special counsel does not run into the problem that the independent counsel did: that it can run amok and just look at everything under the Sun because it is still under the Attorney General's control ultimately. If that special counsel were to decide to, say, investigate something that went on in Indonesia unrelated or something related to the President's campaign finances, the Attorney General could snip it right off. That was the main objection to the independent counsel law.

The advantage of the special counsel is very simple, particularly if someone of some stature and independence is appointed, such as some of our previous colleagues—Senator Danforth, Senator Rudman, Senator Mitchell, or Senator Nunn. Then there is an assurance of some independence and integrity and, at the same time, the day-to-day operations of the special counsel are not under the control of the Attorney General.

The special counsel, if he or she were blocked by the Attorney General, would at the end of his or her investigation have to report to the Congress that ''I wish to interview so and so and the Attorney General said no.'' Or ''I wish to pursue this lead, and the Attorney General said no.''

We all know the Brandeisian quote: Sunlight is the great disinfectant and, therefore, as long as this becomes public, there is almost a prophylactic effect. People will be unlikely or be far more reluctant to block an avenue of investigation or the interrogation of a certain witness.

The investigation has proceeded, and it is very clear that all of the things we worry about—we worry about an apparent conflict of interest. That obviously exists. We worry about a conflict of interest that, too, still exists.

By the way, because the Attorney General is a close political friend and associate of the President's, all the more reason that a special counsel was then and still is needed.

There are two models for appointing Attorneys General in this sense anyway. One is to appoint a close friend, confidante, even relative. President Kennedy appointed his brother. That is reasonable to do, but you lose independence. The other is to appoint someone more independent, the Janet Reno model. But in this case, the President chose to appoint someone politically tied to him, someone with a close relationship, so no one even believes there is much independence there. We ask for this special counsel to avoid both apparent conflict and the real conflicts that exist.

Those pleas, done certainly by me earnestly—I am just outraged by what happened, and I think we have to get to the bottom of it no matter where it leads. I called for this investigation on July 22, long before any names such as Rove or some of the others were bandied about because I felt so strongly that whoever did this should be punished. It is a despicable act. But as the investigation began to unfold, we saw there was an additional problem, and that is that the investigation was not being run very well; that by textbook prosecutorial rules and ways of operating, this investigation had a number of failures. In fact, our leader, Senator DASCHLE, and my colleagues Senators BIDEN and LEVIN, and I sent a letter to the President on October 9 that outlined some of these missteps. I thought I would read the parts of the letter that are relevant.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 9, 2003.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to express our continuing concerns regarding the manner in which your Administration is conducting the investigation into the apparently criminal leaking of a covert CIA operative's identity. You have personally pledged the White House's full cooperation in this investigation and you have stated your desire to see any culprits identified and prosecuted, but the Administration's actions are inconsistent with your words.

Already, just fourteen days into this investigation, there have been at least five serious missteps.

First, although the Department of Justice commenced its investigation on Friday, September 26, the Justice Department did not ask the White House to order employees to preserve all relevant evidence until Monday, September 29. Every former prosecutor with whom we have spoken, has said the first step in such an investigation would be to ensure all potentially relevant evidence is preserved, yet the Justice Department waited four days before making a formal request for such documents.

Second, when the Justice Department finally asked the White House to order employees to preserve documents, White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales asked for permission to delay transmitting the order to preserve evidence until morning. That request for delay was granted. Again, every former prosecutor with whom we have spoken has said that such a delay is a significant departure from standard practice.

Third, instead of immediately seeking the preservation of evidence at the two other Executive Branch departments from which the leak might have originated, i.e., State and Defense, such a request was not made until Thursday, October 1. Perhaps even more troubling, the request to State and Defense Department employees to preserve evidence was telegraphed in advance not only by the request to White House employees earlier in the week, but also by the October 1st Wall State Journal report that such a request was ''forthcoming'' from the Justice Department. It is, of course, extremely unusual to tip off potential witnesses in this manner that a preservation request is forthcoming.

Fourth, on October 7, White House spokesperson Scott McClellan stated that he had personally determined three White House officials, Karl Rove, Lewis Libby and Elliot Abrams, had not disclosed classified information. According to press reports, Mr. McClellan said, ''I've spoken with each of them individually. They were not involved in leaking classified information, nor did they condone it.'' Clearly, a media spokesperson does not have the legal expertise to be questioning possible suspects or evaluating or reaching conclusions about the legality of their conduct. In addition, by making the statement, the White House has now put the Justice Department in the position of having to determine not only what happened, but also whether to contradict the publicly stated position of the White House.

Fifth, and perhaps more importantly, the investigation continues to be directly overseen by Attorney General Ashcroft who has well-documented conflicts of interest in any investigation of the White House. Mr. Ashcroft's personal relationship and political alliance with you, his close professional relationships with Karl Rove, and Mr. Gonzales, and his seat on the National Security Council all tie him so tightly to this White House that the results may not be trusted by the American people. Even if the

case is being handled in the first instance by professional career prosecutors, the integrity of the inquiry may be called into question if individuals with a vested interest in protecting the White House are still involved in any matter related to the investigation.

We are at risk of seeing this investigation so compromised that those responsible for this national security breach will never be identified and prosecuted. Public confidence in the integrity of this investigation would be substantially bolstered by the appointment of a special counsel. The criteria in the Justice Department regulations that created the authority to appoint a Special Counsel have been met in the current case. Namely, there is a criminal investigation that presents a conflict of interest for the Justice Department, and it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside special counsel to assume responsibility for the matter. In the meantime, we urge you to ask Attorney General Ashcroft to recuse himself from this investigation and do everything within your power to ensure the remainder of this investigation is conducted in a way that engenders public confidence.

Sincerely,

TOM DASCHLE.
JOSEPH R. BIDEN.
CARL LEVIN.
CHARLES E. SCHUMER.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chair. I am going to read these five steps that, again, fly in the face of good prosecutorial practice:

First, although the Department of Justice commenced its investigation on Friday, September 26, the Justice Department did not ask the White House to order employees to preserve all relevant evidence until Monday, September 29. . . .

Second, when the Justice Department finally asked the White House to order employees to preserve documents, White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales asked for permission to delay transmitting the order to preserve evidence until morning and the request for delay was granted.

In both these instances, every seasoned prosecutor knows that is not standard practice. You don't give those who might—underline ''might''—want to destroy evidence an opportunity to do so. The first thing a good prosecutor does is gather as much evidence quickly and as broadly as possible.

Third, instead of immediately seeking the preservation of evidence at the two other Executive Branch departments from which the leak might have originated, i.e., State and Defense, such a request was not made until Thursday, October 1. Perhaps even more troubling, the request to the State and Defense Department employees to preserve evidence was telegraphed in advance not only by the request to White House employees earlier in the week, but also by the October 1st Wall Street Journal report that such a request was ''forthcoming'' from the Justice Department.

I have talked to prosecutors who flipped their lid at that one. You put in the newspaper that you are going to request evidence of potential suspects? Wow. Something is wrong. Is it done nefariously? I do not know. Perhaps not. But it does not matter. Certainly, the leaker, whoever he or she is, is under a cloud and worried about potential criminal prosecution. Whether this was done by accident or by design, it does not make a darn bit of difference. It fouls up the investigation to a farethee-well.

Fourth, on October 7, going back from the letter, White House spokesman Scott McClellan stated that he had personally determined that three White House officials: Karl Rove, Lewis Libby, and Elliott Abrams, had not disclosed classified information. According to press reports, Mr. McClellan said he had spoken to each of them individually.

What is going on? We have the White House press spokesperson on his own—or maybe with authorization. Did he get it from Justice? I doubt it, but I sure would like to know—goes and interviews the witnesses, or potential witnesses?

He then came to a conclusion and told it to the Nation: They were not involved in leaking classified information, nor did they condone it.

Again, this comes from prosecution 101. A media spokesperson does not have the legal expertise to be questioning possible suspects or evaluating or reaching conclusions about the legality of their conduct.

In addition, by making this statement, the White House has now put the Justice Department in the position of having to determine not only what happened but whether to publicly contradict the White House spokesperson.

Fifth, and maybe most importantly, the letter goes on to say that the investigation continues to be directly overseen by Attorney General Ashcroft, who has well documented conflicts of interest in any investigation of the White House.

So we renewed our plea. Now, let me make two additional points that have not come out since we last spoke about this on the Senate floor. First, we do not know who is in charge. Who is running this investigation? Is it, as some newspaper reports have said, the head of the Counterterrorism Division within the FBI, a gentlemen named Mr. Dion? Is it the head of the FBI, Mr. Mueller? Is it the Attorney General? Is it the Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division or somebody else? Who is making the decisions? How the heck can there be a prosecution when we do not know who is in charge?

Then, of course, we do not know if that person is reporting to Attorney General Ashcroft day to day. Is this person available? If the White House press spokesperson will do his own little investigation and tell everyone what happened, how about letting the public at least get an idea from who is doing the investigation not to talk publicly about the details but to let them know what is going on because, when one looks at the press reports, it is either Judge Gonzales or a Justice Department spokesperson or a member of the Justice Department who gets up and says this is what is happening. It is unheard of. This investigation already is so tainted.

So many of us ask, if they are not going to go for a special counsel, which is what should happen, at least Attorney General Ashcroft should publicly recuse himself. He has not even done that. What kind of assurance does the public have that we are going to get to the bottom of this?

Then the President says we may never get to the bottom of it. Well, maybe he is just stating what he thinks, maybe he is just stating what he hopes, or maybe he is sending a signal. I do not know which is which, but he should not have said that. One day he said he wants to get to the bottom of it, and we should, and that was great. The next day he says, well, we may never know.

So this investigation is fraught with mistakes and errors, whether by design or by accident, that imperil its results, whatever they come to be.

I have never quite seen anything like it. I was on the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives for 16 years and have now been in the Senate for 5 years. I am somewhat familiar with how our Federal justice agencies work. In all of my years, I have never seen what happened. We can be sure that if this had happened during the Clinton years, and these mistakes were being made, what we are saying and asking to be done would be mild, would be pablum, compared to what some of my colleagues on the other side would be asking for.

One other point before I get to the substance: This morning's New York Times reported the following, and the headline is, ''Senior Federal Prosecutors and FBI Officials Fault Ashcroft Over Leaked Inquiry.'' I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 16, 2003]

SENIOR FEDERAL PROSECUTORS AND F.B.I. OFFICIALS FAULT ASHCROFT OVER LEAK INQUIRY

(By David Johnston and Eric Lichtblau)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 15.—Several senior criminal prosecutors at the Justice Department and top F.B.I. officials have privately criticized Attorney General John Ashcroft for failing to recuse himself or appoint a special prosecutor to investigate the leak of a C.I.A. operative's identity.

The criticism reflects the first sign of dissension in the department and the F.B.I. as the inquiry nears a critical phase. The attorney general must decide whether to convene a grand jury, which could compel White House officials to testify.

The criminal justice officials, who spoke on the condition that they not be identified, represent a cross section of experienced criminal prosecutors and include political supporters of Mr. Ashcroft at the department's headquarters here and at United States attorneys' offices around the country.

The officials said they feared Mr. Ashcroft could be damaged by continuing accusations that as an attorney general with a long career in Republican partisan politics, he could not credibly lead a criminal investigation that centered on the aides to a Republican president.

Democrats have criticized each step of the inquiry as tainted by Mr. Ashcroft's relationship with the White House.

The investigation is trying to determine who told the syndicated columnist Robert Novak, as he wrote in July, that Valerie Plame, the wife of a former ambassador, Joseph C. Wilson IV, was a C.I.A. employee. Mr. Wilson was a critic of the administration's Iraq policies.

A senior Justice Department official acknowledged on Tuesday that the question of whether Mr. Ashcroft should step aside had stirred discussion in the department, but said that the dissent was limited and did not reflect the overall thinking of the career lawyers who are in daily control of the leak case. The official said that the option of recusal or referral to a special prosecutor remained ''wide open.''

The official said that the question of whether Mr. Ashcroft should step aside had been discussed among Mr. Ashcroft's senior advisers, but that so far none of the career lawyers on the case had recommended that the attorney general remove himself.

The official said Mr. Ashcroft had twice gathered his investigative team to urge them to find out who had leaked the identity of the C.I.A. operative and to prosecute that person if possible. ''He's angry about this,'' the official said.

* * * * *

But Mr. Ashcroft and the F.B.I. director, Robert S. Mueller III, operate as major members of Mr. Bush's antiterror team, a closeness that complicates a criminal inquiry at the White House managed by Mr. Ashcroft and Mr. Mueller.

Several alternative approaches have been suggested both inside and outside the Justice Department, the officials said. In one approach, Mr. Ashcroft would recuse himself from the case once James B. Comey, the federal prosecutor in Manhattan, took over as deputy attorney general in either an acting or permanent basis.

Mr. Bush said earlier this month that he intended to appoint Mr. Comey as deputy attorney general. Mr. Comey brings established prosecutorial credentials to the job.

If Mr. Comey took charge, it would avoid the time-consuming prospect of appointing a special counsel who would then have semi-independence to investigate the case, but would still be answerable to the attorney general.

Mr. Ashcroft is aware of the political sensitivity of the case, and aides said he had worked hard to ensure an aggressive investigation.

After a news report indicated that the F.B.I. would move cautiously because of the intense scrutiny, an angry Mr. Ashcroft had an aide call the F.B.I. immediately to let officials there know that that would not be the case, a Justice Department adviser said. ''He wants to make certain we're moving with all appropriate dispatch.''

Mr. Ashcroft and Alberto R. Gonzales, the White House counsel, have also been under fire for their initial handling of the case. The Justice Department allowed the White House to wait overnight on Sept. 28 before sending an electronic message ordering White House employees not to destroy records related to the leak.

Ashley Snee, a spokesman for Mr. Gonzales, said he believed the delay was acceptable because no one in the White House had any idea there was an investigation. But The New York Times and The Washington Post had reported the day before that the C.I.A. had forwarded the matter to the Justice Department for possible investigation.

Mr. SCHUMER. So now we are finding that even people within the Justice Department mention in the article that political supporters of Mr. Ashcroft at the Department's headquarters and at the U.S. Attorney's Offices around the country object, take issue with the way this investigation has been conducted.

Again, this was a serious crime.

This is what former President George H. W. Bush says about the leaking of names of undercover CIA agents: I have nothing but contempt and anger for those who betray the trust by exposing our sources. They are, in my view, the most insidious of traitors.

Serious stuff, traitors, not in the words of some partisan Democrat but of our present President's father, our former President.

Here we are running an investigation that makes one scratch one's head and wonder how serious, how competent, and how careful this investigation is.

I quote a former CIA agent, Mr. Marcinkowski, from an October 7 appearance on CNN, where he said:

> As an operations officer on scene in a country, the effects of this—

The leak—

> are that anyone who knows you or did know you will now look at your mosaic. They will look at the people you've come in contact with. They will suspect those people, be they official contacts or innocent contacts. They will suspect those persons of being intelligence agents. They could be subject to interrogation, imprisonment and even death, depending on the regime that you may be operating under.

He goes on to say:

> There's also ramifications for CIA morale. I'm not naive enough to say this is having a huge impact, but certainly, it contributes to a decline in morale when you know that your own government can identify you as a clandestine operator. Certainly, there's going to be a reluctance on the part of foreign nationals that may want to help the United States in these trying times. They're going to be reluctant to serve and help us with information, based on the fact that their identification may be revealed by the government.

So it is more obvious now than when we tried to ask for it several weeks ago that at the very minimum we need a special counsel and that Attorney General Ashcroft should recuse himself immediately. Yet we get continued mistakes and continued handling of this case as if someone does not know how to do it or someone does not care or someone is afraid to do it in a full-fledged sense.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this is not going to go away. The best thing we could do, not only to serve our country, which is in a time of war and I have had sympathy for that, but to serve this administration, is to put this out of any question, appoint a special counsel of high repute and integrity, and let the investigation go forward on its own and see wherever it leads.

That is why the amendment I will be introducing shortly is so important to all of us. I am not going to introduce it as of yet because I know several of my colleagues wish to speak.

Mr. HARKIN. I wonder if the Senator will yield for a question.

Mr. SCHUMER. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. First, I thank the Senator from New York for his very early and very eloquent statements on this issue, going clear back to July. It was the Senator from New York who first started alerting this body and the American people as to this disclosure by the Bush administration of an undercover CIA agent's name and the ramifications it had. So we owe the Senator from New York a great deal of gratitude for his leadership on this issue because it is a matter of very grave national security importance.

I have been listening to the Senator from New York talk about the need for a special counsel and why it is so important for the Attorney General to recuse himself from this. But I ask this of the Senator from New York. It seems to me one of the ways we might really get to the bottom of this in a hurry would be if those who leaked the information to the journalists were to release the journalists from any obligation to hide the sources.

I ask the Senator, would it not be possible for the President of the United States to call in all of his senior staff, have them sit down at a desk and sign a piece of paper releasing Mr. Novak and any other journalists from protection of his or her name as a possible source of the leak? Couldn't the President just have all of the senior White House people, senior administration people sign such a thing? Then wouldn't that release the duty or obligation of the journalists to protect their sources? And wouldn't that get to the bottom of it in a hurry? I ask the Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague from Iowa for his question, which is an interesting question, as well as his dogged pursuit in regard to the truth in this matter. I know this is one of many times he has come to the floor.

The bottom line is this gets us into the realm of journalists' rights and the shield law and other things. I think if the President would ask all of those in his office to release journalists from any strictures, any compunction about letting it be known—if they believed it appropriate—who leaked to them, that would be a very good idea.

I hasten to add that the journalists themselves might not do it. They have not done it in previous times. We probably would still need this investigation. But it certainly—and my colleague from Iowa is right and I wouldn't want to compel them and I know he wouldn't either, but it certainly would, again, call into good light the desire, professed desire, of those in the White House, including the President himself, to get to the bottom of this because obviously it could, and it could quickly, provided the journalists who were so released would be willing to come forward.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to the Senator from New York, it seems to me if the

President really wants to get to the bottom of this—and I don't really know that he does want to get to the bottom of this—I say to the Senator from New York, it seems odd the President has been so nonchalant about it, actually joking about it with foreign reporters.

Let's say, if I were a senior administration official working for the President, and the President called me in and said: ''Tom, I want you to sign this thing; it just says, 'I, Tom Harkin, hereby release any and all journalists from any obligation they may have to me to protect my name as any possible source of a leak of this information regarding Valerie Plame,''' and he'd ask me to sign it, it seems to me if I had nothing to hide, I would sign it. If I had something to hide, I might not want to sign it. Then the President would know.

You are obviously right, you don't want to force anyone, but obviously they work for the President.

I ask the Senator from New York, doesn't it strike you as odd that the President, who has spoken so forcefully about leaks and national security, has been so nonchalant about this? Doesn't it strike the Senator as odd?

