



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 8, 2003

No. 99

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.

July 8, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM MURPHY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, to modernize the Medicare Program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction to individuals for amounts contributed to health savings security accounts and health savings accounts, to provide for the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 1) "An Act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, to modernize the Medicare Program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction to individuals for amounts contributed to health savings security accounts and health savings accounts, to provide for the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and

flexible spending arrangements, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. FRIST, Mr. KYL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. BREAUX, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year President Bush addressed a Michigan audience laying out his plans to restructure Medicare. He said, "If it's good enough for Members of Congress, it's good enough for seniors in this Nation." What he meant was that American seniors who enroll in Medicare should have health insurance choices like those available to Members of Congress under the health insurance plan called the Federal employees health benefits plan. President Bush was not the only one to say so. Republican leaders in the House made the same point. All of us have heard colleagues here say that. That message, that seniors should have the same kind of health insurance choices available to Members of Congress, was an important selling point for the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill.

That message is absolutely right. The problem is that the Republican bill is absolutely the opposite. The Republican Medicare bill, H.R. 1, does not even come close to giving seniors the kind of coverage that Members of Congress have provided for themselves. The Congressional Research Service says the FEHBP plan which Members of Congress are in offers a drug benefit worth \$2,700, but the same CRS, Congressional Research Service, non-partisan arm of the Congress said the Republican Medicare bill is worth only about half of that. The Republican Medicare bill does not offer American seniors health care choices just like Members of Congress even though the President said it did. It does not even come close.

Even a basic comparison shows how the Republican bill comes up woefully short. The Republican bill tells seniors they have to pay a \$250 deductible. Members of Congress do not pay a deductible. The Republican bill requires seniors with drug costs over \$2,000 to continue paying monthly premiums even though they do not get any coverage until they spend an additional \$2,900 out of pocket. Members of Congress do not make premium payments and get nothing in return. The Republican Medicare bill does not offer American seniors health care choices just like Members of Congress. It does not even come close.

The Washington Post said the drug benefit proposed by the Republicans for seniors provides merely a fraction of the drug coverage that Members of Congress receive. The chairman of the health policy department at Emory University said that drug benefits are much better in the congressional Federal employees plan. Still do not believe the Republican bill offers a bad deal for American seniors? You have to look no farther than H.R. 2631 on today's suspension calendar. H.R. 2631 says that private insurance plans under

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6273

the Federal employees health benefit plan must agree to provide drug coverage for Federal retirees actuarially equivalent to the drug coverage they provide to current Federal employees. In other words, what that means is that when Members of Congress and other Federal employees retire, they will not be forced to go into H.R. 1, into the Republican Medicare bill. It is good for Members of Congress, it is good for Federal employees, because the Republican Medicare drug benefit would be a step down for them. Remember what the President said: If it is good enough for Members of Congress, it is good enough for seniors in this Nation. That is what he says about the Republican bill.

It would be a big step down to go into the Republican privatized drug benefit plan for the 13 million American private sector retirees who get drug coverage through their employers' health insurance. The Congressional Budget Office said that more than one-third of all seniors who are in private retirement plans will see their plans dropped by their employer. They will be forced out of the private coverage they have today, forced out of that plan and put into the inferior Republican Medicare prescription drug plan.

H.R. 2631 says Members of Congress should not have to live under the same system that the Republican Medicare plan foists on the American public. Should we pass H.R. 2631 today? Absolutely, because 8.5 million Federal employees should not have to live with the Republican Medicare bill's drug benefit. But given that the Republican Medicare bill's drug benefit is so bad that Congress, after passing it 2 weeks ago, today is exempting themselves, get that again, the Republican Medicare bill is so bad from 2 weeks ago that passed here that today Congress is exempting itself from that plan so that Members of Congress can continue to enjoy good health coverage, not the inferior plan that President Bush and Republicans are foisting on Congress.

We should pass H.R. 2631 today and we should throw H.R. 1 in the shredder and get to work on a real prescription drug benefit for American seniors. And the President when he says, "If it's good enough for Congress, it's good enough for seniors in this Nation," the President should mean what he says.

BETTER TEACHERS MAKE BETTER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, following President Bush's landmark No Child Left Behind law, we now have an opportunity to make overdue reforms in the Federal Government's role in our national education system. We will take up two very important education reauthorization bills this week to begin

that process. The first is the Ready to Teach Act of 2003 sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) which will strengthen and improve teacher training programs all around this country. With the enormous responsibilities weighing on them today, we owe it not only to American teachers but to their students to prepare every one of them before they set foot in the classroom. Highly qualified teachers, as all of us know and some of us were lucky enough to have in school, are worth their weight in gold. But too many inexperienced teachers are being thrown into the classroom without effective training and preparation. This legislation will start measuring training programs' success and holding them accountable. It will bring higher qualified individuals into the training programs and ultimately into the classrooms. It is an important first step in reshaping American education to face the emerging challenges of the 21st century.

Equally important is the bill of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act. Under this bill, qualified teachers in math, science and special education would be eligible for student loan forgiveness of up to \$17,500 if they teach in low-income community schools. Most of these poor title I schools are in our Nation's inner cities and in our rural areas where the need for qualified teachers is most acute. Too many math and science classes are being taught by teachers who neither majored nor minored in those fields. And two-thirds of public schools around the country have teacher vacancies in their special education programs.

Mr. Speaker, as more and more of our best teachers retire every year, the teaching shortage in America is approaching crisis levels and we must act. We have to develop innovative ways to attract and retain the highest quality individuals we can for our schools, to get results for students, parents and teachers around the country. And while these two bills are only part of a broader agenda, both of them start to do just that.

RECOGNIZING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARICOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize the 30th anniversary of CARICOM which was celebrated on July 4 of this year. Founded in 1973 in Chaguaramas, Trinidad, CARICOM, or its full name, the Caribbean Community, now includes 16 members. I want to congratulate CARICOM's outgoing chair, Prime Minister Pierre Charles of Dominica, and the incoming chair, the Honorable P.J.

Patterson of Jamaica, on behalf of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Congress of the United States. We in the Virgin Islands and the CBC pledge our continued support as they meet the challenges presented by new global and regional trade alliances and loss of preferences, HIV/AIDS and the other social and economic needs of their constituencies, governance, the need for regionalization and the difficult relationship with us, their northern neighbor.

I particularly want to recognize the historic participation of the Honorable Thabo Mbeki, President of South Africa, in the recent 24th regular meeting of the conference of CARICOM heads of government in Montego Bay, Jamaica. His presence significantly underscores the connectedness of all people of African descent and the sameness of our struggles no matter whether on the continent of Africa or in the diaspora. As we are linked by blood and history, so is our future tied together.

Mr. Speaker, the Caribbean community also shares important historical ties with this Nation and today represents not only an important trading partner with the balance in our favor but also a critical partner in our fight against drugs in our own country and our important efforts to ensure our homeland security. With this background and the need for closer cooperation, the recent interactions of our country at the 24th heads of government meetings held during the anniversary celebration do not make sense to me.

First, although the presence of U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick was important to discussions of the impact of the upcoming FTAA agreement, the refusal to support what I consider to be standard transitioning for these smaller countries in the face of the loss of important preferences which have been the bulwark of their economic stability is not the action of a friend and neighbor. I hope that the administration will reconsider its position. Secondly, there was discussion on the International Criminal Court. While there may be differing opinions as to whether the United States should be given a waiver from liability under this court, it is unconscionable in my view for us to strong arm the Caribbean countries into supporting the waiver by threatening to cut off financial aid which has been previously committed and on which they are depending. With friends like us, the CARICOM nations do not need enemies.

This is not the first instance in which this country has sought to force its will by employing or threatening punitive measures that these nations can ill afford. The CARICOM countries are to be commended, however, for not surrendering their national integrity in the face of our bullying. But there has to be a better way. I want to use this time, Mr. Speaker, to call on the administration to seek that better way

and to recognize the value and integrity of these countries and territories, not only because of their importance to our national defense in homeland security and economic stability but because they are also sovereign nations in their own right, with a long history of democratically elected governments.

As the Delegate from one of this country's two Caribbean offshore areas, the health of the region has a direct impact on my district and constituents, even more directly than it does on our larger Nation. We offer ourselves and that of the recently formed Caribbean Caucus as mediators to restore the relationships and mutual support that we used to enjoy with the members of CARICOM.

July 4 is our most important national holiday. It is interesting that this is the same day that CARICOM was founded. Perhaps the sharing of this date may form the basis of the beginning of that new and improved relationship.

INTRODUCING RESOLUTION TO BRING GREAT AWARENESS OF THE PROBLEM OF STALKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Peggy Klinke was a constituent of mine from Albuquerque, New Mexico. She was murdered in January of this year by a former boyfriend who was obsessed with her and stalked her for almost 2 years. Today I will be introducing a resolution to this House to bring greater awareness of the problem of stalking in America and the things that we need to do to protect its victims. It is my pleasure that Debbie Riddle and Mark Spark are here today. Debbie was Peggy's sister and Mark was her boyfriend. I wanted to thank them for joining me here today in the House.