Mr. SCHUMER. It does. I thank my colleague. It does strike me as strange. I agree with you. The times there has been joking or bantering about this, it bothered me very much.

Another thing that bothers me, along the same line as to what he has asked: This President, in my judgment, to his credit, has made it a point that we have to do everything we can to defend our soldiers on the front lines. Whatever one's opinion of the war in Iraq, whatever one's opinion of our actions in Afghanistan and Kosovo and everywhere else—Korea, where we have soldiers—this President has made it a hallmark of defending those troops and doing everything to defend those troops. In fact, we are here in the Chamber defending, of the $87 billion, the vast majority, I guess—over $60 billion—to help defend them in Iraq, something that most of us, myself included, support.

Yet when it comes to defending an agent who was on the front lines and has been betrayed by, in the words of President George H. W. Bush, a traitor, we get nonchalance, a joke here and there, ''What's the bother? What's the fuss?'' Excuses—''This wasn't an agent, it was an analyst.'' Or, ''This wasn't done by malice''—the effect still being the same. That is serious.

I would say one other thing to my colleague. The President could also demand that the culprit turn himself or herself in. I haven't heard that yet. Would you think that would be the case if someone had betrayed some of our soldiers in the field in Iraq?

There is sort of a strange dichotomy that my colleague from Iowa is absolutely right to point out. That is, for this betrayal of a soldier, if you will, who has been on our front lines, there is a nonchalance, an attitude: Well, who cares too much about this?

Do you know what it makes the average American think? It makes them think maybe there is something there, because if the President were certain that it might not go to one of his close associates, or the President were certain in his belief we had to get to the bottom of this, I don't think we would see the kinds of actions we have seen from the White House and even from the prosecution, because the prosecution itself, as I said, is not being handled well. Again, maybe not by design, but just by the structure that the President—the buck stops at his office—has allowed to persist, the structure being investigation.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for his response.

I have one last inquiry I would like to make and have the Senator address. A lot has been focused on the individual, Valerie Plame—whom I never met, of course. But a lot has been focused on her as sort of an isolated incident, just one person, and that is it.

It has occurred to this Senator, as the Senator from New York has so plainly stated, there are more than just the uniformed soldiers in Iraq fighting the war on terrorism. It is all of our undercover agents, our CIA, our information-gathering apparatus around the world to give us forewarning of what is going to happen, to get access to that vital information that we need in this fight against global terrorism.

Can the Senator address himself to the kind of chilling effect such a disclosure might have on operatives of ours in the CIA, around the globe today, who may be out there? They are getting their sources of information. But what if they think at some point in the future they could be outed, their name could be spread out there? What about, not only them personally, but what about all their contacts? Now their contacts are thinking: My gosh, if they are outed, I am outed and my life is at risk.

Could the Senator address himself to the broader kind of effects this might have on our fight on global terrorism?

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague from Iowa for his good question.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have been very patient. It is not a question. It is a request to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is correct. The Senator may only yield time for the purpose of a question.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I would be happy to yield for a rephrased question.

Mr. HARKIN. Does the Senator believe that such a disclosure could have a chilling effect on operatives of ours in the field today and who in the future may be out there risking their very lives gathering information that we need on the war on terrorism? Does the Senator believe this could have a chilling effect?

Mr. SCHUMER. I would like to answer my colleague. I do indeed. Don't take my word for it. A few minutes before my colleague came to the Chamber, I quoted former agent Mr. Marcinkowski who said that on CNN. It has been reported by the media all over the place that those who have served in intelligence say exactly that—that perhaps the greatest danger that has occurred here may not have been to the individual agent, may not have even been to the group of contacts that agent had when undercover but, rather, to the morale of the intelligence agency and, as importantly, to the effectiveness because agents know they can be ''outed'' because they or someone they are close to says someone high up may not like it and it could well have a chilling effect.

My reports are that the CIA from top to bottom is just furious that this happened for the very reason of my friend's question, and the answer to that which I was just giving.

The only way to alleviate it—the only way to restore that credibility—is to get to the bottom of this in a full and thorough investigation.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARKIN. The question is, Has the investigation been tainted so far? One instance which comes to this Senator's mind is when the Department of Justice announced an official investigation but they waited for days to notify the White House. I ask the Senator: Is this not an indication that the investigation has already been tainted by the Justice Department?

Mr. SCHUMER. In answer to my colleague's question, I believe this certainly calls into question the effectiveness of this investigation, perhaps the desire to get to the bottom of it, how strong that is and how full that is. In a letter, which I, along with Senator DASCHLE, Senator LEVIN, and Senator BIDEN, sent to the President, we raised that very question. We have not yet received an answer.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague.

I know my friend from Alaska is eager to draw this to something of a close and still allow us to have a vote.

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator will yield to answer my question?

Mr. SCHUMER. For the purpose of a question.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator's amendment, if offered, is subject to a point of order. Haven't we been working on something now for 45 minutes which is not germane to this bill?

Mr. SCHUMER. In answer to my colleague—and let me say I thought there was a gentlemen's agreement between leaders FRIST, DASCHLE, the bill managers, yourself, and our colleague from West Virginia that if the minority agreed to help complete work on this important bill by Friday the majority would not raise points of order against our amendments. In fact, as I understand it, a number of amendments have

been allowed to be voted on where points of order might stand.

Also, if I might just continue the point——

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. In 1 minute. I want to finish the answer to the question. It was indeed a question and not an invitation for a statement. I understand that.

But if this agreement was designed to address the fact that the House hasn't completed its work yet on the supplemental, it makes it impossible for Senators to defend the germaneness of our amendments without the text of a House bill to which to refer. We don't know what is in the House bill, nor if the House bill has a provision in there which might make this germane. That is why we came to that agreement.

Again, I wish to underscore the fact that my colleague from Alaska has honored the agreement and allowed votes on a number of amendments which clearly would be not germane. I think our side has honored the agreement as well, and we have tried to proceed without undue delay with our own amendments. Yet now we are arguing that this amendment might not be germane.

First, I disagree. It is utterly germane to the debate we are now involved in about supporting our troops overseas. As I mentioned, Valerie Plame was just as much a soldier in the war on terrorism. She was an expert on weapons of mass destruction, which is the casus belli of where we are. It is vital we get to the bottom of it.

I think this amendment is quite germane—more germane, in fact, than others. The supplemental includes $600 million to fund further weapons inspections. If we are going to spend $600 million, we have to know there is an honest assessment of whatever they may find or not find without fear of retaliation.

I understand that my colleague from Alaska has the right to object to this under germaneness. But I also understand—and I ask the question of him: Hasn't there been an agreement to allow nongermane amendments, and hasn't my colleague, in keeping that agreement, allowed nongermane amendments to be called up for a vote on the floor?

I yield to him for an answer.

Mr. STEVENS. I wonder if the Senator realizes he has just yielded the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Just for a question.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator asked me a question. But I will not argue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York will be allowed to yield to the Senator from Alaska for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. STEVENS. A gentlemen's agreement was entered into that we would not raise a point of order under rule XVI for germane amendments. But for those that are not germane, we made no such agreement. This is not germane to this bill. Therefore, I hope the Senator will not offer it. As a matter of fact, I hope he will take into account another answer which I will give to him about the question of germaneness. This matter is now in the counterintelligence section of the Department of Justice. That section has decades of experience and has really enormous experience in working on matters of this type.

It is my judgment, and I ask the Senator this question: Does he realize that this sense-of-the-Senate resolution has a connotation of lack of confidence—no confidence—in the work of the counterintelligence section, a group that has very distinguished career people, and that the legislative liaison for the CIA has indicated to me through my staff that they are following the standard procedures of a series of administrations in handling this matter, and both the CIA and the counterintelligence section believe there is no need for a special counsel at this time? Does the Senator realize that this is not something which is sought by those professionals experienced in the area?

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague for his question. He underscores my point. I understand what he is saying. But we have no knowledge if the Counterintelligence Division is solely in charge of this investigation. They have to report to the Attorney General, or to the head of the FBI, or to somebody else at every move they make. Have they been countermanded in where they want to go? We know none of that. In fact, the very statement my friend from Alaska related about his staff inquiry is the most information that has been publicly given about how this investigation is being conducted.

The problem we are trying to get at here and the reason a special counsel is so needed is very simple; that is, we don't know who is in charge. My colleague from Alaska said, staff to staff, they say it is counterintelligence.

May I yield to him for the purpose of a question only and then reclaim the floor? I ask my colleague for that permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from New York yielding to the Senator from Alaska for the purpose of answering a question?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the President. I thank my colleague from Alaska.

Does my good colleague know if Mr. Dion, head of the Counterintelligence Division—I have nothing bad to say about him—is required to report to anybody about whom he subpoenas, whom he questions, what kind of facts he is allowed to pursue, or can he do this completely on his own?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, from my experience with this section—and I do not get involved with this section too often—it is a counterintelligence section of the Department of Justice. They have their own system of investigation. It has a very broad agenda in terms of portfolio. They have the scope of the whole intelligence network to work with.

I share the Senator's umbrage about the leak. The question is, how to handle that leak. It is in the hands of the people who are trained and who have in the past discovered such leaks. Who will it be reported to? I am sure the criminal division of the Department of Justice, if and when they find who is responsible for the leak, because it is a violation of the criminal statute.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague for his answer. I simply say that in an area such as this, which is so unusual, this is not just the typical leak. The counterintelligence division handles scores of leak cases every year. My good colleague from Alaska is correct. However, none, as far as I am aware, have involved the revealing of the name of an agent. It is a much more serious situation. It is a crime in itself.

The bottom line is very simple: This is so important that we cannot leave to conjecture that the counterintelligence division generally does a good job so we will assume they are doing a good job here. I appreciate my colleague being on the floor when I spoke, but there have been a number of missteps along the way not caused by the counterintelligence division but by others. This is too important to leave to supposition. That is why we are seeking a special counsel. We cannot just say they generally do a good job, we assume they will do a good job on this. This is a crime, a matter of great importance. I would like to go further than that. That is the purpose of this amendment which I hope my colleague will allow us to offer and vote on, given the agreement.

I am happy to yield for another question.

Mr. STEVENS. On what basis does the Senator say this is a unique case? In my experience, I have known several leaks and several individuals who were apprehended for leaks, some prosecuted, some not. Is it the Senator's impression this is a case of first impression?

Mr. SCHUMER. It is my impression, in answer to my colleague's question, this is a question of rare impression. The number of times the name of an agent has been publicly published in the newspaper and leaked by somebody not on the other side but rather by somebody who is ''a high administration official,'' I cannot think of a one. I know some spies leak names. Aldridge Ames leaked names and was punished for it, but I don't know of a single instance where someone within the administration leaked the name of an agent.

If it is not a first impression, it is a very rare impression, quite different than most of the leaks we have had. That is my answer to my colleague's

question. I don't think this is usual or typical. I pray to God it is not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendments and consider the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REID, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. EDWARDS, proposes an amendment numbered 1872.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress concerning the appointment of a special counsel to conduct a fair, thorough, and independent investigation into a national security breach)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL COUNSEL TO CONDUCT A FAIR, THOROUGH, AND INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION INTO A NATIONAL SECURITY BREACH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the national security of the United States is dependent on our intelligence operatives being able to operate undercover and without fear of having their identities disclosed;

(2) recent reports have indicated that administration or White House officials may have deliberately leaked the identity of a covert CIA agent to the media;

(3) the unauthorized disclosure of a covert intelligence agent's identity is a Federal felony; and

(4) the Attorney General has the power to appoint a special counsel of integrity and stature who may conduct an investigation into the leak without the appearance of any conflict of interest.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Attorney General of the United States should appoint a special counsel of the highest integrity and stature to conduct a fair, independent, and thorough investigation of the leak and ensure that all individuals found to be responsible for this heinous deed are punished to the fullest extent permitted by law.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator for yielding the floor. Now, I am sorry to say, I make a point of order under rule XVI that this legislation on an appropriations bill is not germane.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield for a minute?

Mr. STEVENS. I don't know if that is debatable or not. I do not want to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is not debatable. The Senator has raised a point of order under rule XVI. The amendment does not appear to be germane and the point of order is sustained. The amendment falls.

Mr. STEVENS. If I still have the floor, I say to the Senator from New York, I have background being a U.S. attorney and being deeply involved in intelligence matters now for 35 years. I share his umbrage at the whole process. I will do everything I can to get to the bottom of this matter, but I do not think this is the time for a special counsel. There may come a time it will be required.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. REID. You talk legal background, but you did not go to a very good law school, did you?

Mr. STEVENS. No.

AMENDMENT NO. 1873

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I have an amendment which is on the list which has been announced, and I would like to send this amendment to the desk. I ask unanimous consent it be put in the appropriate place of the queue of amendments to be considered later on this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be sent to the desk, be set aside, and be scheduled at an appropriate time as agreed to on both sides. I would like the remaining 5 minutes before the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. My parliamentary inquiry is, may I raise rule XVI at this point?

HIV/AIDS is not germane to this bill, either.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not yet been reported.

Mr. STEVENS. I do not object to receiving the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for himself and Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 1873.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funds for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. (a) GLOBAL HIV/AIDS FUNDING.—For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading ''Global AIDS Initiative'' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 2004, $879,700,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated by this section shall be made available in accordance with the amount authorized in accordance with sections 202(d)(1) and 202 (d)(4)of Public Law 108-25.

(b) OFFSET.—The total amount appropriated under title II under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' (other than the amount appropriated for Iraqi border enforcement and enhanced security communications and the amount appropriated for the establishment of an Iraqi national security force and Iraqi Defense Corps) shall be reduced by $879,700,000.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall consult with, and provide a written report to, the appropriate committees of Congress, concerning the amount by which each sector, program, and activity is reduced pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President it is my understanding this is an amendment pertaining to HIV/AIDS, and I support all activities concerning that, but it is not germane to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska raises a point of order under rule XVI.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, may I address the point of order?

Mr. STEVENS. A point of order is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will entertain debate on the motion.

Mr. DURBIN. It is my understanding this $87 billion emergency appropriations requested by the administration includes foreign aid that is going to the nation of Iraq as well as Afghanistan. What I am suggesting is this item, some $800 million, in the nature of foreign aid be sent to fight the global AIDS epidemic. It would seem it is germane to the same issue before the Senate in the pending supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. STEVENS. That would be earmarking this money for a matter that is not germane for this bill. It is true that money could be used for that purpose, but I do not believe amendments are in order to start earmarking this money for items that are not germane to the bill.

I am raising that it is legislation on the appropriations bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Could the Chair address the question of the defense of germaneness if we are not entertaining a bill first passed by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Restate the question.

Mr. DURBIN. Could the Chair inform me as to the defense of germaneness and whether it applies in this situation

where we are not dealing with a bill already passed by the House and a question as to whether our amendment is germane to that House-passed bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The defense of germaneness does not apply when the Senate is considering a Senate bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Is the Chair prepared to rule on the germaneness question raised by the Senator from Alaska?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's understanding is the Senator from Alaska has challenged the amendment on the grounds that it is legislating on appropriations.

Mr. DURBIN. I am sorry, I thought—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. DURBIN. Is that debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the ruling is not debatable.

The point of order is sustained. The Chair rules the amendment constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill. The amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 1818

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 4 minutes of debate equally divided on each side on the Byrd amendment.

Who yields time?

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment is cosponsored by Senators BYRD, KENNEDY, LEAHY, BOXER, HARKIN, JEFFORDS, and KERRY.

The administration needs to change its course in Iraq. If the United States is ever to work successfully with the international community to obtain the contributions of troops and money that are needed to share the heavy burden of postwar Iraq, the White House must take real steps to share power with the United Nations.

The Byrd-Kennedy-Leahy amendment would push the administration to do more to share power in Iraq. It would also require the President to submit reports to Congress about the participation of other countries in Iraq, as well as a plan for supporting American troops by bringing them home.

The amendment gives the President $10.1 billion in reconstruction funds immediately but requires another vote by Congress before the other $10.2 billion in reconstruction funds can be spent.

It is imperative that Congress review the situation in 6 months to determine whether the President's efforts at the U.N. have paid off in more foreign contributions to the future of Iraq. Congress should also evaluate the President's plan for how to get the U.N. in, and the U.S. out of, Iraq. A vote in 6 months' time on whether to release the additional $10.2 billion in reconstruction funding would give Congress the opportunity to make a midcourse correction if our occupation of Iraq is still going poorly.

The Byrd-Kennedy-Leahy amendment is a simple amendment to help Congress watch the people's money and to support our troops by getting the international help they need.

Mr. President, I urge the Senators to support the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, 6 months ago, President Bush took the country to war with Iraq, without the support of key allies other than Britain, without the support of the international community at large. We didn't need international support to win the war. We all knew that our brave fighting men and women would defeat Saddam Hussein's forces easily. But we did—and we do—need the international community to help us win the peace—a painfully obvious truth that this administration has steadfastly refused to accept.

As long as Iraqis see us as occupiers rather than liberators, our troops will remain at increased risk and our efforts to rebuild Iraq's economy and political system will be suspect. The process of reconstructing Iraq and creating a new Iraqi government must be an international process—not an American process. Only then will it gain full legitimacy in the eyes of the Iraqi people and the world.

The Bush administration's brazen go-it-alone policy has placed the burden and the bill for rebuilding Iraq almost solely on the shoulders of the American people. They don't deserve it, and they don't want it. We need an immediate change of course.

For months I have been urging the administration to bring the United Nations and the international community into the process of rebuilding Iraq's economy and political system. The United Nations must be given a clearly defined, central role in the reconstruction of Iraq and in the process of establishing a new Iraqi government. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has been very clear: he will not send U.N. personnel back to Iraq—and risk their lives—without improvements in the security situation and an unambiguous U.N. role with clear lines of authority. In my view, the best way to achieve this is to transfer the authority over reconstruction and governance to the United Nations. The United Nations is not perfect but it has far more experience and capacity in these areas than the Pentagon and the Coalition Provisional Authority. Finally, the Iraqi people must be assured that political power and responsibility for reconstruction will be transferred to them quickly.

The administration's resolution, which the Security Council passed today, is long overdue. It will provide a modicum of international legitimacy which is essential to our success in Iraq. And it does require that the Iraqi Governing Council lay out by December 15 of this year a timetable and program for the drafting of a constitution and national elections. But this resolution does not fundamentally change the lines of authority and responsibility for the reconstruction and governance of Iraq. It is really more show than substance. The resolution will not gain meaningful international support for our efforts in Iraq. After months of dismissing and ridiculing the international community, the Bush administration will not gain tangible support for our efforts in Iraq—that is, boots on the ground and money in the coffers at this month's donor conference—as a result of this resolution.