More than 1 million women a year and almost 400,000 men are stalked annually. Those numbers are staggering. One in 12 women and one in 45 men in their lifetime will be stalked. Yet the problem continues to go mostly unrecognized and not responded to properly. The bill that I am introducing would make January Stalking Awareness Month in honor of Peggy in the month that she died.

The first step in addressing any problem is to understand that problem and make sure that other people do, because until people understand it, you cannot mobilize the will for change. We need model laws and to make sure those model laws are implemented in every State in this country. We need to identify the best practices for dealing with stalkers, practical things proven to work in the field that can be used by victims and also by law enforcement to make sure victims are safer. We need

to better train our police and our district attorneys so that they know what tools they have at their disposal when they are dealing with a stalker. And we need better cross-jurisdictional communication.

Eleven percent of stalking victims move to get away from their stalker. As soon as they do, you have got two police departments, two district attorneys and two judicial systems supposedly working together but often not communicating about the victim and the stalker. No one should have to live in fear without protection and without hope. I believe that this resolution is the first step to getting better protection for the victims of stalkers.

I ask the House to rapidly consider the resolution and pass it from this House.

U.S. SUCCESS IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, 227 years ago 56 men put their lives, their families and fortunes on the line as they defied the most powerful country in the world, England. These men declared independence and our country was born by a swift stroke of a pen. This weekend we celebrated our country's 227th birthday. This country, of course, has survived many conflicts, both foreign and domestic, and we have survived due to the fact that American men and women always have answered the call should our rights and our freedoms come under attack. In the last couple of years, terror has taken on a new meaning to this country and its citizens. We have been threatened like never before. With an amazing outpouring of patriotism, we refused to allow the mantle of freedom to be taken from our shoulders.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, with the end of Operation Sidewinder in Iraq, our Armed Forces have experienced tremendous success. Yet we remain confronted with the sad truth that this success has come at a cost of American lives. Over the weekend, a Florida National Guard soldier from my congressional district was killed. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends and I also mourn his loss. I had the opportunity to meet this young man at the community college he attended while serving in the National Guard. His presence, enthusiasm and dedication exemplifies the men and women of our Armed Forces that continue to serve in Iraq.

From Afghanistan to Iraq and possibly Liberia, our troops face life-threatening situations. But they fight for those who yearn for freedom, who cannot fight for themselves. All who wish for democracy know that America can be the source of the freedoms that have so long eluded them. Our troops liberated 24 million Iraqis and gave

them the opportunity for freedom that had been denied them for so long. As such, rebuilding a country neglected for decades by a worthless tyrant takes time, it takes patience, it takes perseverance. Iraq is showing signs that the efforts of our troops are yielding large gains. We have over half of the Iraqis most wanted in custody. We are training Iraqis to police and govern themselves as a free nation. Iraqis have access to a growing number of publications, newspapers and magazines replacing the propaganda of the state-run news that previously existed. Electricity is running 24 hours a day in Basra and improvements are being made in Baghdad. According to reports now, Hussein would black out parts of Baghdad simply because there was not sufficient generation of power for the entire city. Our people are working to change that and they are working very, very hard.

Mr. Speaker, many in some parts of the media seem not only content but resolute in reporting only those stories that portray bad news. Remember, some of these same people called our initial military strategy a failure after less than a week of combat. But I find it perplexing that all we hear from some reporters are stories describing an Iraq that is a viper's nest of Saddam loyalists and full of an angry civilian population who want us to leave. However, unlike some of our media reporting, I believe normal, everyday people in this country realize that it will take time to foster democracy and to quell attempts to destabilize fledgling new, free governments. Today's copy of *The Hill* magazine touched on this issue and quoted dozens of soldiers who seem to be baffled by the endless wave of negative press. One helicopter pilot is quoted as saying, "The media has misrepresented Iraqi resistance. For the most part, people here are extremely friendly to us." He goes on to say that, quote, crime in Baghdad is one-tenth of what it is in Los Angeles. Finally, according to a poll taken by the Iraq Center for Research & Strategic Studies, it was found that 65 percent of Baghdadis want U.S. troops to stay for how. Only 17 percent wanted them to pull out immediately.

Let us look at what the U.S. has accomplished. For that, of course, we need look no further than the words of General Tommy Franks in his recent retirement speech when he said, "When we arrived, the Taliban and al Qaeda controlled Afghanistan and Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq with an iron hand. What a difference 22 months makes. Twenty-two months ago, the United States of America and the free world looked into the face of evil and defeated it." Now we are moving closer to freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Yes, there is a tremendous amount of work to be done but the peace is not lost. With where we are today, the glass for continued democracy in these countries is over half full.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, You delivered Jericho into the hands of Joshua with the mighty sound of trumpet blasts and the joyful shouts of believers in Your power. We remember the story of these tumbling walls coming down, but to this day no one can find any remains of Joshua's Jericho. So complete is Your victory, Lord.

In our own day, bring an end to the violence in Iraq. Protect and bless peacemakers and the coalition military forces who are trying to bring law and order to that land. Bring down the walls of prejudice and indifference which surround war-torn Iraq. Embrace the people there with Your Spirit, that they may know peace and unity. May their ancient treasures of culture be restored as they rebuild a new nation founded upon religious truth and human dignity.

May goodness, truth and beauty in the end prove victorious. 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. LORETTA SANCHEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SANCHEZ 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.

NORTH KOREA SELLING HEROIN TO PAY FOR NUKES

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of months ago, a North Korean ship, the

Pong Su, was captured while trying to transfer \$80 million worth of heroin to a fishing boat off the coast of Australia. This incident confirms that the rogue regime of Kim Jong Il is selling drugs to tighten his grip on power and prolong his reign of terror.

The evidence tying this evil regime to the drug trade is overwhelming. One of the 26 people aboard the Pong Su was a member of the North Korean ruling party who served as a senior envoy in Pyongyang's embassy in Beijing.

At a recent hearing in the Senate, a former high-ranking North Korean official testified that Kim Jong Il has personally designated land in North Korea for the growth of opium. And U.S. State Department officials have concluded that the illegal drug program is sanctioned by the North Korean Government, who is using it to fund its weapons programs.

This incident is a reminder that North Korea will stop at nothing to expand its nuclear arsenal.

BRING IT ON

(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 voice concern over the disregard President Bush has shown to our brave servicemembers and their families. Our troops are dying in Iraq at a rate of one per day. The reason? This administration failed to adequately plan for post-war peacekeeping and civil reconstruction in Iraq. As a consequence, our troops are overstretched, morale is low, and the situation within Iraq is getting worse by the day.

This administration must, it must readdress the situation and give our troops the peacekeeping training that they need; and, in addition, efforts to reach out to the international community for assistance must be enhanced. In short, we should do everything in our power to quell the violence as quickly as possible.

But instead, just last weekend, President Bush taunted insurgents in Iraq by boasting, "Bring 'em on." This is an insult not only to the military families who have lost a loved one in Iraq, but to those who live under the constant fear that their loved ones might not come home.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2658, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 26, 2003, 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. 2658.

□ 1208

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. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004 and for other purposes, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 26, 2003, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

First, I appreciate very much having the opportunity to share this time with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). I am very pleased today to bring before the House the 2004 defense appropriations bill. It is a bill that reflects very much the direction of the Commander-in-Chief as well as the Department of Defense regarding the war on terrorism that we are pursuing in the Middle East at this point, but also recognizing its great threat around the world.

The bill itself is a very, very good bill that I highly commend to the Members, Mr. Chairman. I must say that in terms of its allocation, I am a bit disappointed, for the bill before us is in the neighborhood of \$3 billion below the President's request. But having said that, we did provide some reallocation that helps some of our other bills, and in the meantime, we are doing all we can to recoup some of those dollars by way of other venues.

Having said that, the bill is a very balanced bill, and we have made every effort to reflect the will of the House as well as the needs of our men and women who are representing us so well around the world.

Before going on and commenting briefly about the bill, I want to express my deep appreciation to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), who works hand in glove with me in developing this bill, always, but particularly in this very difficult year with the challenges we face in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that this work would not have been able to have

July 8, 2003

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H6277

been carried forward in this timely fashion without the help of our very fine staff, Kevin Roper particularly, on my side, and a variety and mix of other fine staff members. I will let the gentleman from Pennsylvania talk about his fantastic staff on his own.

But in the meantime, rather than going into great deal about the bill at

this point in time, let me say that we have made every effort to fully fund the personnel needs that we face in this challenging world, such as a modest pay raise for our men and women who make up our forces, and funding the health care programs that are so vital to their needs, as well as their housing challenges.