In simply terms, the Security Council resolution adopted today is not the triumph of diplomacy, but rather the beginning of a much-needed process to bring real international support to our effort.

We in the Congress have a responsibility to push the administration to advance the diplomatic effort and not rest content with a fig leaf resolution that hides what remains an American occupation in Iraq. The amendment that Senator BYRD is offering, which I am pleased to cosponsor, seeks to do just that. It requires the President to certify that the U.N. resolution provides tangible international contributions, including substantial troop and financial contributions from other countries. In addition, it requires the administration to certify that reconstruction activities are being implemented in accordance with a new detailed plan to be submitted to the Congress no later than March 1 of next year.

This is a good amendment. It sends a clear message to the administration: You need a real, detailed plan for reconstruction Iraq and you need to do the hard work of diplomacy to internationalize the military and civilian sides of the operation to reduce the risks to our soldiers on the ground and take some of the financial burden off the American taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the amendment is an amendment that will require Congress to enact another appropriations for the balance of the reconstruction money. It will cap the reconstruction funds at $5 billion. It puts another road block in the way of the reconstruction efforts.

I referred earlier to yesterday's editorial in the Washington Post, which said:

> Paying to improve life for Iraqis will help create a safer environment for U.S. troops and will hasten the day they can leave. Rebuilding the electricity grid, fixing the water supply, getting the oil flowing, maintaining public safety—all this is central to hopes for stability and representative government.

I think the loss of momentum that will come from requiring another bill to be enacted before we get more money for reconstruction will destroy the whole concept of the plan that Ambassador Bremer is working on.

I call to the attention of the Senate, I also put in a letter I received by fax from Ambassador Bremer just today reaffirming his plea to us to pass this bill as soon as possible.

I do not think it is in the best interests of our troops. I do not think it is in the best interests of the Iraqi people. It certainly is not in the best interests of the person in charge of the whole effort, Ambassador Bremer, for the Byrd amendment to be approved.

For that reason, I move to table the Byrd amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1818. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 385 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Cochran	Frist
Allard	Coleman	Graham (SC)
Allen	Collins	Grassley
Bayh	Cornyn	Gregg
Bennett	Craig	Hagel
Bond	Crapo	Hatch
Breaux	Dayton	Hutchison
Brownback	DeWine	Inhofe
Bunning	Dole	Kyl
Burns	Domenici	Landrieu
Campbell	Ensign	Lott
Chafee	Enzi	Lugar
Chambliss	Fitzgerald	McCain
McConnell	Santorum	Stevens
Miller	Sessions	Sununu
Murkowski	Shelby	Talent
Nelson (NE)	Smith	Thomas
Nickles	Snowe	Voinovich
Roberts	Specter	Warner

NAYS—42

Akaka	Durbin	Leahy
Baucus	Edwards	Levin
Biden	Feingold	Lincoln
Bingaman	Feinstein	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham (FL)	Murray
Byrd	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Cantwell	Hollings	Pryor
Carper	Inouye	Reed
Clinton	Jeffords	Reid
Conrad	Johnson	Rockefeller
Corzine	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Schumer
Dodd	Kohl	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lieberman

The motion was agreed to.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings. Today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO HAMILTON PASCAL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Hamilton Pascal for his accomplishments in the business world for which he has earned the Thomas R. Fortune Business Award.

Hamilton was born and raised in Trinidad where he attended public elementary school and later, Burke High School. After graduating from Burke High School, he went on to obtain his license in Electrical Installation from Victoria Institute.

In 1976, Hamilton came to the United States and settled in Brooklyn, New York. He decided that he wanted to further his education in building maintenance and repairs, obtaining his license as a real estate salesperson.

Wanting to become more involved in civic affairs and learn more about politics in the United States, Hamilton became a member of Unity Democratic Club in the early 1990's. By joining Unity Democratic Club, he became involved with the Men's Council and took an active role in several of the activities held by UDC.

For the future, Hamilton is planning to own a home improvement store along with his son Eric Pascal, who currently resides with him.

Mr. Speaker, Hamilton Pascal has worked to improve his business skills and has shown a genuine interest in becoming actively involved in his community. As such, he is more than worthy of receiving our recognition. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in honoring this truly remarkable individual.

FREEDOM FOR BERNARDO AREVALO PADRON

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a Cuban prisoner of conscience. I rise today in honor of Bernardo Arevalo Padron.

Mr. Arevalo Padron founded the Cuban independent news agency Linea Sur Press in October 1996 to condemn the atrocious human rights violations committed by Castro's tyrannical regime. Mr. Arevalo Padron's insistence on reporting about the deteriorating plight of the Cuban people under Castro's machinery of repression led directly to his arrest.

Bernardo Arevalo Padron was jailed for six years in November 1997 for ''insulting'' Fidel Castro and calling him a ''liar'' for not keeping his promises about democracy and so many other matters. Mr. Arevalo Padron was sentenced to six years behind bars because he dared to print the truth about a government that ruthlessly represses any kind of dissent.

After five years of sadistic cruelty in Castro's gulag, Mr. Arevalo Padron has been diagnosed with leptospirosis, which is spread by rats. According to a report issued by Reporters Without Borders, Mr. Arevalo Padron should have been freed on parole in October 2000, but the government refuses to release him because he has not cooperated in the so called re-education program.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arevalo Padron has been slowly festering in Castro's inhumane dungeons since 1997 because he called Fidel Castro ''a liar''. Has ever a man been through so much for a single word of truth?

One of the key reasons why I bring the plight of Mr. Arevalo Padron to the attention of Congress is because there is no independent press in Cuba. None, Mr. Speaker.

Here in the United States we often say, ''the truth will set you free''; in Castro's deplorable dictatorship the truth will set you in the gulag for six years. I implore my colleagues to stand for truth, democracy and decency and call with one voice for the instant release of Bernardo Arevalo Padron.

HONORING ROBERTA R. GOLDMAN

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding individual, Roberta R. Goldman who will be receiving the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanitarian Award from the Shrewsbury Democratic Town Committee.

Mrs. Goldman has worked for years to improve her community in many different ways. In 1982, she joined the Shrewsbury Democratic Town Committee, which she has served on ever since, and currently serves as chairperson of the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanitarian Awards program and vice-chairperson of the town committee itself. In 1998 Mrs. Goldman was elected to the Massachusetts Democratic State Committee, of which she is now an elected representative from the Second Worcester Senatorial District and a member of the State Committee's Rules Committee. During Michael Dukakis' term as Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Mrs. Goldman was Director of Education Reform in the Office of Educational Affairs. Her efforts helped to create the Education Reform Act of 1985, an act that she helped to pass when she was a representative of the Eleventh Worcester District in the Massachusetts House of Representatives. As State Representative, she served on the committees on Education, Human Services and Elder Affairs.

Although Mrs. Goldman generally concentrates on helping Democratic candidates in Massachusetts, she has also ventured outside of the state frequently to campaign in New Hampshire as well as spending a summer in Texas, working for Ann Richards, who was running for Governor. Mrs. Goldman has also worked in Wisconsin partaking in the Dukakis presidential campaign and has given much time to aid former President William Clinton in New Jersey.

In addition to Mrs. Goldman's many political endeavors, she is an enthusiastic teacher, working for the Shrewsbury school system since 1971. In 1987, Mrs. Goldman began working at Shrewsbury High School as a social studies teacher. In the early 1990's, Mrs. Goldman established the Political Action Group, a non-partisan organization at Shrewsbury High School, which has enhanced many students' interests in politics and current events.

Finally, her contributions to improving the lives of individuals with developmental disabilities are significant. She is in her sixth term as President of the FOR Special Friends, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating my friend, Roberta Goldman.

A TRIBUTE TO HUGH ERROL BOSTON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Hugh Errol Boston for his accomplishments in the business world for which he has received the Thomas R. Fortune Business Award.

Hugh was born to Mr. & Mrs. Samuel and Ruth Boston of Bush Lot, Essequibo, Guyana. Hugh, the fourth of seven children, immigrated to the United States of America in December 1974.

He attended the Anna Regina Primary School and then continued his education by attending Burnette High School. After graduation, Hugh Errol became a member of the Guyana Police Force, where he was employed for four years.

Throughout his years in America, Hugh worked in various enterprises including the construction industry. He also worked at Pfizer Pharmaceuticals as a Quality Control Inspector and a mailroom supervisor at Philip Holtzer and Associates. However, Hugh never lost sight of his goal to establish himself as an entrepreneur. He would eventually realize his goal, opening Boston Shipping Enterprises at 506 Decatur Street, Brooklyn, NY.

He is committed to giving back to the community and has followed his motto of ''making a difference in anyone's life,'' to assist whenever possible. This is demonstrated by his numerous contributions to his community. He built a Church in honor of his mother at Bush Lot in Guyana where he sponsors a Vacation Bible School every summer, providing meals and organizing field trips. He also distributes toys to children at the community block party near his residence. Additionally, he offers part-time employment to youngsters who live within the vicinity of his business.

Hugh is married and is the proud father of four daughters.

Mr. Speaker, Hugh Errol Boston has achieved his life ambition in establishing his own business and has used his success to give back to his community. As such, he is more than worthy of receiving our recognition. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in honoring this truly remarkable individual.

TRIBUTE TO OYSTER BILINGUAL SCHOOL

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as the Hispanic Heritage Celebration—2003 draws to a close, I rise to pay tribute to Oyster Bilingual Elementary School, a pearl right here in the Nation's Capital. For over 30 years, Oyster School has proudly served the Hispanic community in Washington, DC.

The Oyster School, named after former D.C. Public Schools Superintendent, James F. Oyster, first opened its doors in the 1920's.

By 1970, the Oyster School was home to many immigrant families from Central America who began to settle in the Adams Morgan neighborhood in the District of Columbia.

These new parents along with community activists pushed for the creation of a bilingual program, one that would best instruct their children, whose first language was Spanish.

In the spring of 1971, the D.C. Public School Board approved a two-way bilingual program at the Oyster School. From the beginning, the Oyster School program was a partnership effort.

In addition to support from D.C. Public Schools, Oyster Bilingual Elementary School received Federal funding and a grant from the Ford Foundation for teacher training, curriculum development, and program evaluation.

As a result, a generation before the ''No Child Left Behind Act'' weaved ''scientifically-based research'' into the education lexicon, Oyster School put into place a scientifically-based model for teaching children to achieve to high standards in two languages—Spanish and English.

At the Oyster Bilingual Elementary School, approximately half the students speak Spanish as their first language and half the students speak English.

Students come from diverse ethnic and socio-economic groups. This year, 35 percent of Oyster's students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. All students are expected to master the D.C. Public Schools content in both languages. Oyster students measure up and test well in both languages, consistently placing Oyster Bilingual Elementary School in the top ten of the over 100 elementary schools in the District of Columbia.

The Oyster Bilingual Elementary School is a model for the Nation. It has received numerous accolades, including a citation for excellence from the U.S. Department of Education and an Exemplary School Award from the National Association for Bilingual Education.

Perhaps a more significant measure of the value of the Oyster Bilingual Elementary School experience is the fact that until D.C. Public Schools introduced a lottery system for admission, hundreds of parents would camp out for days in order to get a coveted ''first come, first serve'' slot at the school.

Oyster Bilingual Elementary School has fostered a sense of community and shared values between the immigrant community and the largely upper-middle class residents of the Woodley Park neighborhood. When the school faced closure in the early 1990's because of its dilapidated facilities, the community rallied and formed the 21st century school fund.

Through this community-public-private partnership, the financing was made available to build the first new school building in the District of Columbia in 20 years—a beautiful new facility that will serve both the growing Hispanic community and the D.C. community at large.

Oyster Bilingual Elementary School's long-term success is a product of community involvement and public-private partnerships.

The school has produced many distinguished alumni who serve as role models and continue to serve the Hispanic community in our nation's capital. Among them are:

Mirna Amaya, a child development specialist who works at Mary's Center for Maternal and Child Care in D.C.;

Nathanial Beers, a doctor at Children's Hospital Medical Center;

Olga Artiga, a kindergarten teacher at Oyster. Her sister Connie Artiga Oliver runs the after-school care program at Oyster; and

Cecilia Arce, a library assistant and a parent of three children at Oyster.

As Oyster Bilingual Elementary School begins to serve a new generation of students I commend it for staying true to its mission, which states:

''We believe that native Spanish-speaking children will learn to perform better in English in an environment that respects their native language and provides continued growth in their native language. In addition, we believe that the education of English speaking children will be enriched by achieving competency in a second language at an age when achieving such competency is easiest.''

Mr. Speaker, the administration at Oyster School is fulfilling this mission and I urge my colleagues in Congress to commend them for their efforts.

HONORING TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. speaker, I rise today to belatedly mark the occasion of Taiwan's National Day, October 10, 2003. It nonetheless gives me great pleasure to report that Taiwan is a thriving democracy that guarantees and protects essential human rights of all its citizens.

Taiwan stands as a remarkable testament to what humankind is capable of when freedom and democracy combine to fuel the economic engine. Even with only 23 million citizens, Taiwan remains one of Asia's strongest economic ''tigers''. With the world's 17th largest economy and the world's 15th largest trade volume, Taiwan has made significant contributions to the global economy.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwan remains a critical U.S. ally, and it is my hope that Taiwan will continue to serve as a beacon for freedom and democracy throughout East Asia.

Today I would like to extend my solidarity to the 23 million freedom loving citizens of Taiwan and their democratically elected leader, President Chen Shui-bian in commemoration of Taiwan's recent National Day of celebration.

A TRIBUTE TO ROY KING

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Roy King for his dedication to his community which has earned him the Thomas R. Fortune Exemplary Service Award.

Roy was born in Georgia and at the age of 6 months he and his family moved to Far Rockaway, NY, where he still resides.

Roy attended public elementary school and junior high schools and graduated from Far Rockaway High School. After high school, he attended Queens Borough Community College, receiving a degree in physical education.

As someone who loves to be around children, Roy applied for a position in security and was hired by the New York City Board of Education where he worked for several years. In 1977, Roy was hired as a counselor for the New York City Department of Social Services—Youth Division where he still works as a child care specialist at the Atlantic Diagnostic Center.

Roy was introduced to the Unity Democratic Club by J.J. Johnson, where he also is an active member of the Men's Council.

He has been a member of St. John Baptist Church in Rockaway Beach, NY for over 20 years where Elder J.D. Williams is the Pastor. He is a faithful member of the Usher Board and the Men's Ministry.

With his wife Anne, Roy has a beautiful home in Rockaway Beach, where they are raising three girls and two grandchildren. All his children and other children around him call him ''Pa Pa''. Roy feels blessed to have his mother and five siblings living in the Far Rockaway area as well.

Mr. Speaker, Roy King has shown that he is committed to his community through both his professional choices and participation in the Unity Democratic Club. As such, he is more than worthy of receiving our recognition. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in honoring this truly remarkable individual.

URGING THE SAUDI AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES TO HELP RESOLVE A LONG STANDING DISPUTE

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the Saudi Ambassador to the United States to help resolve a long standing dispute between another Saudi Prince—a cousin to the Ambassador—and a resident in my home state.

Nearly 20 years ago, Prince Abdul Aziz, son of Prince Salman, the current Governor of Riyadh, borrowed $1.7 million from Bob Burch in Colorado.

In 1991, an independent accounting study confirmed the debt. Regrettably, after promising to honor the results of the study, Prince Abdul Aziz never paid up.

Bob Burch had been a great friend to the Royal family, supporting them through medical and personal crises, college degrees and even a plane crash.

This is a time of great challenge in the U.S. relationship with Saudi Arabia. Never before have we asked the Saudis to work so closely with us to fight terrorism. It is in that spirit of cooperation that I urge the Saudi Ambassador to work to put this longtime dispute behind us.

INTRODUCING THE AFFORDABILITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 2003

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for the Affordability in Higher Education Act, legislation I authored to address the college cost crisis that is facing our Nation. This bill moves beyond the rhetoric, and offers real solutions that will hold colleges accountable and empower consumers as we all work together to keep higher education affordable.

For decades, the cost of higher education has been rising dramatically. Tuition increases have far outpaced increases in the rate of inflation and the growth in family incomes, and these skyrocketing costs are having a devastating impact on American students and families. This is not a new problem. Over half a decade ago I stood here and voiced these same concerns. And several years before that, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG was leading a similar charge to keep college affordable. Yet in all that time, we have been unable to find solutions, and the cost of college just keeps going up.

According to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, cost factors are preventing 48 percent of college-qualified low-income students from attending a four-year institution, and 22 percent from having access to any college at all. At the rate we are going, by the end of the decade 2 million students will lose out on the chance to achieve the dream of a college education. This is unacceptable, and I believe we can no longer stand idly by while our Nation's students, the future of our country, are being priced out of the promise of higher education.

The Affordability in Higher Education Act is simple in its purpose, but monumental in its potential to help struggling students and families. The bill proposes to empower the consumers of higher education—students and parents—with significant information on higher education, and hold colleges and universities accountable for the dramatic cost increases that are hampering our Nation's ability to make the dream of higher education a reality for needy students.

The bill establishes a ''College Affordability Index,'' a standard measure by which the consumers of higher education can understand and compare tuition increases in real terms. Using data already being reported by colleges and universities, the U.S. Department of Education will make information about college costs, including the College Affordability Index, publicly available through a user friendly website.

The bill provides colleges and universities with ample time to meet the challenge of affordability, and beginning in 2008, schools will begin to be held accountable for their cost increases. Using the College Affordability Index, schools that increase their tuition and fees by more than twice the rate of inflation over a three year period will be required to provide more information and undertake actions to improve affordability.

I believe one of the most important factors in addressing the college cost crisis is the need to empower consumers. Parents and students simply do not have access to adequate information necessary to make informed decisions in the higher education marketplace. And as we empower consumers and encourage accountability, we must also embrace innovation.

That's why the Affordability in Higher Education Act includes a demonstration program that will encourage schools to look for innovative strategies to hold down costs without sacrificing quality. The bill would grant waivers to schools which apply and are chosen to participate—allowing these institutions to have the freedom to find new ways to improve affordability and ultimately, increase access.

The face of higher education has changed significantly in recent years, and while college costs are a formidable barrier, the fact is, today's students face other obstacles as they work to reach their higher education goals. One of the most needless and often frustrating obstacles is an inability to transfer credits among institutions.

Recent data from the Department of Education tells us that over half of the nation's postsecondary education students attend more than one college or university. Yet many of these students struggle to transfer their credits, and as a result must retake coursework which costs both time and money. The bill recognizes that students deserve to have freedom and flexibility, and would make it easier for students to transfer credits. Let me be clear—the bill does not mandate coursework, nor does it require that particular credits be accepted to or from particular institutions. It simply makes it clear that credits cannot be denied based solely on what organization accredited the institution, so long as it is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. Such territorial or political practices are harming students, and must not continue.

As colleges and universities strive to meet the challenge of affordability, I also believe we must also do our part at the Federal level to make that possible. Schools often tell us that they are burdened by voluminous and often unnecessary regulations and paperwork requirements. We must ease that burden by eliminating such cumbersome requirements. Last year, through the FED UP initiative, we made great strides in reducing red tape and eliminating unnecessary and costly regulations. The bill I'm offering today will continue that effort, and help institutions as they work to increase affordability.

Taken together, the reforms in this bill will make a real difference to the millions of students and families who are counting on us. The future of our Nation—today more than ever—depends on our ability to educate our students. We cannot allow the continued explosion of college costs to go unchecked. The time has come to find solutions, and today, I believe we are taking a step in the right direction.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure, Mr. Speaker; and I look forward to a higher education system that is accessible to every single American student who strives for it, regardless of financial circumstances. Our students, and our Nation, deserve nothing less.

TRIBUTE TO DUB RITER

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly great American, great leader and dear friend—A.W. ''Dub'' Riter of Tyler, Texas—whose passing on September 23, was mourned by friends and admirers from East Texas to the White House. Dub was admired and respected not only for his many civic contributions and professional success but also for his goodness, compassion and humility. Dub truly cared about people and wanted to make life better for everyone. He gave selflessly of his time, talent and financial backing to countless civic, business and educational causes locally, statewide and nationally, and in doing so he sought to help others—not call attention to himself.

Dub was my dear friend and advisor for many years. He was a highly recognized and successful banker, retiring from his 50-year banking career as senior chairman of the Board of NCNB in Tyler (now Bank of America) in 1988. Throughout his career and after his retirement, he was tirelessly devoted to a host of community and State activities and organizations.

Education was particularly important to Dub. In 1997 Gov. George W. Bush appointed him to serve as a member of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System for a six-year term ending Feb. 1, 2003. Gov. Rick Perry then asked him to extend his term through the legislative session this year. He was a vice chairman of the board and a member of the Finance and Planning Committee, Facilities Planning and Construction Committee and the Student, Faculty and Staff Campus Life Committee. Dub was currently serving as a member of the Governor's Select Task Force on Public Education.

Dub and his wife, Betty Jo, also were devoted to The University of Texas at Tyler, where Dub served as chairman of the development board. Dr. Rodney Mabry, UT Tyler President, said that Dub was the ''heart and soul'' of the university the past several years. Dub and Betty Jo donated a $1.35 million gift to UT Tyler to create the Dub and B.J. Riter Millennium Carillon Tower and Plaza and were involved in many activities at the university.

Dub also served as chairman of the University of Texas Health Center at Tyler Development Board and was a past president of the

UT Tyler Educational Foundation, Inc., and the Texas Chest Foundation. At one time he served as president of the East Texas State Fair Association, East Texas Hospital Foundation, East Texas Symphony Association, Mother Frances Hospital Foundation, Texas Rose Festival Foundation, Tyler Area Chamber of Commerce, Tyler Economic Development Council, Tyler Industrial Foundation and United Way. He was a board member of the East Texas Communities Foundation, East Texas Medical Center Regional Healthcare System, Regional East Texas Food Bank, Salvation Army and Tyler Junior College Foundation.

As a testament to his lifetime of service, he received the W.C. Windsor Award as Tyler's Most Outstanding Young Man of the Year in 1958 and the T.B. Butler Award as Tyler's Most Outstanding Citizen of the Year in 1968. In 1987 he received the Patriot of the Year award from UT Tyler, and in 1994 he and his wife received the All Saints Episcopal School Flame of Excellence award. This year he received the Business Hall of Fame honor from Junior Achievement of Greater Tyler, of which he was a charter member.

At the State level, Dub was a life board member of the Texas Research League, serving as treasurer for six years, and served two terms as president of the Texas Association of Taxpayers. He was a past board member of the Texas Chamber of Commerce, which named him East Texan of the year in 1992. In 1989 Gov. Bill Clements appointed him to the Texas Growth Fund Board of Trustees, and in 1990 he was appointed to the Teacher Retirement System Board of Trustees. He was a member of the Governor's Business Council Executive Committee and the Executive Committee of the Chancellor's Council for The University of Texas System.

This legacy of outstanding achievement speaks to the dedication and leadership of this incredible man—and underlying his remarkable lifetime of service was his basic goodness and kindness. His gentle spirit, positive attitude and belief in others were evident in all that he did. Dub inspired, guided and served as a mentor to so many. He had an abiding faith in God and was a leader in the First Presbyterian Church of Tyler, where he served as elder, trustee, deacon and Sunday School teacher.

There was an outpouring of sympathy following Dub's death. The President and Mrs. Bush sent their condolences. National, State and local dignitaries attended his memorial service, and hundreds in the community expressed their love and support to his family—his beloved wife of 53 years, Betty Jo; son A.W. ''Whit'' Riter III and daughter-in-law Cynthia; daughter Melinda Shoemake and son-in-law Tom, six grandchildren and one great-grandson.

Dub touched and enriched so many lives, and in his absence there will be a void that will be difficult to fill. But Dub also leaves a powerful legacy of service and selflessness that will be felt for years to come. Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn today, let us join his family and many friends in celebrating and honoring the life of this great Texan and great American—A.W. ''Dub'' Riter—whose exemplary life we will remember and cherish.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed rollcall votes Nos. 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, and 531 during the week of September 30 through October 2. Had I been present, I would have voted the following:

Rollcall vote No. 524: Sandlin Motion to Instruct on H.R. 1—''no''; rollcall vote No. 525: Pallone Motion to Instruct on H.R. 1308—''no''; rollcall vote No. 526: H. Res. 357—''yes''; rollcall vote No. 527: Dicks Motion to Instruct on H.R. 2691—''no''; rollcall vote No. 528: Case Motion to Instruct on H.R. 1—''no''; rollcall vote No. 529: Davis (AL) Motion to Instruct on H.R. 1308—''no''; rollcall vote No. 530: Adoption of the Conference Report on S. 3—''yes''; rollcall vote No. 531: Obey Motion to Instruct on H.R. 2660—''no''; rollcall vote No. 532: H. Con. Res. 274—''yes''; rollcall vote No. 533: Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 1—''no''; and rollcall vote No. 534: Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 1—''no.''

HONORING LAURA BERG

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I rise today to honor one of my constituents from Santa Fe Springs, California, Laura Berg, who has recently been named to the U.S. Olympic Women's Softball Team. Laura has been a member of this team in the 1996 and 2000 Olympic games, winning gold medals both times. She is one of four two-time Olympic champions on the current team which will compete in the 2004 Olympic games in Athens, Greece. Berg started as a centerfielder in all 10 games in the 2000 Olympics and will play outfield for the team in 2004.

Berg has been a part of the USA Softball national system since 1994 when she was member of the USA Team that captured gold at the ISF Women's World Championship in St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada. In addition to her Olympic glory, Laura has won numerous accolades for her softball skills at the high school, college, national and international levels, including two gold medals at the Pan American Games and three World Championship gold medals. A graduate of Santa Fe High School and Fresno State University, she is of three players at Fresno State to ever boast 300 or more career hits and post a 160-game defensive errorless streak. She also spent 4 years as an assistant coach for the Fresno State Bulldogs team.

Laura firmly believes in setting challenging goals for herself and working hard to achieve them, whether she is practicing softball and studying in school. Her commitment to her sport, positive attitude, and strong work ethic have led to her extraordinary success and make her a role model for other young women.

Laura began playing softball as a child, tagging along to a program in which her parents had enrolled her twin sister, Randi. She continues to be inspired by the challenges of the game and has become a veteran leader for her teammates.

Laura is married to Rob Peterson, the Assistant Athletic Director at the University of South Dakota. The two met when Peterson was Director of Facilities at Fresno State.

For the next 11 months, Laura and her teammates will be working hard in preparation of defending their Olympic title. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Laura and the other outstanding women who make up the team and in wishing them great success.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. HELENA HOSPITAL IN ST. HELENA, CA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the St. Helena Hospital of Napa County as it celebrates its 125th Anniversary.

On June 1, 1878, the Rural Health Retreat opened its doors to the public. 125 years later, the Rural Health Retreat has a new name and a new look but its commitment to quality healthcare remains the same. Today, the St. Helena Hospital is the world's oldest continuously operating Seventh-day Adventist hospital.

The hospital has grown substantially over the years, both in its ability to heal and in its physical space. What began as a small two-story building has matured into a state-of-the-art facility, which includes a 24-hour emergency room, a heliport, and top-of-the-line surgical suites.

Mr. Speaker, among other services, the St. Helena Hospital offers a wide range of facilities to assist our community members in overcoming their illnesses including addictions. Specifically, the hospital has a mental health unit, an alcohol and chemical recovery program and it houses wellness programs such as the Nicotine Addiction Program.

In 1974, a team of surgeons performed the first open-heart surgery in the North Bay, paving the way for St. Helena Hospital to become a leader in cardiac care. Today, history continues to be written and St. Helena Hospital has been named among the Top 100 Cardiovascular Hospitals in the country.

Mr. Speaker, during its 125 years of existence, the St. Helena Hospital has been a medical sanctuary for thousands of people from both in and out of our community. The hospital has a wonderful tradition of providing for the sick. Regardless of who you are or where you are from, you will receive the best medical assistance possible at the St. Helena Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, for maintaining such a high standard of excellence and for healing our community for over 125 years, it is appropriate that we honor the St. Helena Hospital as they recognize their 125th anniversary.

HALF-EMPTY, HALF-FULL

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues the October 5, 2003, an editorial from the Omaha World Herald, which is entitled ''Half-empty, half-full.'' As the editorial correctly notes, Iraq remains a country ''full of positive potential but also fraught with danger.''

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Oct. 5, 2003]

HALF-EMPTY, HALF-FULL

Gene Taylor, a Democratic U.S. representative from Mississippi, recently returned from a trip to Baghdad. He struck the right note when he said the situation in Iraq ''is neither going as well as the administration says it's going nor as badly as the media say it is going.''

Indeed, the situation is decidedly mixed. That hasn't stopped diehard partisans on either side from trying their best to highlight only one facet of the matter, however.

The catalog of challenges is well known. Saddam Hussein loyalists and outside terrorists have succeeded, for the time being, in rattling people's nerves about security. Enemies of the U.S. campaign have assassinated one member of Iraq's Governing Council and murdered a Shiite cleric who advocated tolerance for the American presence. They have used pinprick attacks to kill and would U.S. soldiers at a slow but relatively steady rate that has diminished support for the Iraq operations among many Americans.

Meanwhile, saboteurs continue to hobble the electrical grid and oil-pipe network. Large numbers of Iraqis remain without jobs. Mafia-style gangs have become a serious concern in Baghdad. Ethnic tensions simmer among Iraq's Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds, sometimes erupting violence.

The United States has come up short, so far, in gaining financial assistance from foreign governments. And a variety of uncertainties beset the ambitious endeavor to move Iraq's political system toward a constitutional republic.

And yet, much is going right. A vivid description of the progress came in an opinion essay written by Julie Flint, a veteran Middle East journalist, for a Lebanese newspaper. Media depictions of Iraq as trapped in bottomless turmoil are wrong, she argued:

''Outside Baghdad, in the Shiite south, the mood was overwhelmingly upbeat. In Basra, ordinary people gave the thumbs-up at the mere sight of a Briton. . . . In Amara, streets were buzzing well after midnight. . . . Shops are overflowing with imported goods; food prices are lower than they were during Saddam's last years. Approximately 85 percent of primary and secondary schools have reopened. . . . All Iraqi cities and 85 percent of its smaller towns have fully functioning municipalities.''

Similarly, Pamela Harris, a United Press International writer praised for her wartime reporting, noted in a recent good news/bad news analysis how she had seen ''happy children running out to greet Marines when they walk through downtown Hillah without body armor or rifles because they have worked long and hard to win the trust of the townspeople, and they have succeeded.''

USA Today recently noted that, thanks to U.S. policy that as tapped $1.7 billion in Iraqi assets frozen during the Gulf War of 1991, government workers in Iraq have received major pay increases. The article described a police officer whose monthly pay has gone from $25 before the war to $275 now.

This leap in the purchasing power of many Iraqis, combined with a tariff-free influx of imported products, has spurred a dramatic flurry of consumer spending, not least on major items such as refrigerators and ovens. (The average price for home appliances has fallen by 41 percent from prewar levels)

Iraq, in short, is in the middle of a momentous time of transition—full of positive potential but also fraught with danger.

As the debate rages over whether the glass is half-empty or half-full, one thing is certain: The United States cannot cut and run. Together with the Iraqi people and whatever support can be mustered from the international community, we will have to see this through—without minimizing how difficult the task will be.

TRIBUTE TO DAVIS HELBERG

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Davis Helberg's leadership with the Northeast-Midwest Institute. Davis has been an Institute director for the past eight years and ably led the board's nominations committee. With his effortless management style, he ensured that the Institute balanced the region's needs for economic vitality and environmental quality. But this should surprise no one.

If there is one word I could use to describe Davis, it is ''passionate.'' A native Minnesotan who grew up on a family farm in a small Finnish community where hard work was considered a hometown value, Davis has been a passionate worker and leader throughout his varied careers. Living near Lake Superior, it's not surprising that in 1959, at the age of 17, Davis worked his first paying job as a deckhand on a lake steamer. After a few years as a newspaper reporter, he returned to his maritime career, working as a vessel agency employee, port public relations director, president of a stevedoring company and, until his retirement earlier this year, Executive Director of the Seaway Port Authority of Duluth. For more than forty years, Davis has tirelessly, served Duluth, the broader Great Lakes community, the national maritime industry, and the northeast and midwest States. It is said that Davis Helberg's name is synonymous with the Great Lakes maritime industry in many national and international circles. I couldn't agree more. Might I add that I believe he is the most passionate Finn I have ever met.

I have known Davis for almost three decades. During that time, I have been the recipient of much of his passionate maritime advocacy. But his many accomplishments are attributable to more than just passion. Davis succeeded in his many endeavors because of solid leadership, vast knowledge, unparalleled experience and energetic dedication, not to mention his legendary storytelling ability. He served 24 years as executive director of the Duluth Seaway Port Authority—the longest serving in the Great Lakes, and he has been a frequent chairman of the American Association of Port Authorities. After eight years, his invaluable service at the Northeast Midwest Institute will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I was a founder of the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition. The Coalition and the Institute long have provided valuable analysis on an array of economic and environmental issues. They have worked hard to ensure bipartisan cooperation among Midwestern and Northeastern lawmakers. Davis Helberg, with his unique talents and unwavering passion, has improved that tradition. He made a difference. His contributions to the Northeast-Midwest Institute are much appreciated.

PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM PAYING SUBSISTENCE CHARGES WHILE HOSPITALIZED

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2003

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strongest possible support for H.R. 2998, and urge my colleagues to join me in passing this important legislation.

I am extremely pleased that the leadership has brought this bill to the floor today, but I am thoroughly confused as to why the Department of Defense has even made this legislation necessary. It is absolutely mind-boggling that they charge military personnel for meals while they are hospitalized with injuries suffered while in combat or training.

Mr. Speaker, on September 24 we passed the conference report for the FY04 Defense Appropriations bill, which provided appropriations for the DoD totaling $368 billion dollars. This figure marked an increase of approximately $13 billion for the DoD. I voted in support of this conference report because I felt that it provided important funding for our troops and for the war on terrorism, but I cannot believe that the DoD, with around $355 billion in funds for FY03, could possibly charge these men and women for the meals they eat while they recover from injuries. This is unconscionable, and I thank Mr. YOUNG for introducing his legislation to remedy this outrage.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation and I will most certainly be voting in support of its passage. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of our troops and to correct this ridiculous situation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ARMENIAN VICTIMS INSURANCE FAIRNESS ACT

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the ''Armenian Victims Insurance Fairness Act''—legislation to provide states with the authority to assist survivors of the Armenian Genocide.

At the end of the 19th century, major American and European insurance companies began expanding their operations into the Ottoman Empire and thousands of Armenians in the area purchased life insurance policies as a form of savings and investment for the

future. By 1915, it is reported that one French-based company had sold more than 11,000 policies in the area. Almost all of these policyholders were massacred when a systematic campaign of ethnic cleansing was launched, killing more than 1.5 million Armenians.

Over eighty years later, insurance companies still have not paid the benefits due on the thousands of policies sold. Some families have tried for years to obtain owed benefits, but insurance companies have demanded that the survivors produce non-existent documents, such as death certificates.

In order to provide victims with the justice they deserve, California enacted legislation to assist both Armenian victims and Holocaust victims in recovering outstanding insurance claims. In addition to providing a right of action for claims arising out of such policies, California enacted an additional law requiring insurance companies doing business in their state to disclose information about Holocaust-era insurance policies. A similar requirement was omitted from the Armenian victims legislation because of a pending Supreme Court challenge of the Holocaust disclosure law.

In a 5–4 ruling, the Supreme Court in AIA v. Garamendi recently struck down the California disclosure law, citing Administration efforts to settle Holocaust insurance claims and stating that ''Congress has done nothing to express disapproval of the President's policy [with respect to settling such claims and preempting state efforts in this area].''

Although no similar Administration efforts have interfered with the settlement of Armenian claims, it is important for Congress to speak clearly on this issue. Private settlement negotiations between insurance companies and families have been slow with no final resolutions reached to date. Families should not have to wait any longer for disclosure of policyholder lists.

I have introduced two pieces of legislation to specifically allow states to collect insurance information for victims and survivors of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust. The Armenian Victims Insurance Fairness Act specifically provides states with the authority to pass disclosure laws related to insurance policies in effect at any time between 1875 and 1923 that were issued to persons domiciled in the Ottoman Empire, such as Armenians, Greeks, and Assyrians.

The Armenian Victims Insurance Fairness Act, and my companion legislation the Holocaust Victims Insurance Fairness Act (H.R. 3129), specifically provide states with the authority to pass policyholder disclosure laws and explicitly express Congressional disapproval of any Executive branch policy or agreement that preempts State efforts in this area. Pleasejoin me in this effort to finally provide justice to those who have been denied it for so long.

RECOGNIZING PANCREATIC CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of recognizing Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month. This resolution comes at a fitting time for me and other Members and staff in the House. I recently lost a good friend and former aide, Barry Beringer, to pancreatic cancer.

Barry was a remarkable man, a warm friend and a consummate counsel. His love of history permeated his work as a Committee General Counsel. His warmth and gently inclusive approach to difficult negotiations and situations made him a friend to all, even to those who may have disagreed with him. His pure motives earned him universal respect and admiration from his friends and colleagues.

Barry served as my General Counsel during my tenure as Chairman of the House Science Committee. His sage advice, thoughtful perspective, and his respect for the history of the institution guided many a decision. His counsel was invaluable and will be missed greatly not only by me but by all who worked with him and around him. His warm humor and collegial approach to everything is unique in this institution . . . and will be missed.