We are also providing funding to make certain as we go about being successful in this war on terrorism we also are laying the foundation for America's leading the world in a way that will preserve peace for all of us.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert the following tabular summary of the bill.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2658)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army.....	26,855,017	37,386,380	28,233,436	+1,378,419	-9,152,944
Military Personnel, Navy.....	21,927,628	25,282,454	23,052,001	+1,124,373	-2,230,453
Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	8,501,087	9,559,441	8,962,197	+461,110	-597,244
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	21,981,277	26,715,989	23,121,003	+1,139,726	-3,594,986
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	3,374,355	---	3,568,625	+194,270	+3,568,625
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,907,552	---	1,983,153	+75,601	+1,983,153
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	553,983	---	571,444	+17,461	+571,444
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	1,236,904	---	1,267,888	+30,984	+1,267,888
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	5,114,588	---	5,382,719	+268,131	+5,382,719
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	2,125,161	---	2,140,598	+15,437	+2,140,598
Total, title I, Military Personnel.....	93,577,552	98,944,264	98,283,064	+4,705,512	-661,200
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	23,992,082	24,958,842	24,903,992	+911,910	-54,850
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	29,331,526	28,287,690	28,060,240	-1,271,286	-227,450
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	3,585,759	3,406,656	3,440,456	-145,303	+33,800
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	27,339,533	27,793,931	26,689,043	-650,490	-1,104,888
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide 1/.....	14,707,506	16,570,847	16,124,455	+1,416,949	-446,392
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	1,970,180	1,952,009	2,031,309	+61,129	+79,300
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	1,236,809	1,171,921	1,171,921	-64,888	---
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	187,532	173,952	173,952	-13,580	---
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	2,163,104	2,179,188	2,144,188	-18,916	-35,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	4,261,707	4,211,331	4,325,231	+63,524	+113,900
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	4,117,585	4,402,646	4,424,046	+306,461	+21,400
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund.....	5,000	50,000	5,000	---	-45,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces....	9,614	10,333	10,333	+719	---
Environmental Restoration, Army.....	395,900	396,018	396,018	+118	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy.....	256,948	256,153	256,153	-795	---
Environmental Restoration, Air Force.....	389,773	384,307	384,307	-5,466	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.....	23,498	24,081	24,081	+583	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	246,102	212,619	221,369	-24,733	+8,750
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.....	58,400	59,000	59,000	+600	---
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction.....	416,700	450,800	450,800	+34,100	---
Support for International Sporting Competition, Defense	19,000	---	---	-19,000	---
Total, title II, Operation and maintenance.....	114,714,258	116,952,324	115,295,894	+581,636	-1,656,430
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	2,285,574	2,128,485	2,180,785	-104,789	+52,300
Missile Procurement, Army.....	1,096,548	1,459,462	1,533,462	+436,914	+74,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	2,266,508	1,640,704	1,956,504	-310,004	+315,800
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	1,253,099	1,309,966	1,355,466	+102,367	+45,500
Other Procurement, Army.....	5,874,674	4,216,854	4,547,596	-1,327,078	+330,742
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	8,812,855	8,788,148	9,030,148	+217,293	+242,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	1,868,517	1,991,821	2,205,634	+337,117	+213,813
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.....	1,165,730	922,355	941,855	-223,875	+19,500
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.....	9,032,837	11,438,984	11,453,098	+2,420,261	+14,114
Other Procurement, Navy.....	4,612,910	4,679,443	4,784,742	+171,832	+105,299
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	1,388,583	1,070,999	1,200,499	-188,084	+129,500
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	13,137,255	12,079,360	11,877,051	-1,260,204	-202,309
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	3,174,739	4,393,039	4,235,505	+1,060,766	-157,534
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.....	1,288,164	1,284,725	1,279,725	-8,439	-5,000
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	10,672,712	11,583,659	11,195,159	+522,447	-388,500
Procurement, Defense-Wide 1/ 2/.....	3,414,455	3,665,506	3,803,776	+389,321	+138,270
National Guard and Reserve Equipment.....	100,000	---	100,000	---	+100,000
Defense Production Act Purchases.....	73,057	67,516	67,516	-5,541	---
Total, title III, Procurement.....	71,518,217	72,721,026	73,748,521	+2,230,304	+1,027,495

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2658)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	7,669,656	9,122,825	10,186,272	+2,516,616	+1,063,447
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	13,946,085	14,106,653	14,666,239	+720,154	+559,586
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force.	18,822,569	20,336,258	20,704,267	+1,881,698	+368,009
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 1/.....	17,524,596	17,974,257	18,763,791	+1,239,195	+789,534
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	245,554	286,661	293,661	+48,107	+7,000

Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	58,208,460	61,826,654	64,614,230	+6,405,770	+2,787,576
=====					
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds.....	1,784,956	1,721,507	1,721,507	-63,449	---
National Defense Sealift Fund: Ready Reserve Force	942,629	1,062,762	1,066,462	+123,833	+3,700
Refined Petroleum Products, Transfer Account.....	---	675,000	---	---	-675,000

Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds..	2,727,585	3,459,269	2,787,969	+60,384	-671,300
=====					
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance.....	14,100,386	14,876,887	14,874,037	+773,651	-2,850
Procurement.....	284,242	327,826	328,826	+44,584	+1,000
Research and development.....	458,914	65,796	410,296	-48,618	+344,500

Total, Defense Health Program.....	14,843,542	15,270,509	15,613,159	+769,617	+342,650

Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Army:					
Operation and maintenance.....	974,238	1,199,168	1,199,168	+224,930	---
Procurement.....	213,278	79,212	79,212	-134,066	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	302,683	251,881	254,881	-47,802	+3,000

Total, Chemical Agents 3/ 4/.....	1,490,199	1,530,261	1,533,261	+43,062	+3,000

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense Office of the Inspector General.....	881,907 157,165	817,371 162,449	817,371 162,449	-64,536 +5,284	--- ---

Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	17,372,813	17,780,590	18,126,240	+753,427	+345,650
=====					
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund.....	222,500	226,400	226,400	+3,900	---
Intelligence Community Management Account.....	163,479	158,640	170,640	+7,161	+12,000
Transfer to Department of Justice.....	(34,100)	(34,100)	(46,100)	(+12,000)	(+12,000)
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund.....	75,000	---	---	-75,000	---
National Security Education Trust Fund.....	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---

Total, title VII, Related agencies.....	468,979	393,040	405,040	-63,939	+12,000
=====					

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2658)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec. 8005).....	(2,500,000)	(4,000,000)	(2,500,000)	---	(-1,500,000)
Indian Financing Act incentives (Sec. 8021).....	8,000	---	8,000	---	+8,000
FFRDCs (Sec. 8029).....	-74,200	---	-74,200	---	-74,200
Disposal & lease of DOD real property (Sec. 8035).....	29,730	31,000	31,000	+1,270	---
Overseas Mil Fac Invest Recovery (Sec. 8038).....	1,000	1,331	1,331	+331	---
Rescissions (Sec. 8049).....	-402,750	---	-139,350	+263,400	-139,350
Excess Foreign Currency Cash Balance	-338,000	---	---	+338,000	---
Travel Cards (Sec. 8083).....	10,000	44,000	44,000	+34,000	---
Government Purchase Card	-97,000	---	---	+97,000	---
American Red Cross (Sec. 8107).....	8,100	---	6,500	-1,600	+6,500
Special needs students	7,750	---	---	-7,750	---
Fisher House (Sec. 8093).....	1,700	---	2,000	+300	+2,000
CAAS/Contract Growth (Sec. 8094).....	-850,000	---	-172,500	+677,500	-172,500
IT cost growth reduction (Sec. 8099).....	-400,000	---	-320,000	+80,000	-320,000
Travel cost growth	-59,260	---	---	+59,260	---
Revised economic assumptions reduction	-1,674,000	---	---	+1,674,000	---
Working Capital Funds Cash Balance (Sec.8101).....	-120,000	---	-539,000	-419,000	-539,000
Working Capital Funds Excess Carryover (Sec. 8102)....	-48,000	---	-67,000	-19,000	-67,000
Ctr for Mil Recruiting Assessment & Vet Emp(Sec. 8103)	3,400	---	5,500	+2,100	+5,500
Transportation Working Capital Fund (Sec. 8119).....	---	---	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000
Other Contracts (Sec. 8118).....	---	---	-294,000	-294,000	-294,000
Fort Irwin education (Sec. 8117).....	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Excess balances from P.L. 108-11 (Sec. 8120).....	---	---	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Total, title VIII, General Provisions.....	-3,993,530	76,331	-4,087,719	-94,189	-4,164,050
Total for the bill (net).....	354,594,334	372,153,498	369,173,239	+14,578,905	-2,980,259
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Consolidated Appropriations Resolution 2003 (PL 108-7)	10,000,000	---	---	-10,000,000	---
Additional transfer authority (sec. 8005).....	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	62,350,100	---	---	-62,350,100	---
Additional transfer authority (Sec. 1311).....	(2,000,000)	---	---	(-2,000,000)	---
Net grand total (including other appropriations)	426,944,434	372,153,498	369,173,239	-57,771,195	-2,980,259
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Disabled military retiree payments (mandatory)....	55,000	302,000	302,000	+247,000	---
Military personnel accounts (discretionary)....	-55,000	-302,000	-302,000	-247,000	---
Army Venture Capital Funds (Sec. 8105).....	17,000	17,000	17,000	---	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)					
Defense Cooperation Account.....	28,000	---	---	-28,000	---
Legislative Proposals:					
Military personnel, Army.....	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
Military personnel, Navy.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	---	7,000	---	---	-7,000
TRICARE indexing to OMB inflation rate.....	---	45,000	---	---	-45,000
NSETF Transfer.....	---	-8,000	---	---	+8,000
Total adjustments.....	45,000	73,000	17,000	-28,000	-56,000
Adjusted total (incl scorekeeping adjustments) ..	426,989,434	372,226,498	369,190,239	-57,799,195	-3,036,259
Appropriations.....	(427,392,184)	(372,226,498)	(369,329,589)	(-58,062,595)	(-2,896,909)
Rescissions.....	(-402,750)	---	(-139,350)	(+263,400)	(-139,350)
Total (including adjustments).....	426,989,434	372,226,498	369,190,239	-57,799,195	-3,036,259
Amount in this bill.....	(426,944,434)	(372,153,498)	(369,173,239)	(-57,771,195)	(-2,980,259)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(45,000)	(73,000)	(17,000)	(-28,000)	(-56,000)
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	426,989,434	372,226,498	369,190,239	-57,799,195	-3,036,259
Mandatory.....	277,500	528,400	528,400	+250,900	---
Discretionary.....	426,711,934	371,698,098	368,661,839	-58,050,095	-3,036,259

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2658)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel.....	93,577,552	98,944,264	98,283,064	+4,705,512	-661,200
Title II - Operation and Maintenance.....	114,714,258	116,952,324	115,295,894	+581,636	-1,656,430
Title III - Procurement.....	71,518,217	72,721,026	73,748,521	+2,230,304	+1,027,495
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	58,208,460	61,826,654	64,614,230	+6,405,770	+2,787,576
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds.....	2,727,585	3,459,269	2,787,969	+60,384	-671,300
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs.....	17,372,813	17,780,590	18,126,240	+753,427	+345,650
Title VII - Related agencies.....	468,979	393,040	405,040	-63,939	+12,000
Title VIII - General provisions (net).....	-3,993,530	76,331	-4,087,719	-94,189	-4,164,050

Total, Department of Defense (in this bill).....	354,594,334	372,153,498	369,173,239	+14,578,905	-2,980,259
Other appropriations.....	72,350,100	---	---	-72,350,100	---

Total DoD funding available (net).....	426,944,434	372,153,498	369,173,239	-57,771,195	-2,980,259

Scorekeeping adjustments.....	45,000	73,000	17,000	-28,000	-56,000

Total mandatory and discretionary.....	426,989,434	372,226,498	369,190,239	-57,799,195	-3,036,259

FOOTNOTES:

- 1/ Transferred \$496,046,000 to Department of Homeland Security from O&M, Defense-wide (-\$66,000,000), Procurement, Defense-wide (-\$30,000,000), and RDT&E, Defense-wide (-\$400,046,000).
- 2/ FY 2004 Budget amendment (H.Doc. 108-67) reduced Procurement, Defense-wide -\$25,000,000 for a Military Construction program.
- 3/ FY 2004 Budget request for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army reduced -\$119,815,000 and transferred to Military Construction.
- 4/ Included in Budget under Procurement title.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a completely bipartisan bill, as the Chairman mentioned. Staff has worked diligently on working the details. We have worked with all the Members. We spent a lot of time asking Members for their input. We got a lot more input than we could afford, but we have done the best we could do with the amount that we had.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I just rise in strong support of this bill and to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. Chairman, when they mentioned the ability of the staff, they are exactly right. This bill, while it is nearly half of all discretionary spending, is not half of all government spending, because mandatories take up two-thirds of the spending. But this bill is half of the discretionary spending, and this subcommittee does a tremendous job in allocating it in a proper way.

I am just in very strong support of this, and I compliment the leadership of the subcommittee.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Democrat for their leadership in bringing this bill to the House Floor.

I would like to express my appreciation for the continued funding of the Joint Diabetes Project in Army RDT&E, Medical Advanced Technology. This project, a collaborative effort of DOD, VA and Joslin Diabetes Center, is bringing advanced, state of the art diabetes detection, care and prevention to large portions of the DOD and VA patient populations. The Joslin Vision Network, enhanced by the Comprehensive Diabetes Management Program, has been proven to reduce costs while providing improved care.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill. National defense is important to all of us. This bill, however, will neither ensure our defense nor promote the general welfare, two of the central obligations of this government.

At over \$368 billion, this bill expends scarce resources in Cold War era weapons systems. It spends another \$9 billion on missile defense, a 17-percent increase over last year. This represents another heavy installment on what may be a bottomless pit of spending.

This spending comes at real costs. To put this in perspective, last year, according to the National Priorities Project, the people of California paid \$859 million in tax dollars that were spent on missile defense.

That money could have paid to allow another 106,000 children to enroll in Head Start. It could have extended healthcare coverage to nearly half a million children. It could have created over 12,000 new units of affordable hous-

ing. Or it could have hired nearly 15,000 elementary school teachers.

And this year we are spending 17 percent more. That's a misplaced priority. And it is not the ticket to national security.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and would like to take a quick moment to compliment the work done by the Defense Appropriations subcommittee. As a new member of this subcommittee, I have been thoroughly impressed by the professional and unified way in which this committee conducts its difficult responsibilities. My chairman, Mr. LEWIS, Ranking Member MURTHA, and their staffs are to be commended on the difficult work of putting together a fair and balanced bill, while being under such a tight allocation constraint.

I would like to call attention to an item in the Defense Health Programs that I believe is noteworthy. Under the committee's action, there are resources allocated for muscular dystrophy research and the muscle research consortium. This research has significant applications for our military in terms of human muscle strength, and the implications for combating bioterrorism through better understanding of how motor neurons and muscle tissue are impacted by biotoxins. It is important that this program be shared in a collaborative consortium of the nation's four pre-eminent muscle research facilities and a national clinical trials network. More importantly, as the author of the Muscular Dystrophy CARE Act signed into law by President Bush in 2001, I am acutely aware of the tremendous needs for translational research regarding the scourge of childhood muscular dystrophy, and I am encouraged that appropriations such as this will bring hope to thousands of families who suffer much and deserve their fair share of Federal research dollars.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my concerns that funds from the Department of Defense budget could be used to provide universal health care coverage for the Iraqi people.

I understand that it may be necessary to care for Iraqi citizens injured in the war, but if we're going to provide universal health care to the Iraqi population we should do the same for our citizens here at home.

The 41.2 million Americans who lack health insurance coverage should not have to suffer from lack of quality health care any longer. And our soldiers fighting in Iraq, who will soon become veterans, should not be denied future health care and should not have to worry about whether their families will receive health care coverage now or in the future.

I had intended to offer an amendment to the 2004 Defense Appropriations bill to require that the U.S. provide funds only for the war-related health care needs of Iraqi citizens, and not for the universal health care services currently being offered for Iraq, however, I understood that my amendment may not have been ruled in order.

Instead of offering an amendment, therefore, I urge my colleagues to consider my position in opposition to universal care service for Iraqis until universal health is provided to all Americans. As Congress continues to address the future health care funding needs related to U.S. involvement in Iraq, I will continue to pursue opportunities to offer amendments which provide for universal health care here in the U.S.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the critical health care needs of all Americans are adequately met before we commit to providing universal health care services in Iraq. I remain dedicated to providing affordable and accessible health care for U.S. citizens first.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2658, the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004. This piece of legislation is perhaps the most important component of our wartime budget for America. It is the third bill we are considering pursuant to the 302(b) allocations adopted by the Appropriations Committee on June 17. I am pleased to report that it is consistent with the levels established in H. Con. Res. 95, the House concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, which Congress adopted as its fiscal blueprint on April 10. The budget resolution provided \$400.1 billion in discretionary budget authority for the national defense function. This bill funds the bulk of that commitment. The rest is funded in the military construction bill, which the House already passed on June 26, and the energy and water bill.

H.R. 2658 provides \$368.662 billion in new discretionary budget authority, which is within the 302(b) allocation to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. This is a 1.2-percent increase from the previous year, but builds on a 5-year average annual growth rate of 7.2 percent for defense appropriations. The bill contains no emergency-designated new budget authority, but does include \$2.14 billion worth of rescissions from previously enacted appropriations.

Accordingly, the bill complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution.