In addition to being a loving husband and father, Barry was a loving human being who left us all richer for having known and worked with him.

Congressman Platts introduced this important resolution to raise awareness of pancreatic cancer. Unfortunately, no one knows the exact causes of pancreatic cancer. Doctors are rarely able to explain why one person gets pancreatic cancer and another does not. I am pleased that the House is acknowledging this deadly disease and raising awareness of pancreatic cancer so others may not suffer the same fate as my friend Barry.

HONORING TYLER MATTHEW PINCHOT

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tyler Matthew Pinchot, a 23-year veteran of the Buena Park Police Department.

Tyler was raised in my district in the city of Garden Grove and he was a graduate of Golden West College's police program in 1979.

He was the only Buena Park police officer to win the Officer of the Year Award two years in a row in 1991 and 1992.

When not on duty protecting citizens, he volunteered his time for his community. He was a Special Weapons and Tactics team member, station house Santa Claus and a tactical officer at Fullerton College's police reserve academy.

Sadly, on June 13 Tyler was trying to catch up to a traffic violator when a car struck his motorcycle. He later died as a result of his injuries.

Tyler was a great citizen. He was a man who devoted himself to his community. His hard work and dedication will serve as an inspiration to others.

RECOGNIZING CITIZENS FINANCIAL GROUP FOR ITS ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Citizens Financial Group on being recognized with both the ''Seven Seals'' and ''Pro Patria'' awards.

In response to the U.S. military actions in Iraq, this Rhode Island business implemented an enhanced military leave policy in February of 2003 that included matched pay, continuance of insurance coverage, job guarantee upon return, and support to employees affected by a family member's call to duty. Due to this comprehensive policy, the Office of the Secretary of Defense awarded Citizens the New Hampshire Committee for the Employee Support of the Guard and Reserve ''Seven Seals'' award, and the Rhode Island Guard and Reserve gave the company its ''Pro Patria'' award. The ''Pro Patria'' award honors the most outstanding employer of reservists.

Citizens Financial Group should be commended for the work they have done to help ensure an employee will not undergo financial or emotional hardships after he or she is called upon to protect our country. It is my hope that other businesses will follow in these noble steps to show much-deserved gratitude for members of the National Guard and Reserves.

I hope our colleagues will join me in congratulating Citizens Financial Group on its achievements.

TRIBUTE TO THE MASHANTUCKET PEQUOT TRIBAL NATION

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as cochairmen of the Congressional Native American Caucus, my colleague Congressman J.D. HAYWORTH and I would like to ask our colleagues to join us in paying tribute to the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation on the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Mashantucket Pequot Indian Land Claims Settlement Act. This landmark legislation settled the Tribes' land claim and granted federal recognition to the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for thousands of years, this land has been home to the Mashantucket Pequots and their ancestors. Centuries before the arrival of Columbus, the Pequots had a sophisticated understanding of their land, which stretched across present-day Southeastern Connecticut.

Like other northeastern Tribes, the Pequots had developed a rich and complex culture. Their language, medicine, rituals, horticulture, trade, government, and social organization defined what it meant to be a Pequot. Within two decades of contact with the white settlers, smallpox and other diseases killed more than half of the Pequots and devastated the social structure of those who survived. Then, in 1637, the settlers in colonial Massachusetts

and Connecticut waged war on the Tribe. In a little more than an hour, hundreds of Pequot men, women and children died. The survivors were dispersed, and the settlers took their land.

As a testament to the bravery and resiliency of the Pequot people, these tragic events did not bring about the end of the Pequot Tribe. Rather, the past three centuries has marked a period of strife, conflict, and a determination to regain its land and bring its people home.

Mr. Speaker, two important themes run through the Pequot history: a persistence to maintain a tribal identity and a struggle to hold onto tribal land. By the mid-17th century, the Mashantucket Pequots had already returned to the land from which they had been banished. In the decades that followed, they were relocated to an area within their historic territory, but then were slowly and wrongfully deprived of most of that land as well. Throughout the centuries, the reservation's population dwindled as Tribal members were forced to seek jobs and housing elsewhere. For many years, the State of Connecticut blocked the return of Tribal members to their land. Still, the Tribe endured.

Finally, in 1983, after years and years of struggle, the Congress enacted the legislation that settled the Tribes' land claim and provided federal recognition to the Tribe. The legislation transformed all aspects of the Tribe's existence and was critical in the Tribe's dramatic economic resurgence. Through the years, Tribal members have worked to re-establish a community and are achieving self-sufficiency by providing employment, health care, social services, education and infrastructure to their people.

A primary concern of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation continues to be the preservation of Pequot history and culture. To accomplish this, the Nation maintains a Cultural Resources Department and a Historical and Preservation Committee made up of Tribal members. The Tribe has also worked to protect important archaeological sites within its territory.

Mr. Speaker, in a short twenty years, the Mashantucket Tribal Nation, led by their elected leaders, have done so much to protect and enhance the tribal sovereignty of their people. They have persevered as a Tribe for centuries under the harshest of conditions and their status as a federally recognized Tribe has been long overdue. Today, the Tribe is an economic catalyst in their community and they employ over 13,000 people, mainly non-Indians needing jobs and opportunity.

The Mashantucket Pequots are also responsible neighbors. Over the last 20 years, the Tribe has generously donated to the Connecticut Special Olympics, the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian, the Mystic. Marine Life Aquarium, the United Way and many other organizations. Additionally, their revenue sharing agreement with the State of Connecticut has provided State coffers over $1.5 billion in additional revenue.

We ask our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join us in congratulating the Mashantucket Pequots on the 20th anniversary of the passage of this legislation and wish them continued success in the future.

CONGRATULATING DR. TONDA HUGHES

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to Dr. Tonda Hughes, who was recently named to the Chicago Gay and Lesbian Hall of Fame for her scientific contributions and advocacy in lesbian health.

Dr. Hughes has spent over a decade conducting research on the health needs of lesbian women. She is currently conducting the first long-term assessment of lesbian women's drinking patterns, the results of which will have important policy implications for treatment and prevention. Lesbian health has been largely ignored by scientists, and Dr. Hughes' work represents much-needed efforts to better the lives of lesbian Americans and all Americans.

Dr. Hughes is an associate professor of nursing at the University of Illinois at Chicago and is the director of research for the University's Center of Excellence in Women's Health. She has published professional journal articles, book chapters, and government monographs. In addition to her scholarly work, Dr. Hughes serves on advisory boards for several Chicago-area health foundations.

Each year since 1991, the Chicago Gay and Lesbian Hall of Fame has honored members of the Chicago lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community. The only municipal hall of fame of its kind, the Chicago Gay and Lesbian Hall of Fame recognizes members of the Chicago community whose volunteer and professional activities have enriched the lives of gay and lesbian residents and the city of Chicago as a whole.

I congratulate Dr. Tonda Hughes for this honor and applaud her important research and the beneficial effects her work has had on the well-being of lesbian women in Chicago and beyond.

FIFTH ANNUAL RACE FOR THE CURE IN TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, there will be an estimated 21,100 new cases of female breast cancer in California this year. Breast cancer is the second most frequently diagnosed cancer in women in the United States. Every 3 minutes a woman is diagnosed with breast cancer.

All of us know someone who has been touched by this disease. That is why I am proud to announce that this Sunday, October 19, the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation will sponsor the fifth annual Race for the Cure in Temecula, CA.

All the funds raised during the event will go to support breast cancer research grants, meritorious awards, educational and scientific conferences and local breast health and breast cancer outreach programs.

Mr. Speaker by supporting such private efforts as the annual Race for the Cure, we pay tribute to the victims and survivors of breast cancer. We also honor those whose efforts will one day eradicate breast cancer as a life-threatening disease.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY COMMONS NURSING CARE CENTER

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the city of Worcester in celebrating the University Commons Nursing Care Center's 10 years of service. During the week of October 20–25, 2003, the Center will celebrate its anniversary with events honoring residents, staff, and families.

Affiliated with the University of Massachusetts Health Care, The University Commons Nursing Care Center is a 164-bed facility that provides skilled, sub-acute, and long-term care services. Residents benefit from an environment that provides expert rehabilitation and medical services. Residents also benefit from social and cultural activities that are designed to maximize opportunities for stimulation and growth. Moreover, the University Commons Child Care Service offers educational day care services to children of employees as well as the community at large. This provides residents with an on-going intergenerational program.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating the University Commons Nursing Care Center for its 10 years of service to the community.

SECTION 8e LEGISLATION

HON. DOC HASTINGS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Washington state the largest pear and sweet cherry producing state in the nation. In recent years pear and cherry growers in Central Washington have invested time and resources into developing the market for high quality fruit.

Under federal marketing orders U.S. fruits and vegetables are held to certain grade, size and quality standards. The bill I am introducing today simply holds foreign grown pears and cherries to these same standards.

My bill would add pears and cherries to Section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 8e lists certain imported fruits and vegetables that are held to the same federal requirements as domestic produce.

Agriculture is at the heart of Central Washington's economy and our farmers are working harder than ever to produce some of the world's finest products. My bill would ensure that our pear and cherry farmers are able to compete more fairly and aggressively with foreign growers in the U.S. marketplace.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MOTHER TERESA OF CALCUTTA

HON. TODD RUSSELL PLATTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional life of Mother Teresa, who began her decades of service to humanity with the simple goal of helping the less fortunate and grew to be a symbol for human rights all over the world.

At the age of eighteen, Mother Teresa became a Roman Catholic sister, the beginning of her life as an educator, a leader, and a servant of God. Perhaps her greatest accomplishment was the establishment of the religious order, Missionaries of Charity. With over 5,000 sisters, the goal of Missionaries of Charity is to help the poor in all aspects of life, providing food, clothing, and shelter to millions of the world's most destitute. Additionally, Mother Teresa initiated countless relief projects, international peace-keeping missions, and medical assistance projects for the needy. Later in life, even as her own health deteriorated, she pressed on with new projects, including the creation of hospice programs for those living with AIDS.

A well-deserving recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the impact of this remarkable woman will last forever. I could not be more pleased to join in remembering Mother Teresa of Calcutta as a shining example of selfless dedication to human kindness. She was an inspiring example for us all.

YOU'VE GOT MAIL—BUT IS IT SECURE? AN EXAMINATION OF INTERNET VULNERABILITIES AFFECTING BUSINESSES, GOVERNMENTS, AND HOMES

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Chairman DAVIS and Ranking Member WAXMAN for calling this important hearing on Internet vulnerabilities and security threats. One such vulnerability is computer viruses and I know first hand how tedious and cumbersome computer infections can be. In the past year, I have had several computer viruses and they are costly and time consuming to fix.

Through my Washington Update, I regularly email my constituents about what's happening in DC. When I wrote to my constituents about today's hearing and requested that they share with me some of their experiences with computer viruses, the response was immediate and resounding. I was immediately inundated with e-mails about the economic, social, and personal toll computer viruses have on the lives of my constituents.

Let me share a sample of these stories with you today to highlight the impact viruses can have on our daily lives.

Mark Patton, Vice President of American Remedial Technology, a small company in my community, wrote in and said:

> Our business was victimized by a number of computer viruses on one occasion. We had hired an IT consultant to provide maintenance of our network, but unfortunately they were not keeping up with our virus protection. As a result we had to replace our server, upgrade our system, and subsequently fire our IT consultant. This episode cost our small business over $10,000 without considering the lost time we incurred. Viruses are a threat to all businesses. . . . The lesson is buyers beware when hiring an IT consultant, but more importantly as businesses become more dependant on the Internet, Internet security becomes a very important issue.

Mission Hills Mortgage Bankers/Gateway Business Bank wrote in and said:

> During the height of the virus-infected e-mail, Mission Hills Mortgage Bankers/Gateway Business Bank webmail site was swamped with thousands of virus-laden e-mails a day in August and September. Fortunately, our firewall and virus software caught and cleaned up the e-mail, but the sanitized e-mail was passed through to the individuals to whom it was addressed. Personally, I was deleting 30 to 50 e-mails a day, both annoying and time consuming.
>
> What I didn't know was how vulnerable a home computer with DSL or cable access is without a firewall even with virus-checker software. I wasn't aware that viruses can come thru to your computer in ways other than on an e-mail until I got one. That was a month ago. I purchased and installed a firewall right away. But I am still experiencing a problem with my computer. Apparently, the damage to files can remain after the virus is cleaned up.

This problem has not only affected businesses. Rio Hondo College wrote in and said:

> We were hit hard by the ''worm'' at Rio Hondo College during the first week of our semester this Fall. Our mainframe computer and every desktop computer on campus were unusable for a week. We could not register students, certify athletic eligibility of athletes, process financial aid requests, conduct many classes, or function in any capacity for a whole week. Eight weeks later we are still trying to get computers and printers and e-mail functioning for every one.

Diane Schumacher wrote in and said:

> I had a virus in September of this year. It was the SO/BIG Virus. I got it when I purchased an item over the Internet that came with an attachment. I have been laid-off. The last thing I needed was to be out of contact with not only EDD, the Employment Development Department, but also with my job search and support groups. Not to mention the expense of repair.

If the stories could not get any worst, this particular antidote affected me the most, Mark Calt wrote in and said:

> I'd like to take pictures of my daughter who currently is 2 years old. I used my digital camera to take a picture of her from the moment she was born and every single month until she reached her first birthday. I stored all those pictures in my hard drive so when I am ready, I'll sort them all out and have them developed and make a nice album that I can show to my daughter when she grows up and maybe play a slide show during her debut (18th Birthday Party). But my computer was hit by the virus just before I got them developed . . . my one year worth of project, my dream, and my gift to my daughter are all gone together with the pictures. I would pay—no matter what the price—if I could retrieve all those pictures . . . they were priceless . . . you cannot bring back the hands of time!

The stories I've shared with you today underscore the prevalence of computer infections. Furthermore, computer viruses are a ''real problem'' not just for businesses, but home users are also affected by this costly burden. An unemployed constituent, a community college, a bank and a father, all have been victimized by computer viruses. Computer viruses affect all of us.

There is much work ahead of us to eradicate threat, so I thank each of the witnesses for being here today to discuss this important topic and I look forward to your testimony. Again, I would like to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for having this hearing.

INTRODUCING THE MARINE MAMMAL PRESERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT (MMPRA) OF 2003

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, when the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) was enacted in 1972, it was with a vision of protection and precaution. It was created to right the ecological wrongs caused by generations of slaughter driven by our collective greed for the products that marine mammals supplied. The founding goal of the MMPA was to provide a broad moratorium on the taking of marine mammals in order to maintain and rebuild healthy populations of whales and dolphins, seals and sea lions, and other marine mammals.

To a noteworthy extent, protection and precaution have paid off. We should celebrate that some marine mammal species have recovered to estimated pre-harvest levels. But we should not be lulled into a false sense of complacency. Many populations, such as North Atlantic right whales and bowhead whales in the Arctic, remain endangered. We also cannot ignore that the full breadth and intensity of human activity in the ocean, including shipping, oil and gas exploration, and military activity, has a profound effect on marine mammals, even if we do not seek to kill them outright.

It is for these reasons that I introduce this bill today that would reauthorize the Marine Mammal Protection Act in a way that preserves its precautionary intent. Summarizing key provisions, the bill would:

Provide a refined definition for the term ''harassment'' that is consistent with the recommendations of the National Research Council and accounts for the cumulative, as opposed to merely incidental, effects of behavioral changes in marine mammals.

Enhance protections for marine mammals in captivity, including the establishment of a new advisory committee to encourage the promulgation of regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture for captive care and maintenance, an updated and publicly accessible captive marine mammal inventory, and elimination of all marine mammal traveling exhibits.

Provide increased funding opportunities for the development of fishing gear that would decrease harmful interactions with marine mammals.

Authorize research and grant programs to study methods of non-lethal deterrence and

control of nuisance seals and sea lions, whose robust populations have been of growing concern in coastal California.

Reauthorize and improve the John H. Prescott funding assistance program to allow an improved nationwide response to stranding and entanglement events.

Clarify the provisions regarding the import and export of Native marine mammal handicrafts.

Modernize the system of penalties and fines for violations of the Act for the first time in 30 years.

Expand the list of fisheries included in the take reduction team process to include both commercial and non-commercial fisheries using comparable gear.

Contrary to the efforts of others in this Congress to weaken the MMPA through strategic piecemeal amendments, I have always urged that the MMPA deserves nothing less than a comprehensive reauthorization.

The Resources Committee Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, to the immeasurable credit of Chairman WAYNE GILCHREST and his predecessor, the former Chairman JAMES SAXTON, invested significant time and resources over the past 4 years in conducting a series of oversight hearings regarding implementation of the Act and needs for reauthorization. This substantive analysis has not been squandered and has, in fact, been incorporated into this legislation.

This bill also reflects the best of the ideas forwarded by the Administration in their proposal regarding priorities and recommendations for reauthorization of the Act. Moreover, this bill incorporates the best ideas offered by a wide range of stakeholders ranging from the sportfishing and public display industries to the animal welfare and environmental communities.

Maintaining protection for marine mammals need not be a contentious or partisan issue. I urge support of this comprehensive and precautionary-minded reauthorization of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

ALLEN-BRADLEY BRAND MARKS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 2003 Rockwell Automation, a world-leading provider of industrial automation power, control and information solutions, began a year-long celebration of the centennial anniversary of the Allen-Bradley Brand. This outstanding company has a rich history and has made major contributions to the automation industry. Allen-Bradley has also played a significant role as a major employer and contributor to the economic and cultural growth of the city of Milwaukee.

The extraordinary transformation story of Allen-Bradley starts with the humble beginnings of two young Bradley brothers starting their business in an office over a delicatessen located on Milwaukee's near south side. Today, Rockwell Automation International Inc. has become a $4 billion industry leader with more than 22,000 employees in 450 locations around the world—serving customers in more than 80 countries. This story typifies the American dream and a dream realized beyond expectation.

In 1893 Lynde Bradley at the age of fifteen invented a compression rheostat that had the capability of regulating electrical current. His friend Dr. Stanton Allen offered to invest a thousand dollars to develop a prototype crane controller, which would use the newly invented rheostat control, and a business was born. Subsequently Lynde Bradley and Dr. Allen formed Compression Rheostat in 1903. In 1910 the company was renamed Allen-Bradley. After a series of dissolutions, mergers, and acquisitions Rockwell International purchased the company in 1985 for $1.651 billion, the largest acquisition in the history of the state of Wisconsin.

Since the start of this company there has been a pioneering spirit that valued innovation, creativity and a constant striving for excellence in products. This spirit has driven the company for 100 years.