This bill represents the House's support for the more than 165,000 U.S. troops performing difficult and dangerous duty in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill contains the largest research and development funding ever, and the largest procurement funding since 1990. H.R. 2658 also funds a range of military pay raises up to 6.25 percent, as previously provided for in the Defense Authorization Bill.

I would add one note of caution: the Pentagon has confirmed in a letter to me that the press reports claiming that DOD cannot account for some of the supplemental funding since September 11, 2001, are essentially correct. Accordingly, it is essential that this body adhere to budget rules, carefully examine budget requests, and diligently conduct oversight to ensure defense resources are used efficiently.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 2658.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of H.R. 2658, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for FY 2004. I applaud the bipartisan effort that has brought this vital and carefully balanced legislation to the floor, and regret that I was unavoidably detained in my home State and, therefore, not able to cast my vote in favor of this bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on this extremely important legislation.

The bill before the House today deserves the strong support of every Member as it continues the efforts of Congress to ensure that

our nation's military is ready for the challenges of the 21st century. As has been repeatedly demonstrated during our ongoing confrontation with terrorists and tyrants around the world, these challenges are as daunting as any our great nation has ever faced. I am gratified that my colleagues understand that our security and the defense of freedom must remain above the partisan fray and demand our full commitment.

We have been thrust into an age of warfare that demands heretofore unimaginable speed, complexity and flexibility for our fighting machines and the men and women who design, build and operate them. This bill provides for the most forward-looking technology in our aircraft, ships, ground weapons and missile defense. We must press forward in developing leading edge technology, looking not only to the needs of today but to 2020, 2050 and beyond.

The most crucial commitment we must fulfill, however, is the one we make to the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who remain unquestionably the foundation for the United States' continuing status as the world's sole superpower, unrivaled in our ability to defend and support freedom anywhere in the world.

The funding provided in this bill is critical to ensuring that the brave men and women in our armed services have the tools and resources necessary to accomplish a swift, sure and decisive victory over tyranny and oppression across the globe. The best of America, and thousands of the best from my home state of Texas—our men and women in uniform, active duty and reserve components alike—are now in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan, on the high seas and at the far corners of the world. These brave Americans now risk their lives to confront the oppression, tyranny, and terrorism that plague and threaten the world and our nation.

Through our support of this bill, Mr. Chairman, we show our unequivocal support for our military men and women by providing them with improved pay and benefits and better working and living conditions. We can never do enough to compensate these dedicated men and women for their sacrifices in defense of our freedom, but this bill represents continuing movement in the right direction.

One of this nation's finest traditions is our support of our men and women in uniform. American forces, whether deployed here at home or across the globe, fight not for narrow interests or for reasons of national pride. American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines are engaged in combat today so that our people do not live in a world in which tyrants armed with weapons of horror hold free nations hostage, and in doing so threaten freedom itself.

Accordingly, it is our solemn obligation to stand solidly behind our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines and to give our men and women in uniform the full and complete support they must have in order to prevail in this war and come safely home. This appropriations bill is an appropriate step in fulfilling our obligation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to lend their full support for H.R. 2658. Our nation's service men and women deserve no less.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as we debate this appropriations bill today, we should recall the words of our President, George W. Bush, shortly after the attacks of

September 11, 2001. He stated: "America is a nation full of good fortune, with so much to be grateful for. But we are not spared from suffering. In every generation, the world has produced enemies of human freedom. They have attacked America, because we are freedom's home and defender."

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us today is our answer to those who would attack America. This is a strong legislative product—one that reflects well on the Committee on Appropriations, I want to commend you, Chairman, LEWIS, Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Members OBEY and MURTHA for your leadership.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider this important legislation, we must remain mindful that our troops are in the field—brave men and women fighting a new kind of war, as we speak.

It is a war fought with new technology in a land that is very old world.

It is a war that had Forward Air Controllers riding horseback and calling in strikes from laptop computers.

This is a war being fought from our ships stationed 700 miles from targets.

This is a war that utilizes B-52s and B-2s and B1Bs for precision targeting, but it is also a war that calls for our troops to go from cave to cave or building to building to seek out the enemy. It is a war whose enemy is difficult to identify.

At the same time as our men and women are in action in Iraq and Afghanistan and other scattered locations, the leadership of the Department of Defense continues its wide-ranging transformation of the methods and missions and capabilities of our fighting forces.

In this context, America's armed forces have been charged with developing the capabilities to fight jointly with coalition partners to secure victory across the full spectrum of warfare while continuing the transition to a more flexible, more agile, lighter and more lethal force.

Of course, our goal is to provide a new level of efficiency and protection to our warfighter so that they may fight—and win—the new kind of wars that will face the United States of America in coming years.

Mr. Chairman, we are a peaceful people. But recent months have shown the world that we will fight anywhere to defend our national security.

The men and women of our armed forces have made us proud. For them—and their families—I urge adoption of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 26, 2003, 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2658

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, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$28,233,436,000.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 116, line 19, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 2, line 15, through page 116, line 19, is as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$23,052,001,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$8,962,197,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$23,121,003,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of

title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$3,568,625,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,983,153,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$571,444,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,267,888,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$5,382,719,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for

personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$2,140,598,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$11,034,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, \$24,903,992,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, not less than \$355,000,000 shall be made available only for conventional ammunition care and maintenance: *Provided further*, That of funds made available under this heading, \$2,500,000 shall be available for Fort Baker, in accordance with the terms and conditions as provided under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", in Public Law 107-117.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$4,463,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, \$28,060,240,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, \$3,440,456,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$7,801,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, \$26,689,043,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that of the funds available under this heading, \$750,000 shall only be available to the Secretary of the Air Force for a grant to Florida Memorial College for the purpose of funding minority aviation training.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, \$16,124,455,000, of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be available for the CINC initiative fund account; and of which not to exceed \$34,500,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his cer-

tificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds provided in this Act for Civil Military programs under this heading, \$500,000 shall be available for a grant for Outdoor Odyssey, Roaring Run, Pennsylvania, to support the Youth Development and Leadership program and Department of Defense STARBASE program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That \$4,700,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$2,031,309,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$1,171,921,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$173,952,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$2,144,188,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals;

maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), \$4,325,231,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, including repair of facilities, maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law for the Air National Guard; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, \$4,424,046,000.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses directly relating to Overseas Contingency Operations by United States military forces, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts; operation and maintenance accounts within this title; the Defense Health Program appropriation; procurement accounts; research, development, test and evaluation accounts; and to working capital funds: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon 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 transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, \$10,333,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 can be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$396,018,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of haz-

ardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *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.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, \$256,153,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *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.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, \$384,307,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *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.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, \$24,081,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *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.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$221,369,000, to remain available until trans-

ferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *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.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 2547, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), \$59,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, \$450,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006.

TITLE III PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$2,180,785,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,533,462,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED
COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,956,504,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$35,000,000 shall be available only for advance procurement items for the fifth and sixth Stryker Brigade Combat Teams.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,355,466,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and the purchase of 4 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed \$180,000 per vehicle; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$4,547,596,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$9,030,148,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$2,205,634,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND
MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$941,855,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long leadtime components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier	Replacement	Program,
\$1,186,564,000;		
Virginia Class Submarine,	\$2,123,221,000;	
SSGN Conversion,	\$1,167,300,000;	
Cruiser Conversion,	\$194,440,000;	
CVN Refueling Overhauls,	\$367,832,000;	
Submarine	Refueling	Overhauls,
\$123,372,000;		
DDG-51,	\$3,198,311,000;	
LHD-1 Amphibious Assault Ship,	\$355,006,000;	
LPD-17,	\$1,367,034,000;	
Minehunter, SWATH,	\$9,000,000;	
Service Craft,	\$39,480,000;	
Landing Craft Air Cushion, LCAC,	\$73,087,000;	
Prior Year Shipbuilding Program,	\$899,502,000; and	

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, \$348,949,000.