The Allen-Bradley Brand is a symbol of great corporate strength, pre-eminence in the industrial controls field and an outstanding example of on-going and continuous support of the Milwaukee community. Thank you and congratulations on this 100th anniversary and continued success in the future.

INTRODUCING THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WILD HERITAGE WILDERNESS BILL

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Southern California Wild Heritage Wilderness Act. If enacted, this bill will protect approximately 1.6 million acres of land in California.

The State of California has lost over 675,000 acres of California's wild lands since 1978. One can only predict that this harmful trend will continue as California's population is expected to explode. California is expected to gain 17.7 million more people by 2025—nearly the entire population of New York State. As the population rises, more development will take place. More development often means less open space and the destruction of precious lands. This bill will prevent that destruction.

Thousands of diverse organizations, businesses, and others see the importance of this legislation and have given it their support. Additionally, hundreds of local elected officials have voiced support for the protection of their local areas.

I am pleased to be a part of this effort and look forward to working with Senator BOXER and Congressman THOMPSON to spearhead this effort and protect our natural resources.

RECOGNIZING RONN OWENS FOR RECEIVING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS' MARCONI AWARD

HON. ELLEN O. TAUSCHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ronn Owens, who received the National Association of Broadcasters' prestigious Marconi Award for major market personality of the year on October 2, 2003.

Ronn Owens began his broadcast career in 1968, hosting radio programs in Atlanta, Miami, Cleveland, and Philadelphia before moving to the Bay Area and KGO in 1975.

Over his thirty-five year radio career, Ronn Owens has established himself as the host of the most compelling and thought-provoking morning talk show in Northern California. A half-million fans tune into The Ronn Owens Show every morning to hear his opinions on a range of issues, from popular culture and gossip to current events and politics. He refers to his show as ''the ultimate town meeting.''

Ronn's guest list reads like a roster of Who's Who among world leaders, top celebrities, personalities, and newsmakers of the day. He has brought his devoted Bay Area audience numerous political figures, such as Al and Tipper Gore, JOHN MCCAIN, Bill Bradley, and Ralph Nader and celebrity personalities, such as tennis player Andre Agassi, theatrical legend Carol Channing, and attorney Johnnie Cochran. Ronn is the newsmen's news man. He has interviewed ABC News anchor Peter Jennings, veteran Washington Correspondent for ABC News Sam Donaldson, NBC's Washington Bureau Chief and Meet the Press host Tim Russert, Hardball host Chris Matthews, and CNN's Wolf Blitzer, to name a few.

Ronn Owens' sense of humor, directness, and intellect has made him a legend in the morning radio talk show industry. Ronn is quoted as saying that he is ''just like everybody else—I look at the world around me and comment on it.'' His fans will forever love Ronn as the man who tickled their funny bones, increased their awareness of national and local issues, and opened their hearts and minds.

Before being elected to Congress, I was a Ronn Owens listener. Over the past seven years, I have gotten to know Ronn as a guest on his show, and I have come to respect him a great deal. I have always found him to be insightful, funny and—even when we are at opposite ends of an issue—fair.

Congratulations, Ronn, on thirty-five years and the Marconi Award. Here's to thirty-five more.

HONORING THE MONTEREY PARK COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Monterey Park Community Relations Commission for celebrating cultural diversity in the fourteenth annual Harmony Festival.

For thirteen years, the City of Monterey Park has been instrumental in bridging the cultural divide amongst its residents. Their leadership and initiative on multicultural awareness have set a high standard for other cities. The 32nd Congressional District is a culturally diverse district, and it is important that all of us work together to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to achieve the dreams for our families and ourselves.

Throughout my career in public service, I have advocated for policies that promote greater multicultural harmony and recognize the strength that lies in the great diversity of our community, our State, and our Nation. In order to build upon the strength of our diverse communities, we must break down the discriminatory barriers that exist in our country. In this regard, I am fighting in Congress for efforts to eliminate discrimination in all aspects of society, including health care, education, housing, and employment.

I take great pride in the cultural diversity that can be found in Monterey Park and throughout the Los Angeles region. I commend the City of Monterey Park and the Monterey Park Community Relations Commission for their efforts to promote greater multi-cultural harmony and understanding. These types of events bring the community together to focus on diversity and appreciation of our differences.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOSE CASANOVA JR.

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Private First Class Jose Casanova Jr., United States Army 82nd Airborne Division. This young man, from my hometown of El Monte, was a communications specialist who served his country with courage, pride and loyalty. On October 13, 2003, Private Jose Casanova Jr. made the ultimate sacrifice and was killed while serving our country.

Private Jose Casanova Jr., a product of the public school system, earned his high school diploma in June of 1999 from Arroyo High School. During high school, Private Casanova was an active member of the student body participating in football, soccer, track and band. After graduation, his passion for music and helping people led him to return to Arroyo High School as a mentor to younger musicians.

On January 3, 2002, Private Casanova enlisted in the United States Army to serve his country and to achieve his dream of going to college and becoming a firefighter. Private Jose Casanova Jr. received training in Fort Bragg North Carolina. His 82nd Airborne unit was activated and deployed to Iraq on February 14, 2003.

Jose Casanova Jr., a United States citizen and a true patriot, is survived by his mother Teresa Muñoz De Casanova and father Jose Casanova Jr. and eight siblings: Sergio, Gustavo, Olga de Carmen, Veronica, Teresa, Maria De Lourdes, Melissa and Gerardo.

Private Casanova's sacrifice will not be forgotten. We are forever in his debt.

ADOPTION PROMOTION ACT OF 2003

HON. RICK RENZI

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Adoption Caucus, I rise in support of the Adoption Promotion Act of 2003, H.R. 3182, to continue rewarding States for their efforts to promote adoption of children in need of loving families. Since 1997, the number of children adopted from foster care has increased 64 percent. I am happy that States have made substantial progress in finding safe, permanent homes for kids. However, many older children still linger in foster care, and this bill will assist States to find adoptive families for these children. Approximately 126,000 children currently are awaiting adoption, half of whom are age nine or older. The Adoption Promotion Act of 2003 enhances the current incentive program, which rewards States that make gains in the number of children adopted, by creating a new incentive for States that increase adoptions of children age 9 or older. This change reflects a proposal outlined by the Bush Administration.

PALESTINIAN LEADERSHIP MUST STOP TERRORIST ATTACKS

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest sympathy to the families of the three Americans who were killed yesterday, and a fourth who was seriously injured by a massive terrorist explosion, while they were traveling along the main road toward Gaza City. They were employees of a government contractor that provides security services to the U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv.

I also want to express my outrage at the continued terrorist attacks that take the lives of children and innocent people in Israel, Gaza and the West Bank. Only twisted minds could ever conceive of such murders as ''warfare.''

What made this particular terrorist attack unusual was that it involved American citizens, part of a diplomatic and security convoy traveling to Gaza to interview Palestinian candidates for a Fulbright scholarship. Ironically, this scholarship was established to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and other countries through the exchange of persons, knowledge and skills. What was tragically not unusual, however, was that this was just the latest in a string of hundreds of violent killings spanning several years.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited Israel a few months ago, I met with Palestinian leaders who expressed their opposition to terrorist attacks. However, their actions have not backed up their rhetoric. Yesterday's terrorist bombing further demonstrates the Palestinian authority's continued reluctance—perhaps even aversion—to aggressively dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in areas under its control. Although Palestinian officials condemned this attack, their inability to act against such acts of terrorism has led to continued terrorist attacks against both Americans and Israelis.

In order to have real progress toward peace, Palestinians must have a leader who is willing to stop terrorism—leadership the world has not seen from Yasser Arafat. The Palestinian authority, while denouncing terrorism, has never fought terrorists or terror organizations in a serious or effective way either under Arafat's direct leadership, or in the shadow of his leadership.

It is clear that despite the best efforts of people of good will on both sides, real progress toward peace can never happen as long as the Palestinians have a President who is unwilling to stop terrorists from blowing up innocent Israelis and Americans.

NATIONAL VETERANS CEMETERY IN MARYLAND

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in Baltimore, Maryland, metropolitan area.

We need little reminder today of the courage and sacrifice of our service men and women. Whether protecting us in past World Wars, in North Korea, Vietnam, or the Persian Gulf, or fighting today in the deserts of Iraq and Afghanistan, our military has rarely questioned their mission to protect the freedoms and liberties we American citizens enjoy every day. In exchange for their service, we promised to take care of our veterans in life and in death. This bill addresses the most basic of those promises for our veterans of yesterday, today and tomorrow.

Maryland has a long-standing tradition of military service and sacrifice dating back to the Revolutionary War—when the Old Line Soldiers were considered General Washington's favorite after saving the Continental Army from destruction as only the Marylanders were left standing. This historical tie was reinforced when the Secretary of the Navy established the Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland in 1845—a testament to Maryland's contribution to the future service of our nation.

That tradition continues today with bases in Ft. Meade, Aberdeen, Ft. Detrick, and Andrews Air Force Base, just to name a few. Maryland is home to over 45,000 active, reserve and guard service men and women, as well as their families. And there are over half a million civilian veterans residing in the State of Maryland.

Yet there is no longer federal or national cemetery space for first interments—for veterans who wish to have a casket burial. While there is state cemetery space, I stand here today on behalf of the veterans I represent, on behalf of their families, and on behalf of the veterans throughout my home state of Maryland to ask my colleagues to keep the national promise to all veterans. At the very least, we should offer choices to veterans between national and state cemetery burials. Families should not be forced to travel great distances to visit their loved ones.

There are approximately 27 million veterans in the United Sites today—10 percent of our national population. And Roll Call on September 29, 2003, said that we are losing 1,500

veterans a day. It is for these brave veterans that I introduce this bill and ask my colleagues for swift passage.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHEMTRONICS, INC.

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important business in my district celebrating it's 50th anniversary. In 1953, Bert Gross, James Lowry and Daniel Brimm joined together to start Chemtronics, Inc., a local small-business specializing in technology that could remove metal in a very rapid and controlled manner. Chem-tronics, Inc. was incorporated in October 1953, with company offices and chemical etching facilities set up in rented World War II surplus barracks on Gillespie Field in El Cajon, California.

Early sales efforts were focused on aircraft frames and skins but they soon realized that the chemical milling process could be applied advantageously to jet engine components as well. With this new opportunity, the company embarked on a campaign to earn a contract with General Electric Co., working on their TF–39 jet engine. From the middle 1960's into the early 1970's, Chem-tronics Inc., built around nine hundred of these parts.

By the early 70's, tools and trained personnel were developed for repairing and accurately reforming titanium fan blades for jet engines utilizing a process patented by the company. This activity has expanded in scope and size over the years and is now a major element of the business with its own specialized management and marketing staff, known as Aviation Repair, also located in El Cajon, California.

Chem-tronics, Inc., while still small, was becoming recognized as a high quality product-producing, vertically integrated, one-stop-shop facility. By 1975, Chem-tronics had products on space launch systems, most of the larger commercial airframes, and several of General Electric Co. and Pratt & Whitney Co.'s larger commercial jet engines.

During this same period of time, Daniel Brimm, who had bought out his earlier partners, developed a unique integral stiffening feature with chemical milling that he patented called Unistructure. This was a critical turning point in the success of Chem-tronics, Inc. Since 1976, Unistructure stiffened light-weight products have been designed and built for virtually every new By-pass Outer Duct for every military jet engine built in the USA. Driven by a company commitment to provide each customer with a one-stop-shop, Chem-tronics began to supply complete product design services in 1978, which included computer aided design and computer, aided manufacturing.

The trend of expanding Chem-tronics' technology has continued over the years with increasing levels of production, factory floor space, manpower and facilities. Major customers include General Electric Co., Pratt and Whitney Aircraft, Rolls-Royce-Allison, Allied Signal, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman and Boeing. Through these customers, Chem-tronics' products have become an important part of military and commercial aircraft, such as the B–1B and B2 Bombers, Joint Strike Fighter, F22 Raptor, as well as the space shuttle and various space launch systems.

The current president, James Legler, joined the company in 1978. Through his leadership, Chem-tronics, Inc. has continued to grow as an aerospace industry leader in technology, quality products, and commitment to customer satisfaction. My fellow colleagues, Chem-tronics, Inc. represents the small-business spirit that made America great. Join me in congratulating this company for their success in creating jobs, providing critical services and products to our country's national security, and making the San Diego community proud for 50 years.

SYRIA ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEBANESE SOVEREIGNTY RESTORATION ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 2003

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in cautious support of the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Act (H.R. 1828).

It is entirely appropriate that we send a strong message to the Syrian government that they have not done enough to weaken terrorist activities in their country. Syria's continued support of international terrorist organizations like Hizballah, Islamic Jihad and Hamas is unacceptable. The United States has given Syria ample opportunity to remove these terrorist threats, and we cannot stand idly by while terrorist operations continue.

In addition, the United States must clearly state that the Syrian occupation of Lebanon will not be tolerated. The people of Lebanon deserve to be ruled by the Lebanese, and not an occupying Syrian force with ties to terrorism. Syrian troops in Lebanon represent a destabilizing force that threatens the peace of Israel and the entire Middle East region.

The Syria Accountability Act must be used as a political lever intended to send an unmistakable message to Syrian President Assad that his government's support for terrorist organizations and occupation of Lebanon cannot be allowed. It must not, however, be interpreted as a catalyst for military action in Syria. Inflaming the dialogue about Syria's reported connections with al-Qaeda or Iraq will only lead to rash decisions unreflective of the best interests of the United States and our allies in the global war on terrorism.

We must remain committed engaging the Syrian government in diplomatic exchange. Only by talking can we expect to improve our bilateral relations with Syria and bring about a peaceful resolution to this challenging issue.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF DAIRY FORWARD CONTRACTING LEGISLATION

HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to make permanent the authority for dairy producers and processors to have an important risk management tool known as forward pricing contracts. As the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee's subcommittee that has jurisdiction over dairy policy, I hope to move this legislation forward before the existing statutory authority expires next year. I am very pleased that my subcommittee chairman, Mr. Gutknecht of Minnesota, has joined me in introducing this legislation, along with 14 other of our colleagues.

Forward pricing contracts allow farmers and their customers the opportunity to freely negotiate a long-term contract for the sale of their agricultural products at a fixed price. This risk management tool gives farmers greater predictability for income streams, which in turn allows for better management of farm and business operations.

Buyers and sellers of many farm commodities rely heavily on forward contracts. According to a report by the GAO, forward cash contracting is the risk management tool most frequently used by producers outside the dairy sector. A majority of cotton (76 percent), corn (65 percent), and wheat (57 percent) producers use forward contracts to lock in their prices and revenue. Dairy producers have utilized this tool less, primarily because the legal requirements of the federal milk marketing order system have prevented dairy processors from offering this risk management tool to dairy farmers.

In 1999, Congress decided to amend federal law to remove this impediment to dairy forward pricing contracts. A pilot program was established, allowing dairy producers and processors to enter into voluntary agreements for the sale of a set amount of milk for a fixed price over a specified period of time. These contracts are based on a negotiated price rather than the minimum price set monthly under federal milk marketing orders.

The pilot program went into effect in July 2000, and is due to expire December 31, 2004. Although it has only been in place for a few years, it is an important tool for the dairy industry to have that deserves permanence. The bill that I introduced today would make this program a permanent authority and thereby ensure the availability of forward pricing contracts to any and all producers and processors who voluntarily want to use such a risk management tool.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation and making it become law in the near future.

SPINA BIFIDA AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let my colleagues know that October is National Spina Bifida Awareness Month and to pay tribute to the more than 70,000 Americans—and their family members—who are currently affected by Spina Bifida—the nation's most common, permanently disabling birth defect. The Spina Bifida Association of America (SBAA), an organization that has helped people with Spina Bifida and their families for nearly 30 years, works every day—not just in

the month of October—to prevent and reduce suffering from this devastating birth defect.

The SBAA was founded in 1973 to address the needs of the individuals and families affected by this disease and is currently the only national organization solely dedicated to advocating on behalf of the Spina Bifida community. As part of its service through 57 chapters in more than 100 communities across the country, the SBAA puts expecting parents in touch with families who have a child with Spina Bifida. These families answer questions and concerns and help guide expecting parents. The SBAA then works to provide lifelong support and assistance for affected children and their families.

Together the SBAA and the West Michigan Spina Bifida Association, the Spina Bifida Association of Southeastern Michigan, the Spina Bifida Association of Upper Michigan, and the Southwest Michigan Spina Bifida & Hydrocephalus Association work tirelessly to help families meet the challenges and enjoy the rewards of raising their child. I would like to acknowledge and thank SBAA and these local Spina Bifida organizations in Michigan for all that they have done for the families affected by this birth defect, especially those living in my state.

Spina Bifida is a neural tube defect that occurs when the central nervous system does not properly close during the early stages of pregnancy. Spina Bifida affects more than 4,000 pregnancies each year, with 1,500 babies being born with Spina Bifida each year. There are three different forms of Spina Bifida with the most severe being Myelomeningocele Spina Bifida, which causes nerve damage and severe disabilities. This severe form of Spina Bifida is diagnosed in 96 percent of children born with this condition. Between 70 to 90 percent of the children born with Spina Bifida are at risk of mental retardation when spinal fluid collects around the brain.

The exact cause of Spina Bifida is not known, but researchers have concluded that women of childbearing age who take daily folic acid supplements reduce their chances of having a Spina Bifida pregnancy by up to 75%. Progress has been made convincing women of the importance of consuming folic acid supplements and maintaining diets rich in folic acid. However, this public education campaign must be enhanced and broadened to reach segments of the population that have yet to heed this call.

Although folic acid consumption reduces the risk and incidence of Spina Bifida pregnancies, we will still have babies born with Spina Bifida who need intensive care and families that need guidance and support in caring for and raising these children. The result of this neural tube defect is that most babies suffer from a host of physical, psychological, and educational challenges, including paralysis, developmental delay, numerous surgeries, and living with a shunt in their skulls in an attempt to ameliorate their condition. Today, approximately 90 percent of all babies diagnosed with this birth defect live into adulthood, approximately 80 percent have normal IQs, and approximately 75 percent participate in sports and other recreational activities. With proper medical care, people who suffer from Spina Bifida can lead full and productive lives. However, they must learn how to move around using braces, crutches or wheelchairs, and how to function independently. They also must be careful to avoid a host of secondary health problems ranging from depression and learning disabilities to skin problems and latex allergies.

After decades of poor prognosis and short life expectancy, breakthroughs in research combined with improvements in health care and treatment children with Spina Bifida are now living long enough to become adults with this condition. However, with this extended life expectancy people with Spina Bifida now face new challenges in the fields of education, job training, independent living, health care for secondary conditions, aging concerns, and other related issues.

I am proud to Co-Chair the newly established Congressional Spina Bifida Caucus with my colleague Representative CHRISTOPHER SMITH. The Congressional Spina Bifida Caucus will bring increased attention to this condition and advance initiatives that will improve the quality of life for those individuals and their families living with Spina Bifida.

I again wish to thank the SBAA and its chapters for all of their hard work to prevent and reduce suffering from this birth defect and for their commitment to improve the lives of those 70,000 individuals living with Spina Bifida throughout our nation. The Spina Bifida community and our nation owe a tremendous debt to the SBAA for its work over the past three decades. Much more work still needs to be done, and I am confident this fine organization and its chapters will lead the effort for decades to come. I wish the Spina Bifida Association of America the best of luck in its endeavors and urge all of my colleagues and all Americans to support its important efforts.

CHICAGO SAYS REPEAL THE PATRIOT ACT

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the record a resolution passed by the City Council of Chicago calling on Congress to actively work for the repeal of sections of the PATRIOT Act that ''violate fundamental rights and liberties as stated in the U.S. Constitution and its Amendments.'' This resolution was passed on October 1, 2003.

I supported this resolution and I want to thank Aldermen Helen Shiller, Joe Moore, Freddrenna Lyle, and Ricardo Munoz for introducing it. I would also like to recognize and thank the City Council of Evanston and the President and Board of Trustees of Wilmette for passing similar resolutions.

I voted against the PATRIOT Act two years ago and I continue to remain skeptical of its effectiveness at keeping us safe. I believe the PATRIOT Act violates our civil liberties, our right to due process, and unnecessarily targets immigrants. Therefore, I am pleased to join with the Chicago City Council in affirming the rights of all people living within Chicago and the country and in saying that we must repeal the PATRIOT Act.

The following is the resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Chicago:

RESOLUTION ON THE USA PATRIOT ACT AND RELATED EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Whereas, the City of Chicago houses a diverse population, including citizens of other nations, whose contributions to the community are vital to its character and function; and

Whereas, the United States Constitution guarantees certain fundamental rights including: freedom of religion, speech, assembly and privacy; protection from unreasonable searches and seizures; due process and equal protection to any person; equality before the law and the presumption of innocence; access to counsel in judicial proceedings; and a fair, speedy and public trial; and

Whereas, the USA PATRIOT Act signed by George W. Bush on October 26, 2001, in the opinion of many American, contains a number of provisions that undermine the above mentioned rights and which fundamentally alter our civil liberties without increasing our security; and

Whereas, examples of the provisions in the USA PATRIOT Act and Executive orders that may undermine the constitution and the rights and civil liberties of Chicago residents include:

A significant expansion of the government's ability to access sensitive medical, mental health, financial and educational records about individuals; and lowers the burden of proof required to conduct secret searches and telephone and Internet surveillance

Giving law enforcement expanded authority to obtain library records, and prohibits librarians from informing patrons of monitoring or information requests

Giving the Attorney General and the Secretary of State the power to designate domestic groups, including religious and political organizations, as ''terrorist organizations''

Granting the Attorney General the power to subject citizens of other nations to indefinite detention or deportation even if they have not committed a crime

Authorizing eavesdropping on confidential communications between lawyers and their clients in federal custody

Limiting disclosure of public documents and records under the Freedom of Information Act; and

Whereas, the Department of Justice interpretations of this Act and these Executive Orders particularly target immigrants, including Hispanics, people of Middle Eastern and South Asian descent and citizens of other nations, thereby potentially encouraging racial profiling by law enforcement and the unintended consequence of increase in hate crimes by individuals in our community; and

Whereas, almost 200 other cities throughout the country have enacted resolutions reaffirming support for civil rights and civil liberties in the face of government policies that threaten these values, and are demanding accountability from federal agencies regarding the use of these new powers; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the City of Chicago joins the almost 200 other U.S. cities and affirms its strong opposition to terrorism, and also affirms that any efforts to end terrorism not be waged at the expense of the fundamental civil rights and liberties of the people of Chicago, the United States and the World; and be it further

Resolved, That the City of Chicago affirms the rights of all people, including United States citizens and citizens of other nations, living within the City in accordance with the Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution by lawfully resisting every effort to erode those rights and protections including: freedom of religion, speech, assembly and privacy; protection from unreasonable searches and seizures; due process and equal protection to any person; equality before the law and the

presumption of innocence; access to counsel in judicial proceedings; and fair, speedy and public trial; and be it further

Resolved, that the members of the City Council of the City of Chicago call on our United States Representatives and Senators to monitor the implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act and the Orders in furtherance thereof and actively work for the repeal of only those sections of the Act and those orders that violate fundamental rights and liberties as stated in the US Constitution and its Amendments by sending a copy of this resolution to the Illinois delegation to Congress.

HONORING HIS HOLINESS, POPE JOHN PAUL II, UPON HIS SILVER JUBILEE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in the celebration of His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, who is marking his Silver Jubilee as the spiritual leader of more than 1 billion Catholics around the world.

It was 25 years ago today that Cardinal Karol Wojtyla, the Archbishop of Krakow, was elected Pope—the youngest chosen in a century. This Cardinal, little-known outside of native-Poland, stood before a crowd of 200,000 in St. Peter's Square and emotionally stated that he had been afraid to accept the nomination, but had done so in obedience to Christ.

While he came from meager beginnings, he will be remembered for fostering peace throughout the world. This is because His Holiness knows the persecution of oppression. He studied for the priesthood in secrecy and saw those he grew up with killed and victimized due to the Nazi Occupation. He later witnessed firsthand the communist subjugation of his native Poland.

Since becoming Pope, he has traveled more extensively throughout the world than any predecessor, during which time he has spread the message of peace, religious freedom, and human dignity.

His Holiness was instrumental in the demise of communism in his native Poland, which in turn fostered the spread of democracy throughout the world.

His Holiness has reached out in an unprecedented manner to peoples of other beliefs and religions all over the world to establish a dialog which may lead to greater understanding, healing, and harmony, including praying for unity among Christian churches, reconciliation with the Jewish people, and specifically acknowledging those times in which the Catholic Church has failed to act in accordance with its teachings. He has also led a pilgrimage to the Middle East, preaching coexistence, peace, tolerance, and goodwill throughout this historically conflicted territory.

His Holiness has used his position as a world leader to become the foremost voice in fostering ties of brotherhood and promoting peace and reconciliation in the world today. His many efforts have invited his being bestowed with the Congressional Medal of Honor on January 8, 2001.

I ask my congressional colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this devoted spiritual leader and to celebrate with him this Jubilee.

SAVE OUR HOMES ACT

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that today I am reintroducing the ''Save Our Homes Act.'' I want to thank my colleagues MAXINE WATERS, BERNARD SANDERS, JULIA CARSON, JAMES MCGOVERN, PETER DEFAZIO, LUIS GUTIERREZ, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, BARBARA LEE, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, DONALD PAYNE, MAJOR OWENS, HENRY WAXMAN, FRANK PALLONE, LYNN WOOLSEY, STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, MADELEINE BORDALLO, RAUL GRIJALVA, GEORGE MILLER, DENNIS KUCINICH, BOBBY RUSH, MARCY KAPTUR, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, CHRIS BELL, GENE GREEN, MICHAEL HONDA, DONNA CHRISTENSEN, and ROBERT BRADY for joining me today as original cosponsors of this legislation.

The Save Our Homes Act would help protect homebuyers from unscrupulous lenders and brokers by creating strong new protections for homeowners throughout the country. The Save Our Homes Act provides a floor, not a ceiling for consumer protections. Strong States and local anti-predatory lending laws would not be preempted by this legislation. The Save Our Homes Act is supported by leading consumer rights organizations, such as the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), National People's Action, and National Community Reinvestment Coalition. This is the strongest anti-predatory lending bill in Congress

The Coalition for Responsible Lending estimates that homeowners lose $9.1 billion annually due to predatory loans. In Chicago, foreclosures increased by 74 percent between 1993 and 2001. Remarkably, over that same time period, foreclosures in the subprime market increased by 500 percent. Half of all the foreclosures occurred within 2 years of origination, signaling fraudulent and abusive lending practices. Under the leadership of Mayor Daley and Governor Blagojevich, Illinois and the City of Chicago have passed tough anti-predatory lending laws. Nevertheless, under current Federal law, State and local governments cannot stop some abusive lending practices. In addition, most States do not have strong anti-predatory lending laws. My legislation would close these loopholes and ensure that all homeowners, in every State, are protected from predatory lenders and brokers.

We are all united in support of homeownership. However, supporting homeownership is not enough; we need to make sure people are able to stay in their homes. That is why we need to crackdown on predatory lenders and brokers.

Predatory lenders and brokers are out to make a fast buck on the backs of the elderly, homeowners in financial distress, low-income families and people of color. Predatory lenders are thieves, preying on consumers who are house rich, but cash poor. They don't wear ski masks or hold a gun to your head. They come knocking on your door with neckties and loan papers, charge you credit card high interest rates, and steal the equity, that you've built in your home.

People living in underserved communities have a difficult time obtaining conventional loans. Despite all the progress that has been made, redlining continues to be a major problem. In 2000, HUD completed a study that found that borrowers in upper income African American neighborhoods, who would easily qualify for conventional, low rate loans, were twice as likely as homeowners in low-income white neighborhoods to receive subprime refinance loans.

Of course, not all subprime lending is abusive and predatory. Responsible subprime lending expands homeownership opportunities for those who cannot qualify for conventional loans. However, it is clear that abusive practices are a major problem in the subprime industry. People who turn to subprime lenders are more likely to obtain abusive loans. That is why homeowners who are forced to turn to the subprime market need strong, Federal protections.

I am looking forward to working with my colleagues to pass this legislation, the Save Our Homes Act, into law.

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACT OF 2003

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducting the ''Education Savings Act of 2003''. This legislation will change current tax law to make it clear that employers can make tax-deductible contributions to employees' education savings accounts, such as 529 or 530 accounts.

Saving for our children's higher education has become increasingly important as we continue to see the cost of college education steadily rising. As a Member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce I have been afforded the opportunity to participate in many hearings outlining some of the difficulty student's face with the rising cost of tuition. Tuition is outpacing the rate of inflation, increases in family income, and even increases in State and Federal financial aid—which have grown tremendously in recent years. Planning for our children's future education by setting up savings accounts is essential now more than ever.

I have seen first hand the effects that can occur from rapidly increasing tuition rates. The State of Nevada has one of the lowest numbers of college graduates per capita. Setting up savings accounts early on for higher education can displace some of the burden created by the high costs of attaining a college education.

The United States tax code offers options for families to SAVE—to Set Aside for the Value of Education. Two such options, the 529 College Savings Plan and the 530 ''Coverdell Accounts'', have benefited thousands of students and have helped their families meet the rapidly escalating costs associated with attaining a college degree. Unfortunately, current tax law penalizes workers for accepting contributions from their employers to these accounts by considering it earned income to the employees.

The ''Education Savings Act'' will clarify that any amount contributed to these education accounts will NOT count towards an employee's taxable income.

By allowing employers to contribute to 529 and 530 accounts without the contribution

being considered taxable income, I hope to increase the ease with which we send our children to college. Employers are able to provide health and retirement benefits and it is time for businesses to be able to provide an education benefit as well without penalizing the employee. The ''Education Savings Act'' is another effort to help defray the ever growing costs of attaining a college education.

Congress should do all we can to encourage our youth to pursue higher education opportunities and eliminate any barriers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes on the morning of September 25 because I was attending meeting with the National Security Advisor at the White House.

I requested a leave of absence from September 30 through October 8 due to a family illness. Had I been here, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 520, 524–529, 531–533, and 535–539 and ''nay'' on rollcall votes 530 and 534.

VETERANS RECOGNIZED BY THE SILVER ROSE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 16, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Gary Chenett, and Robert Baker. These two gentlemen are responsible for awarding The Silver Rose to our military veterans in Texas and across the Nation.

Established in 1997 by Mary Elizabeth Marchand, The Order of The Silver Rose gives many veterans the satisfaction of being recognized for making the ultimate sacrifice for our nation. Mrs. Marchand's father, Chief Hospital Corpsman Frank Davis, died from illnesses resulting from the use of Agent Orange in the Vietnam War. A combat veteran, Chief Davis was not wounded in combat but exposed to a dangerous substance while fighting for his country. Exposure to Agent Orange resulted in Davis losing his life some years later. Subsequently, determination was made by the Department of Defense that Chief Davis and many like him do not qualify for The Purple Heart.

The Order of The Silver Rose recognizes the courage, heroism, and contributions of American service personnel who were exposed to Agent Orange in a combat zone. There are thousands of veterans who served this country faithfully who are now suffering illnesses, some fatal, directly due to being exposed to harmful substances during the war.

Gary Chenett and Robert Baker award veterans with The Silver Rose. To date over one thousand veterans have received this award. Sadly, many of these awards have been made posthumously. October is now recognized as Agent Orange month in Texas and many other states. On behalf of Texas, I thank our brave patriots for their sacrifices.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S12635–S12669

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1739–1751, S.J. Res. 19, and S. Res. 244–245. **(See next issue.)**

Measures Reported:

S. 300, to award a congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation, and to express the sense of Congress that there should be a national day in recognition of Jackie Robinson.

S. 1691, to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II. **(See next issue.)**

Measures Passed:

National Character Counts Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 245, designating the week beginning October 19, 2003, as "National Character Counts Week". **(See next issue.)**

Western Shoshone Claims Distribution Act: Senate passed S. 618, 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, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **(See next issue.)**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, Iraq and Afghanistan: Senate continued consideration of S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S12643–69 (continued next issue)**

Adopted:

Stevens (for Feingold) Amendment No. 1832, to require reports on Iraqi oil production and revenues to be made available to the public in English and in Arabic. **Page S12655**

Stevens (for McCain) Amendment No. 1853, to provide for financial and performance audits of the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund and other assistance to Iraq. **Page S12655**

Stevens (for Hollings) Amendment No. 1865, to clarify the fiscal year limitation in a provision of the Public Law 108–11, Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act. **Page S12655**

Stevens (for Durbin) Amendment No. 1866, to require quarterly reports on the status of the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group to account for the Iraq weapons of mass destruction programs. **Pages S12655–56**

Stevens (for McConnell) Amendment No. 1863, to authorize the export of lethal military equipment to Iraq for use by a reconstituted (or interim) Iraqi military or other security forces, that support U.S. efforts in Iraq. **Page S12660**

Stevens (for Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 1814, to require the Coalition Provisional Authority to provide additional information justifying allocations for capital projects in Iraq. **Page S12660**

Stevens (for Harkin/Clinton) Amendment No. 1855, to provide for a report by the Comptroller General on certain contracts performed in, or relating to, Iraq. **Pages S12660–61**

By 97 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 387), McConnell Amendment No. 1874, to express the Sense of the Senate that the Global War on Terrorism medal should be awarded expeditiously to members of the Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle. **(See next issue.)**

Stevens (for Reid/Daschle) Modified Amendment No. 1869, to prohibit the use of funds to arm, train, or employ individuals under the age of 18 years for the Facilities Protection Service. **(See next issue.)**

Stevens (for Hollings) Amendment No. 1870, to provide that, notwithstanding the Algiers Accords, any United States citizen held hostage between 1979 and 1981, and their spouses and children at the time, shall have a claim for money damages against a foreign state for personal injury that was caused by the Foreign State's act of torture or hostage-taking. **(See next issue.)**

Stevens (for Cantwell) Modified Amendment No. 1857, to improve the process for timely informing members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, their families, their employers, and Congress

of changes in deployment policies and schedules applicable to mobilize members of the reserve components. **(See next issue.)**

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 388), Nickles Amendment No. 1876, to express the sense of the Senate that all countries that hold debt from the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein should be urged to forgive their debt. **(See next issue.)**

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 389), Bayh Amendment No. 1871, to require that funds for reconstruction in Iraq be used for certain purposes. **(See next issue.)**

Hutchison Modified Amendment No. 1877, to express the sense of Congress on reconstruction efforts in Iraq. **(See next issue.)**

Nelson (FL) Modified Amendment No. 1858, to set aside certain amounts available national security, $10,000,000 for the Family Readiness Program of the National Guard. **(See next issue.)**

Stevens (for Warner) Amendment No. 1880 (to Amendment No. 1867), to designate the amount designated for disaster relief provided in connection with Department of Defense infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel as an emergency requirement. **(See next issue.)**

Warner Amendment No. 1867, to increase the Federal share of the cost of disaster relief provided in connection with Hurricane Isabel; and to provide for repair or replacement of Department of Defense infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel. **Page S12656**

Reid (for Nelson (FL)) Amendment No. 1881, to require a report on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2020. **(See next issue.)**

Reed/Hagel Amendment No. 1834, to increase the end strength of the Army and to structure the additional forces for constabulary duty. **(See next issue.)**

Feingold Amendment No. 1852, to enable military family members to take leave to attend to deployment-related business and tasks. **(See next issue.)**

Rejected:

Byrd Amendment No. 1818, to impose a limitation on the use of sums appropriated for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. (By 57 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 385), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S12668–69**

Lautenberg Amendment No. 1868, to prohibit the use of funds for any contract or other financial agreement or arrangement with any entity that pays compensation in the form of deferred salary to certain United States Government officials. (By 65 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 386), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S12657–60**

Withdrawn:

Feinstein Amendment No. 1848, to require reports on the United States strategy for relief and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, and to limit the availability of certain funds for those efforts pending determinations by the President that the objectives and deadlines for those efforts will be substantially achieved. **(See next issue.)**

Pending:

Byrd/Durbin Amendment No. 1819, to prohibit the use of Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Funds for low priority activities that should not be the responsibility of U.S. taxpayers, and shift $600 million from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund to Defense Operations and Maintenance, Army, for significantly improving efforts to secure and destroy conventional weapons, such as bombs, bomb materials, small arms, rocket propelled grenades, and shoulder-launched missiles, in Iraq. **(See next issue.)**

Bond/Mikulski Amendment No. 1825, to provide additional VA Medical Care Funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs. **(See next issue.)**

Durbin Amendment No. 1837, to ensure that a Federal employee who takes leave without pay in order to perform certain service as a member of the uniformed services or member of the National Guard shall continue to receive pay in an amount which, when taken together with the pay and allowances such individual is receiving for such service, will be no less than the basic pay such individual would then be receiving if no interruption in employment had occurred. **(See next issue.)**

Daschle Amendment No. 1854, to achieve the most effective means of reconstructing Iraq and to reduce the future costs to the American taxpayer of such reconstruction by ensuring broad-based international cooperation for this effort. **(See next issue.)**

Reid (for Landrieu) Amendment No. 1859, to promote the establishment of an Iraq Reconstruction Finance Authority and the use of Iraqi oil revenues to pay for reconstruction in Iraq. **(See next issue.)**

Boxer Modified Amendment No. 1843, to make retroactive the relief of hospitalized members of the uniformed services from the obligation to pay for food and subsistence while hospitalized. **(See next issue.)**

Reid (for Chafee/Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 1807, to provide for humanitarian assistance and reconstruction in Liberia. **(See next issue.)**

Durbin Amendment No. 1879, to provide funds for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS. **(See next issue.)**

Corzine Amendment No. 1882, to establish a National Commission on the Development and Use of Intelligence Related to Iraq. **(See next issue.)**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

Chair sustained a point of order against Schumer Amendment No. 1872, to express the sense of Congress concerning the appointment of a special counsel to conduct a fair, thorough, and independent investigation into a national security breach, as being in violation of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate which prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S12661–69

Chair sustained a point of order against Durbin Amendment No. 1873, to provide funds for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, as being in violation of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate which prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill, and the amendment thus fell. **(See next issue.)**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 9 a.m., on Friday, October 17, 2003, Senate will begin a series of votes on certain pending amendments. **(See next issue.)**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 9 a.m., on Friday, October 17, 2003. **(See next issue.)**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Timothy John Dunn, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States.