In all: \$11,453,098,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2008, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such

vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of 2 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger carrying vehicles but not to exceed \$245,000 per unit; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$4,784,742,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, \$1,200,499,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$11,877,051,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$4,235,505,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and

accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,279,725,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of 1 vehicle required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed \$243,000 per vehicle; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$11,195,159,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including not to exceed 3 passenger motor vehicles for the Defense Security Service; the purchase of 4 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed \$250,000 per vehicle; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$3,803,776,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons, and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, \$100,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006; *Provided*, That the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective Reserve or National Guard component.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), \$67,516,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$10,186,272,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005; *Provided*, That of the amounts provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 for Molecular Genetics and Musculoskeletal Research in program element 0602787A, shall remain available until expended.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$14,666,239,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005; *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces; *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$20,704,267,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$18,763,791,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$293,661,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, \$1,721,507,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, \$1,066,462,000, to remain available until expended; *Provided*, That

none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (that is; engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes; *Provided further*, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract; *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes; *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$6,500,000 of the funds available under this heading shall be available in addition to other amounts otherwise available, only to finance the cost of constructing additional sealift capacity.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law, \$15,613,159,000, of which \$14,874,037,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 2 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2005; of which \$328,826,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006, shall be for Procurement; and of which \$410,296,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005, shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, \$1,533,261,000, of which \$1,199,168,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance to remain available until September 30, 2005; \$79,212,000 shall be for Procurement to remain available until September 30, 2006; \$254,881,000 shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation to remain available until September 30, 2005; and no more than \$132,677,000 may be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, of which \$44,168,000 shall be for activities on military installations and \$88,509,000 shall be to assist state and local governments.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for Operation and maintenance; for Procurement; and for Research, development, test and evaluation,

\$817,371,000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *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 transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$162,449,000, of which \$160,049,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed \$700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which \$300,000 to remain available until September 30, 2005, shall be for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation; and of which \$2,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006, shall be for Procurement.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, \$226,400,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, \$170,640,000, of which \$26,081,000 for the Advanced Research and Development Committee shall remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$46,100,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Justice for the National Drug Intelligence Center to support the Department of Defense's counter-drug intelligence responsibilities, and of the said amount, \$1,500,000 for Procurement shall remain available until September 30, 2006 and \$1,000,000 for Research, development, test and evaluation shall remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided further*, That the National Drug Intelligence Center shall maintain the personnel and technical resources to provide timely support to law enforcement authorities and the intelligence community by conducting document and computer exploitation of materials collected in Federal, State, and local law enforcement activity associated with counter-drug, counter-terrorism, and national security investigations and operations.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND

For the purposes of title VIII of Public Law 102-183, \$8,000,000, to be derived from the National Security Education Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of

compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. 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. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$2,500,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section must be made prior to May 31, 2004.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8006. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made between working cap-

ital funds and the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" appropriation and the "Operation and Maintenance" appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8007. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in session in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8008. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any 1 year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of \$20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any 1 year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed \$500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for multiyear procurement contracts as follows:

F/A-18 aircraft;
E-2C aircraft; and
Tactical Tomahawk missile.

SEC. 8009. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99-239: *Provided further*, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities,

on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8010. (a) During fiscal year 2004, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2005 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2005 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2005.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8011. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Department of Defense to exceed, outside the 50 United States, its territories, and the District of Columbia, 125,000 civilian workyears: *Provided*, That workyears shall be applied as defined in the Federal Personnel Manual: *Provided further*, That workyears expended in dependent student hiring programs for disadvantaged youths shall not be included in this workyear limitation.

SEC. 8012. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by more than 10 Department of Defense civilian employees unless such conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function and the Competitive Sourcing Official certifies that the projected savings of the competition exceed the minimum conversion differential for such activity or function: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply in circumstances in which the Department of Defense publishes in the Federal Register a determination that compliance would have an adverse impact on national security: *Provided further*, That this section and subsections (a), (b), and (c) of 10 U.S.C. 2461 shall not apply to a commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that: (1) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 47), popularly referred to as the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act; (2) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance

with that Act; or (3) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 450b(e) of title 25, United States Code, or a Native Hawaiian organization, as defined in section 637(a)(15) of title 15, United States Code.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protégé Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2301 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section manufactured will include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds appropriated by this Act available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) or TRICARE shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care provider for inpatient mental health service for care received when a patient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or residential treatment care by a medical or health care professional having an economic interest in the facility to which the patient is referred: *Provided*, That this limitation does not apply in the case of inpatient mental health services provided under the program for persons with disabilities under subsection (d) of section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, provided as partial hospital care, or provided pursuant to a waiver authorized by the Secretary of Defense because of medical or psychological circumstances of the patient that are confirmed by a health professional who is not a Federal employee after a review, pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretary, which takes into account the appropriate level of care for the patient, the intensity of services required by the patient, and the availability of that care.

SEC. 8018. (a) During the current fiscal year and hereafter, the Secretary of Defense may, by executive agreement, establish with the government of any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nation a separate account into which residual value amounts negotiated with that nation in the return of

United States military installations in that nation may be deposited, in lieu of direct monetary transfers to the United States Treasury. Any such deposit may be made in the currency of the host nation. Amounts in such an account shall be treated as credits to that host nation and may be used only as specified in subsection (b).

(b) Amounts deposited by a host nation in an account as provided for in an agreement under subsection (a) may be used—

(1) subject to subsection (c), for the construction of facilities to support United States military forces in that host nation; or

(2) for such real property maintenance and base operating costs at United States military installations in that host nation that are currently executed through monetary transfers to such host nation.

(c) A military construction project may be executed from an account established under this section only if the project has been previously authorized by law.

(d) In the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the President's budget for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall identify—

(1) amounts anticipated to be received during that fiscal year in residual value settlements under this section; and

(2) such construction, real property maintenance, and base operating costs that shall be funded by the host nation during that fiscal year through such credits under an agreement under this section.

(e)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall report any executive agreement with a NATO member nation under this section to the congressional committees specified in paragraph (2) not less than 30 days before the conclusion and endorsement of the agreement.

(2) The committees referred to in paragraph (1) are the congressional defense committees, the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 8019. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M-1 Carbines, M-1 Garand rifles, M-14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M-1911 pistols.

SEC. 8020. No more than \$500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8021. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, \$8,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by Section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in 25 U.S.C. 1544 or a small business owned and controlled by an individual defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9) shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over \$500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making Appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 41 U.S.C. §430, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition

of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part by any subcontractor or supplier defined in 25 U.S.C. §1544 or a small business owned and controlled by an individual defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9).

SEC. 8022. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to perform any cost study pursuant to the provisions of OMB Circular A-76 if the study being performed exceeds a period of 24 months after initiation of such study with respect to a single function activity or 48 months after initiation of such study for a multi-function activity.

SEC. 8023. Funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8024. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may adjust wage rates for civilian employees hired for certain health care occupations as authorized for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by section 7455 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 8025. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall afford qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped the maximum practicable opportunity to participate as subcontractors and suppliers in the performance of contracts for the procurement of supplies or services that are let by the Department of Defense using funds appropriated for military functions of the Department of Defense (other than for military construction or military family housing).

(b) A business concern that has negotiated with the Secretary of a military department or the director of a Defense Agency a subcontracting plan for the participation by small business concerns pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) shall be given credit toward meeting that subcontracting goal for any purchase made from a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped.

(c) For the purpose of this section, the term "qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped" means a nonprofit agency for the blind, or a nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped, that has been approved by the Committee for the Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48).

(d) This section shall apply during the current fiscal year and hereafter.

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, net receipts pursuant to collections from third party payers pursuant to section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, shall be made available to the local facility of the uniformed services responsible for the collections and shall be over and above the facility's direct budget amount.

SEC. 8027. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed \$350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8028. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than \$32,758,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) \$21,432,000 shall be available from "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counterdrug ac-

tivities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) \$10,540,000 shall be available from "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force"; and

(3) \$786,000 shall be available from "Other Procurement, Air Force" for vehicle procurement.

(b) Notwithstanding section 9445 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law, of the funds made available to the Civil Air Patrol Corporation in this Act under the heading "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", not more than \$770,000 may be transferred by the Secretary of the Air Force to the "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" appropriation to be merged with and to be available for administrative expenses incurred by the Air Force in the administration of Civil Air Patrol Corporation. Funds so transferred shall be available for the same period as the appropriation to which transferred.

(c) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8029. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administered by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other non-profit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2004 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2004, not more than 6,321 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,050 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs.

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2005 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by \$74,200,000.

SEC. 8030. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and

rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8031. For the purposes of this Act, the term "congressional defense committees" means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8032. (a) During the current fiscal year and hereafter, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance, and repair of aircraft, vehicles, and vessels, as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms.

(b) In the case of a competition conducted under this section, the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned shall certify that the successful bid includes comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for bids submitted both by Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and by private firms. The authority of the Senior Acquisition Executive under this section may be delegated.

(c) Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to a competition conducted under this section.

SEC. 8033. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2004. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Buy American Act" means title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations

for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

SEC. 8034. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain available at the end of the current fiscal year as a result of energy cost savings realized by the Department of Defense shall remain available for obligation for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2865 of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8035. Amounts deposited during the current fiscal year to the special account established under 40 U.S.C. 572(b)(5)(A) and to the special account established under 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1) are appropriated and shall be available until transferred by the Secretary of Defense to current applicable appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense under the terms and conditions specified by 40 U.S.C. 572(b)(5)(B) and 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1)(B), to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 8036. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for appropriation for that fiscal year for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the defense agencies.

SEC. 8037. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available for "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense" may be obligated for the Young Marines program.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8038. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8039. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) PROCESSING OF REQUESTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota.

(c) RESOLUTION OF HOUSING UNIT CONFLICTS.—The Operation Walking Shield program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "Indian tribe" means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8040. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the De-

partment of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$250,000.