Stuart W. Holliday, of Texas, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Zalmay Khalilzad, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan.

Adam Marc Lindemann, of New York, to be Member of the Advisory Board for Cuba Broadcasting for a term expiring October 27, 2005.

James Curtis Struble, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru.

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Air Force under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

18 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Navy. **(See next issue.)**

Messages From the House: **(See next issue.)**

Measures Referred: **(See next issue.)**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **(See next issue.)**

Measures Read First Time: **(See next issue.)**

Executive Communications: **(See next issue.)**

Executive Reports of Committees: **(See next issue.)**

Additional Cosponsors: **(See next issue.)**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **(See next issue.)**

Additional Statements: **(See next issue.)**

Amendments Submitted: **(See next issue.)**

Authority for Committees to Meet: **(See next issue.)**

Privilege of the Floor: **(See next issue.)**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—389) **Pages S12669 (continued next issue)**

Adjournment: Senate met at 9:31 a.m., and adjourned at 1:05 a.m., on Friday, October, 17, 2003 and will reconvene at 9 a.m. on the same day. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in the next issue of the Record.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS: INTELLIGENCE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing to discuss the intelligence provisions of S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004 (pending on Senate Calendar) from members of the intelligence community.

HOUSING GSE'S

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee held a hearing to examine proposals for improving the regulation of the Housing government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs), focusing on essential elements and proposals of regulatory reform, resolution of accounting issues, funding of new oversight offices, receiving testimony from John W. Snow, Secretary of the Treasury; Mel Martinez, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Franklin D. Raines, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Fannie Mae; George D. Gould, Presiding Director, Freddie Mac; and Norman B. Rice, President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle.

Hearings continue on Thursday, October 23.

AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing on the pursuit of security and democracy in Afghanistan, focusing on providing adequate resources and support to the Afghan government, and

related provisions of S. 1689, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan Security and Reconstruction Act 2004, (pending on Senate Calendar), after receiving testimony from William B. Taylor, Jr., Coordinator for Afghanistan, Department of State; Peter W. Rodman, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, and Brig. General Gary L. North, Deputy J–5 for Political and Military Affairs, The Joint Staff, both of the Department of Defense; Peter Tomsen, McLean, Virginia, former United States Special Envoy and Ambassador on Afghanistan; and William J. Durch, Henry L. Stimson Center, The Future of Peace Operations Project, and Nancy Lindborg, Mercy Corps, both of Washington, D.C.

U.S.-EUROPEAN UNION COOPERATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on European Affairs concluded a hearing to examine United States-European Union Cooperation on regulatory affairs, focusing on non-tariff barriers, the history of transatlantic regulatory cooperation, innovative and informal approaches, and global growth, after receiving testimony from Charles P. Ries, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs; Eric Stewart, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Europe; Gerard Depayre, European Commission to the United States, Stuart E. Eizenstat, European-American Business Council, Gary Litman, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Thomas L. Farmer, American Bankers' Association, all of Washington, D.C.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing on access to postsecondary education in relation to reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on the relationship among quality, efficiency, and access to higher education, after receiving testimony from George W. Waldner, York College of Pennsylvania, York; Jamie P. Merisotis, Institute for Higher Education Policy, Washington, D.C.; Shane Hollett, Ohio College Access Network, Cleveland; and Troy Lambert, University of Maryland, College Park.

INDIAN WATER RIGHTS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' management of the Missouri River, focusing on the effects of the Master Manual (a guide used by the Corps to operate the six dams on the mainstream of the Missouri River) on the effect on federally-reserved Indian water rights, after receiving testimony from Senator Daschle; George S. Dunlop, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Policy and Legislation; Brigadier General William T. Grisoli, Commander and Division Engineer, Northwestern Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; John Yellow Bird Steele, Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, South Dakota; and Michael Claymore, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Fort Yates, North Dakota.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1691, to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II; and

The nominations George W. Miller, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Deborah Ann Spagnoli, of California, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, Department of Justice.

Also committee began markup of S. 1545, to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to permit States to determine State residency for higher education purposes and to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

LITIGATIONS IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts concluded a hearing on S. 1428, to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for damages or injunctive relief for claims of injury resulting from a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition related to weight gain or obesity, after receiving testimony from Senator McConnell; Victor E. Schwartz, Shook, Hardy, and Bacon, LLP, Washington, D.C.; Russel L. Sutter, Tillinghast-Towers Perrin, St. Louis, Missouri; Wayne Reaves, Manna Enterprises, Inc., Anniston, Alabama, on behalf of the National Restaurant Association; and Gerard J. Musante, Structure House, Residential Weight Loss and Life Style Change Clinic, Durham, North Carolina.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 3305–3329; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 72; H. Con. Res. 303–304, and H. Res. 400, 402, 403, 404, were introduced. **(See next issue.)**

Additional Cosponsors: **(See next issue.)**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows today:

H.R. 3214, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, amended, (H. Rept. 108–321, Pt. 1); and

H. Res. 401, providing for further consideration of 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 (H. Rept. 108–322).

(See next issue.)

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Thornberry to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H9485**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered today by Rev. Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Congregational Methodist Church in Milner, Georgia. **Page H9485**

International Contributions to the Reconstruction of Iraq: The House agreed to H. Res. 198, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, and Russia can initially best contribute to the reconstruction of Iraq by the forgiveness of outstanding debt between both Iraq and France, Iraq and Germany, and Iraq and Russia, by a yea-and-nay vote of 394 yeas to 31 nays, Roll No. 545. **Pages H9489–91, H9508–09**

Agreed to the amendment in the nature of a substitute by voice vote. **Page H9491**

Agreed to amend the preamble by a voice vote. **Page H9509**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read, ''Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, Russia, and other nations can contribute to Iraq's reconstruction by forgiving debts owed by Iraq to those nations and by making generous pledges for Iraq's reconstruction at the International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq to be held in Madrid.'' **Page H9509**

Privileged Resolution: Representative McDermott offered a privileged resolution to correct the Congressional Record of January 28, 2003. **Page H9509**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations: The House concluded debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004. **Pages H9509–29**

The House then began consideration of 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. Further consideration of the bill will resume on Friday, October 17.

Pages H9530–83 (continued next issue)

Agreed to:

Young of Florida amendment that exempts servicemembers with combat-related injuries from the requirement of paying for subsistence charges while hospitalized; **Page H9562**

Maloney amendment that requires $20 million of the Economic Support Fund be used for programs for women and girls in Afghanistan; **(See next issue.)**

Slaughter amendment that requires executive agencies to provide specific information to Congress when an agency awards a ''no-bid'' contract using funds from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund; and **(See next issue.)**

Kirk amendment that allows non-competitive contracts to be reported to Congress seven days after the contract has been awarded in some circumstances (by a recorded vote of 405 ayes to 20 noes, Roll No. 549). **(See next issue.)**

Rejected:

Obey amendment that would have required that funds provided for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund be given as loans (by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 546); **Pages H9575–82**

Obey amendment that would have provided funds for quality of life enhancements for U.S. servicemembers (by a recorded vote of 209 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 547); **Pages H9562–65, H9582–83**

Goode amendment that would have eliminated funding for the U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping operations in Liberia and for international disaster and famine assistance in Liberia and Sudan; **(See next issue.)**

Blumenauer amendment that would have transferred funds from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund to rebuilding and assistance efforts in Afghanistan; **(See next issue.)**

Waxman amendment that would have reduced funding for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (by a recorded vote of 197 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 548); **(See next issue.)**

Markey amendment that would have struck certain provisions that would allow the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds (by a recorded vote of 146 ayes to 279 noes, Roll No. 550); **(See next issue.)**

Holt amendment that would have eliminated funding to import petroleum products into Iraq (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 551); and **(See next issue.)**

Loretta Sanchez amendment that would have struck the wording ''or the Global War on Terrorism'' from page 23 line 13 of the bill (by a recorded vote of 128 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 552). **(See next issue.)**

Withdrawn:

Shadegg amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of October 15) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. **(See next issue.)**

Point of order sustained against:

Obey amendment in the nature of a substitute; **Pages H9552–62**

Pence amendment (No. 33 printed in the Congressional Record of October 15) that sought to require that 50% of the total funds be made as a grant and 50% be made as a loan after the President informs Congress that a democratically elected government has been established in Iraq; **Pages H9565–75**

Filner amendment that sought to eliminate the disabled veterans tax; and **(See next issue.)**

Spratt amendment that sought to increase pay and benefits for active and reserve military personnel. **(See next issue.)**

Agreed by unanimous consent to consider certain amendments before the consideration of other amendments for 10 minutes each, that such amendments shall not be subject to amendment, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or the Committee on the Whole, and may amend a portion of the bill not yet read (except amendments proposing to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill must conform to clause 2(f) of rule 21). **(See next issue.)**

Agreed by unanimous consent to limit the time allowed for debate on certain amendments. **(See next issue.)**

Agreed by unanimous consent to consider certain amendments offered on the bill before consideration of other amendments. **(See next issue.)**

H. Res. 396, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by voice vote, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 202 nays with one voting ''present'', Roll No. 544. **Pages H9491–H9508**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:55 p.m. and reconvened at 1:01 a.m. **(See next issue.)**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today will appear in the next issue of the Record.

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule will appear in the next issue of the Record.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 1:02 a.m.

Committee Meetings

MAXIMIZE FARM AND RANCH INCOME

Committee on Agriculture: Held a hearing to examine new generation cooperatives and strategies to maximize farm and ranch income. Testimony was heard from Thomas C. Dorr, Under Secretary, Rural Development, USDA; Douglas Flory, member of the Board, Farm Credit Administration; and public witnesses.

DOD LONG-TERM BUDGET ISSUES

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on Department of Defense Long-Term Budget Issues. Testimony was heard from Dov S. Zakheim, Under Secretary (Comptroller) and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Defense; and Douglas J. Holtz-Eakin, Director, CBO.

HEALTHSOUTH FINANCIAL COLLAPSE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''The Financial Collapse of HealthSouth.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of HealthSouth Corporation: Diana Henze, Assistant Controller; and Greg Smith, Chief Auditing Officer;

the following former officials of HealthSouth Corporation: Teresa Sanders, Group Vice President and Chief Auditing Officer; Steve Schlatter, Physical Therapist; Michael Vines, Corporate Fixed Assets Department; Kelly Cullison, Vice President of Compliance; William Horton, Executive Vice President and corporate Counsel; Brandon Hale, Executive Vice President of Administration, Corporate Secretary and Compliance Office; James Goodreau, Chief of Security; and Anthony Tanner, Corporate Secretary and Compliance Officer; and Martin Cohen, Senior Managing Director, FTI Consulting.

In refusing to give testimony, the following former officials of HealthSouth Corporation: Richard M. Scrushy, Founder and Former Chairman and CEO; and Susan Jones-Smith, Senior Vice President Finance Reimbursement, invoked Fifth Amendment privileges.

U.S. CAPITAL MARKET STRUCTURE REVIEW

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Reviewing U.S. Capital Market Structure: The New York Stock Exchange and Related Issues.'' Testimony was heard from John Reed, Interim Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, New York Stock Exchange, Inc.; and public witnesses.

INTERNET VULNERABILITIES AFFECTING BUSINESSES, GOVERNMENTS AND HOMES

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing on ''You've Got Mail—But is it Secure? An Examination of Internet Vulnerabilities Affecting Businesses, Governments and Homes.'' Testimony was heard from Karen Evans, Administrator, Office of Electronic Government, OMB; and public witnesses.

CASTRO'S CUBA—ONGOING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Human Rights and Wellness held a hearing entitled ''Castro's Cuba: What is the Proper United States Response to Ongoing Human Rights Violations in Our Hemisphere?'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Roger Noriega, Assistant Secretary, Western Hemisphere; and Adolpho Franco, Assistant Administrator, Latin America and the Carribean, AID; R. Richard Newcomb, Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

FEC—ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Committee on House Administration: Held a hearing on the Federal Election Commission Enforcement Procedures. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the FEC: Ellen L. Weintraub, Chairman; and Bradley A. Smith, Vice Chairman; Karl Sandstrom, former Commissioner, FEC; and public witnesses.

U.S. POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN—CURRENT RECONSTRUCTION ISSUES

Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on United States Policy in Afghanistan: Current Issues in Reconstruction—Part II. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: William B. Taylor, Jr., Afghanistan Coordinator; and James Kunder, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia and the Near East, AID; Peter Rodman, Assistant Secretary, International Security Affairs, Department of Defense.

RESOLUTION OF THE ETHIOPIA-ERITREA BORDER DISPUTE ACT

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 2760, Resolution of the Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Dispute Act of 2003.

STATE FEDERAL AGENCY PROTECTIONS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on ''The GAO's Recent Report on the Implementation of Executive Order 12630 and the State of Federal Agency Protections of Private Property Rights.'' Testimony was heard from Anu Mittal, Director, Natural Resources and Environment Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

DATABASE AND COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION MISAPPROPRIATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 3261, Database and Collections of Information Misappropriation Act.

OVERSIGHT—VISA OVERSTAYS A GROWING PROBLEM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims held an oversight hearing on ''Visa Overstays: A Growing Problem for Law Enforcement.'' Testimony was heard from Kevin Tanner, Director, Foreign Terrorist

Tracking Task Force, FBI, Department of Justice; Nancy Kingsbury, Managing Director, Applied Research and Methods, GAO; Theresa Papademetriou, Senior Legal Specialist, Library of Congress; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 280, National Aviation Heritage Area Act; H.R. 704, Rim of the Valley Corridor Study Act; H.R. 1399, Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Boundary Revision Act of 2003; H.R. 1594, St. Croix National Heritage Area Study Act; H.R. 1618, Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area Act; H.R. 1862, Oil Region National Heritage Area Act; H.R. 1798, Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Act; and H.R. 2909, Utah Test and Training Range Protection Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Schiff and McInnis; Gerald F. Pease, Jr., Associate Director, Ranges and Airspace, U.S. Air Force, Department of Defense; the following officials of the Department of the Interior: deTeel Patterson Tiller, Acting Associate Director, Cultural Resources, National Park Service; Jeffrey Loman, Acting Director, Trust Services, Bureau of Indian Affairs; and Jim Hughes, Deputy Director, Land Management, Bureau of Land Management; Randy Johnson, Deputy Director, Planning for Public Lands, State of Utah; and public witnesses.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule on 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, providing that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule provides that no further motion or amendment shall be in order.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; FUTURE OF HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

Committee on Science: Ordered reported the following measures: H. Con. Res. 279, recognizing the significance of the anniversary of the American Association for the Advancement of Science Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Program, and reaffirming the commitment to support the use of science in governmental decisionmaking through such Program; and H. Res. 395, recognizing the importance of chemistry to our everyday lives and supporting the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

The Committee also held a hearing on The Future of Human Space Flight. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IS AMERICA LOSING ITS LEAD IN HIGH-TECH?

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled ''Is America losing its lead in high-tech: implications for the U.S. defense industrial base?'' Testimony was heard from Ronald Sega, Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.

AVIATION SECURITY—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held an oversight hearing on the Transportation Security Administration's Perspective on Aviation Security. Testimony was heard from James M. Loy, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.

VETERAN'S HEALTH CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Held a hearing entitled ''Handoff or Fumble: Do VA and DOD Provide Seamless Health Care Coverage to Transitioning Veterans?'' Testimony was heard from Neal P. Curtin, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, GAO; the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: Harold Kudler, M.D., Co-Chairman, Under Secretary for Health's Special Committee on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder; Robert H. Roswell, M.D., Under Secretary, Health; and Robert J. Epley, Associate Deputy Under Secretary, Policy and Programs, Veterans Benefits Administration; and Edward P. Wyatt, Jr., Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs, Department of Defense.

BRIEFING—SENSITIVE COUNTERTERRORISM ISSUES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a briefing on Sensitive Counterterrorism Issues. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

BRIEFING—GLOBAL INTELLIGENCE UPDATE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security, executive, briefing on Global Intelligence Update. The Subcommittee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

FASTER AND SMARTER FUNDING FOR FIRST RESPONDERS ACT

Select Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness and Response held a hearing on H.R. 3266, Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act of 2003. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PLUGGING THE GAPS IN BORDER SECURITY

Select Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Infrastructure and Border Security held a hearing entitled ''Plugging the Gaps in Border Security: the One Face at the Border Initiative.'' Testimony was heard from Robert Bonner, Commissioner, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2003

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Government Reform, hearing entitled ''Implementing the SAFETY Act: Advancing New Technologies for Homeland Security,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m., Friday, October 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1689, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, with a series of votes to occur on certain amendments.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, October 17

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Further consideration of H.R. 3289, Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2004.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E2059
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E2058
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E2055, E2056
Dooley, Calvin M., Calif., E2065
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E2068
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E2057
Hastings, Doc, Wash., E2061
Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E2056
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E2065
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E2067
Issa, Darrell E., Calif., E2061
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E2060
Kleczka, Gerald D., Wisc., E2063
Langevin, James R., R.I., E2060
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E2065
McGovern, James P., Mass., E2055, E2061
McKeon, Howard P. ''Buck'', Calif., E2057
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E2064
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E2058
Oberstar, James L., Minn., E2059
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E2062
Paul, Ron, Tex., E2068
Platts, Todd Russell, Pa., E2062
Porter, Jon C., Nev., E2067
Renzi, Rick, Ariz., E2064
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E2064
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E2062
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E2060
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E2061, E2066, E2067
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E2059
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E2060
Solis, Hilda L., Calif., E2063, E2063, E2064
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E2065
Tancredo, Thomas G., Colo., E2056
Tauscher, Ellen O., Calif., E2063
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E2058
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E2055, E2055, E2056
Udall, Tom, N.M., E2059

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $217.00 for six months, $434.00 per year, or purchased for $6.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (866) 512–1800 (toll free), (202) 512–1800 (D.C. Area), or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Record, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.