SEC. 8041. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2005 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2005 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2005 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for agent operations and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall remain available until September 30, 2005.

SEC. 8043. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8044. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", not less than \$10,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8045. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term "Buy American Act" means title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality-competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8046. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than \$25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8047. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or
(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to field operating agencies funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program.

SEC. 8048. Notwithstanding section 303 of Public Law 96-487 or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to lease real and personal property at Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2667(f), for commercial, industrial or other purposes: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy may remove hazardous materials from facilities, buildings, and structures at Adak, Alaska, and may demolish or otherwise dispose of such facilities, buildings, and structures.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8049. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts,

the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

"Aircraft Procurement, Army, 2003/2005", \$47,100,000;

"Other Procurement, Army, 2003/2005", \$8,000,000;

"Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2002/2006", \$25,600,000;

"Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2003/2005", \$27,000,000;

"Other Procurement, Air Force, 2003/2005", \$30,000,000; and

"Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 2003/2004", \$1,650,000.

SEC. 8050. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military (civilian) technicians of the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military (civilian) technicians, unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8051. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8052. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated in this Act are available to compensate members of the National Guard for duty performed pursuant to a plan submitted by a Governor of a State and approved by the Secretary of Defense under section 112 of title 32, United States Code: *Provided*, That during the performance of such duty, the members of the National Guard shall be under State command and control: *Provided further*, That such duty shall be treated as full-time National Guard duty for purposes of sections 12602(a)(2) and (b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8053. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP), and the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA) aggregate: *Provided*, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8054. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the civilian medical and medical support personnel assigned to military treatment facilities below the September 30, 2002 level: *Provided*, That the Service Surgeons General may waive this section by certifying to the congressional defense committees that the beneficiary population is declining in some catchment areas and civilian strength reductions may be consistent with responsible resource stewardship and capitation-based budgeting.

SEC. 8055. (a) LIMITATION ON PENTAGON RENOVATION COSTS.—Not later than the date each year on which the President submits to Congress the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a certification that the total cost for the planning, design, construction, and installation of

equipment for the renovation of wedges 2 through 5 of the Pentagon Reservation, cumulatively, will not exceed four times the total cost for the planning, design, construction, and installation of equipment for the renovation of wedge 1.

(b) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of applying the limitation in subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the cost for the renovation of wedge 1 by any increase or decrease in costs attributable to economic inflation, based on the most recent economic assumptions issued by the Office of Management and Budget for use in preparation of the budget of the United States under section 1104 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN COSTS.—For purposes of calculating the limitation in subsection (a), the total cost for wedges 2 through 5 shall not include—

(1) any repair or reconstruction cost incurred as a result of the terrorist attack on the Pentagon that occurred on September 11, 2001;

(2) any increase in costs for wedges 2 through 5 attributable to compliance with new requirements of Federal, State, or local laws; and

(3) any increase in costs attributable to additional security requirements that the Secretary of Defense considers essential to provide a safe and secure working environment.

(d) CERTIFICATION COST REPORTS.—As part of the annual certification under subsection (a), the Secretary shall report the projected cost (as of the time of the certification) for—

(1) the renovation of each wedge, including the amount adjusted or otherwise excluded for such wedge under the authority of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c) for the period covered by the certification; and

(2) the repair and reconstruction of wedges 1 and 2 in response to the terrorist attack on the Pentagon that occurred on September 11, 2001.

(e) DURATION OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The requirement to make an annual certification under subsection (a) shall apply until the Secretary certifies to Congress that the renovation of the Pentagon Reservation is completed.

SEC. 8056. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, that not more than 35 percent of funds provided in this Act for environmental remediation may be obligated under indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts with a total contract value of \$130,000,000 or higher.

SEC. 8057. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8058. Appropriations available in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" for increasing energy and water efficiency in Federal buildings may, during their period of availability, be transferred to other appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense for projects related to increasing energy and water efficiency, to be merged with and to be available for the same general purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred.

SEC. 8059. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement

of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of "commercial items", as defined by section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end item.

SEC. 8060. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available to the Department of Defense shall be made available to provide transportation of medical supplies and equipment, on a nonreimbursable basis, to American Samoa, and funds available to the Department of Defense shall be made available to provide transportation of medical supplies and equipment, on a nonreimbursable basis, to the Indian Health Service when it is in conjunction with a civil-military project.

SEC. 8061. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8062. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Naval shipyards of the United States shall be eligible to participate in any manufacturing extension program financed by funds appropriated in this or any other Act.

SEC. 8063. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each contract awarded by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year for construction or service performed in whole or in part in a State (as defined in section 381(d) of title 10, United States Code) which is not contiguous with another State and has an unemployment rate in excess of the national average rate of unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall include a provision requiring the contractor to employ, for the purpose of performing that portion of the contract in such State that is not contiguous with another State, individuals who are residents of such State and who, in the case of any craft or trade, possess or would be able to acquire promptly the necessary skills: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of this section, on a case-by-case basis, in the interest of national security.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Defense who approves or implements the transfer of administrative responsibilities or budgetary resources of any program, project, or activity financed by this Act to the jurisdiction of another Federal agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8065. (a) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of

the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an international organization any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use in the activities described in subsection (b) unless the congressional defense committees, the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(b) COVERED ACTIVITIES.—This section applies to—

(1) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and

(2) any other international peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation.

(c) REQUIRED NOTICE.—A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including the reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8066. To the extent authorized by subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may issue loan guarantees in support of United States defense exports not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That the total contingent liability of the United States for guarantees issued under the authority of this section may not exceed \$15,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That the exposure fees charged and collected by the Secretary for each guarantee shall be paid by the country involved and shall not be financed as part of a loan guaranteed by the United States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and International Relations in the House of Representatives on the implementation of this program: *Provided further*, That amounts charged for administrative fees and deposited to the special account provided for under section 2540c(d) of title 10, shall be available for paying the costs of administrative expenses of the Department of Defense that are attributable to the loan guarantee program under subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8067. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8068. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transport or provide for the transportation of chemical munitions or agents to the Johnston Atoll for the purpose of storing or demilitarizing such munitions or agents.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any obsolete World War II chemical munition or agent of the United States found in the World War II Pacific Theater of Operations.

(c) The President may suspend the application of subsection (a) during a period of war in which the United States is a party.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8069. During the current fiscal year, no more than \$30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8070. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): *Provided*, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: *Provided further*, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8071. Funds appropriated for the Department of Defense in this Act or any other Act for the current fiscal year and hereafter for Operation and Maintenance or for the Defense Health Program for supervision and administration costs for facilities maintenance and repair, minor construction, or design projects may be obligated when the reimbursable order is accepted by the performing activity. For the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 8072. (a) During the current fiscal year and hereafter, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) During the current fiscal year and hereafter, amounts collected under the subsection (a) shall be credited to funds then available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and shall be available to defray the costs associated with the use of

equipment of the Distance Learning Project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purpose without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8073. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8074. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: *Provided further*, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve or license the sale of the F-22 advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government.

SEC. 8076. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section 11 (chapters 50-65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8077. (a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that the unit has committed a

gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) **MONITORING.**—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SEC. 8078. The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to the Department of Defense, to Indian Health Service facilities and to federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(l)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(l)(2)(B))).

SEC. 8079. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy shall be used to develop, lease or procure the T-AKE class of ships unless the main propulsion diesel engines and propulsors are manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes or there exists a significant cost or quality difference.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8081. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide" for any advanced concept technology demonstration project may only be obligated 30 days after a report, including a description of the project and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8082. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of establishing all Department of Defense policies governing the provision of care provided by and financed under the military health care system's case management program under 10 U.S.C. 1079(a)(17), the term "custodial care" shall be defined as care designed essentially to assist an individual in meeting the activities of daily living and which does not re-

quire the supervision of trained medical, nursing, paramedical or other specially trained individuals: *Provided*, That the case management program shall provide that members and retired members of the military services, and their dependents and survivors, have access to all medically necessary health care through the health care delivery system of the military services regardless of the health care status of the person seeking the health care: *Provided further*, That the case management program shall be the primary obligor for payment of medically necessary services and shall not be considered as secondarily liable to title XIX of the Social Security Act, other welfare programs or charity based care.

SEC. 8083. During the current fiscal year and hereafter, refunds attributable to the use of the Government travel card, refunds attributable to the use of the Government Purchase Card and refunds attributable to official Government travel arranged by Government Contracted Travel Management Centers may be credited to operation and maintenance accounts of the Department of Defense which are current when the refunds are received.

SEC. 8084. (a) **REGISTERING FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS WITH DOD CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.**—None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used for a mission critical or mission essential financial management information technology system (including a system funded by the defense working capital fund) that is not registered with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense. A system shall be considered to be registered with that officer upon the furnishing to that officer of notice of the system, together with such information concerning the system as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. A financial management information technology system shall be considered a mission critical or mission essential information technology system as defined by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

(b) **CERTIFICATIONS AS TO COMPLIANCE WITH FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PLAN.**—

(1) During the current fiscal year, a financial management automated information system, a mixed information system supporting financial and non-financial systems, or a system improvement of more than \$1,000,000 may not receive Milestone A approval, Milestone B approval, or full rate production, or their equivalent, within the Department of Defense until the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) certifies, with respect to that milestone, that the system is being developed and managed in accordance with the Department's Financial Management Modernization Plan. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

(2) The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1).

(c) **CERTIFICATIONS AS TO COMPLIANCE WITH CLINGER-COHEN ACT.**—

(1) During the current fiscal year, a major automated information system may not receive Milestone A approval, Milestone B approval, or full rate production approval, or their equivalent, within the Department of Defense until the Chief Information Officer certifies, with respect to that milestone, that the system is being developed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.). The Chief Information Officer may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

(2) The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees

timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1). Each such notification shall include, at a minimum, the funding baseline and milestone schedule for each system covered by such a certification and confirmation that the following steps have been taken with respect to the system:

(A) Business process reengineering.

(B) An analysis of alternatives.

(C) An economic analysis that includes a calculation of the return on investment.

(D) Performance measures.

(E) An information assurance strategy consistent with the Department's Global Information Grid.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "Chief Information Officer" means the senior official of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 3506 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) The term "information technology system" has the meaning given the term "information technology" in section 5002 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).

SEC. 8085. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide support to another department or agency of the United States if such department or agency is more than 90 days in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing the requested support pursuant to such authority: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8086. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any non-governmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of "armor penetrator", "armor piercing (AP)", "armor piercing incendiary (API)", or "armor-piercing incendiary-tracer (API-T)", except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8087. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under 10 U.S.C. 2667, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in 32 U.S.C. 508(d), or any other youth, social, or fraternal non-profit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8088. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic

beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: *Provided*, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: *Provided further*, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: *Provided further*, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

SEC. 8089. (a) The Department of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements with the Department of Veterans Affairs and federally-funded health agencies providing services to Native Hawaiians for the purpose of establishing a partnership similar to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, in order to maximize Federal resources in the provision of health care services by federally-funded health agencies, applying telemedicine technologies. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to develop a consultation policy, consistent with Executive Order No. 13084 (issued May 14, 1998), with Native Hawaiians for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of governmental services so as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Native Hawaiian" means any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii.

SEC. 8090. Funds available to the Department of Defense for the Global Positioning System during the current fiscal year may be used to fund civil requirements associated with the satellite and ground control segments of such system's modernization program.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8091. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading, "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", \$48,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", up to \$177,000,000 shall remain available until expended, and is available for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations, for certain classified activities, and may be transferred to other appropriations accounts of the Department of Defense, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated to carry out projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That any funds transferred shall be merged with and made available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this para-

graph is in addition to any other transfer authority provided to the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8092. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) shall continue in effect to apply to disbursements that are made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 8093. In addition to amounts provided in this Act, \$2,000,000 is hereby appropriated for "Defense Health Program", to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

SEC. 8094. Amounts appropriated in title II are hereby reduced by \$172,500,000 to reflect savings attributable to improvements in the management of professional support services, surveys and analysis, and engineering and technical support contracted by the military departments, as follows:

- (1) From "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$21,500,000.
- (2) From "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$34,400,000.
- (3) From "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$4,300,000.
- (4) From "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$21,300,000.
- (5) From "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$91,000,000.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8095. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", \$899,502,000 shall be available until September 30, 2004, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: *Provided*, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer such funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: *Provided further*, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred:

- To:
- Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1996/04":
 - LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Ship Program, \$150,300,000;
 - Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1998/04":
 - New SSN, \$81,060,000;
 - Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1999/04":
 - DDG-51 Destroyer Program, \$44,420,000;
 - New SSN, \$166,978,000;
 - LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Ship Program \$86,821,000;
 - Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2000/04":
 - DDG-51 Destroyer Program, \$69,460,000;
 - LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Ship Program \$112,778,000; and
 - Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2001/04":
 - DDG-51 Destroyer Program, \$90,313,000; and
 - New SSN, \$97,372,000.

SEC. 8096. The Secretary of the Navy may settle, or compromise, and pay any and all admiralty claims under 10 U.S.C. 7622 arising out of the collision involving the U.S.S. GREENEVILLE and the EHIME MARU, in any amount and without regard to the monetary limitations in subsections (a) and (b) of that section: *Provided*, That such payments shall be made from funds available to the Department of the Navy for operation and maintenance.

SEC. 8097. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may exercise the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g) for occupations listed in 38 U.S.C. 7403(a)(2) as well as the following:

Pharmacists, Audiologists, and Dental Hygienists.

(A) The requirements of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g)(1)(A) shall apply.

(B) The limitations of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g)(1)(B) shall not apply.

SEC. 8098. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in 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) during fiscal year 2004 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 8099. The total amount appropriated in title II is hereby reduced by \$320,000,000 to reduce cost growth in information technology development, to be derived as follows:

- (1) From "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$60,000,000.
- (2) From "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$100,000,000.
- (3) From "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$100,000,000.
- (4) From "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$60,000,000.

SEC. 8100. None of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate a new start program without prior notification to the Office of Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8101. The amounts appropriated in title II are hereby reduced by \$539,000,000 to reflect cash balance and rate stabilization adjustments in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds, as follows:

- (1) From "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$107,000,000.
- (2) From "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$45,000,000.
- (3) From "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$387,000,000.

SEC. 8102. The amount appropriated in title II for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy" is hereby reduced by \$67,000,000 to reduce excess funded carryover.

SEC. 8103. (a) In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of \$5,500,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense for "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard". Such amount shall be made available to the Secretary of the Army only to make a grant in the amount of \$5,500,000 to the entity specified in subsection (b) to facilitate access by veterans to opportunities for skilled employment in the construction industry.

(b) The entity referred to in subsection (a) is the Center for Military Recruitment, Assessment and Veterans Employment, a non-profit labor-management co-operation committee provided for by section 302(c)(9) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 186(c)(9)), for the purposes set forth in section 6(b) of the Labor Management Co-operation Act of 1978 (29 U.S.C. 175a note).

SEC. 8104. (a) During the current fiscal year and hereafter, funds available to the Secretary of a military department for Operation and Maintenance may be used for the purposes stated in subsection (b) to support chaplain-led programs to assist members of the Armed Forces and their immediate family members in building and maintaining a strong family structure.

(b) The purposes referred to in subsection (a) are costs of transportation, food, lodging, supplies, fees, and training materials for members of the Armed Forces and their family members while participating in such programs, including participation at retreats and conferences.

SEC. 8105. FINANCING AND FIELDING OF KEY ARMY CAPABILITIES.—The Department of Defense and the Department of the Army shall make future budgetary and programming plans to fully finance the Non-Line of Sight (NLOS) Objective Force cannon and resupply vehicle program in order to field this system in the 2008 timeframe. As an interim capability to enhance Army lethality, survivability, and mobility for light and medium forces before complete fielding of the Objective Force, the Army shall ensure that budgetary and programmatic plans will provide for no fewer than six Stryker Brigade Combat Teams to be fielded between 2003 and 2008.

SEC. 8106. (a) MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION ACTIVITIES AT BLUEGRASS ARMY DEPOT, KENTUCKY.—If a technology other than the baseline incineration program is selected for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions pursuant to section 142 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261; 50 U.S.C. 1521 note), the program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment shall be responsible for management of the construction, operation, and closure, and any contracting relating thereto, of chemical demilitarization activities at Bluegrass Army Depot, Kentucky, including management of the pilot-scale facility phase of the alternative technology.

(b) MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION ACTIVITIES AT PUEBLO DEPOT, COLORADO.—The program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment shall be responsible for management of the construction, operation, and closure, and any contracting relating thereto, of chemical demilitarization activities at Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado, including management of the pilot-scale facility phase of the alternative technology selected for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions.

SEC. 8107. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act, \$6,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall make grants in the amount of \$4,000,000 to the American Red Cross for Armed Forces Emergency Services; and \$2,500,000 to the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Foundation.

SEC. 8108. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund" may be transferred or obligated for Department of Defense expenses not directly related to the conduct of overseas contingencies: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives that details any transfer of funds from the "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund": *Provided further*, That the report shall explain any transfer for the maintenance of real property, pay of civilian personnel, base operations support, and weapon, vehicle or equipment maintenance.

SEC. 8109. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8110. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8111. Notwithstanding section 2465 of title 10 U.S.C., the Secretary of the Navy

may use funds appropriated in title II of this Act under the heading, "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", to liquidate the expenses incurred for private security guard services performed at the Naval Support Unit, Saratoga Springs, New York by Burns International Security Services, Albany, New York in the amount of \$29,323.35, plus accrued interest, if any.

SEC. 8112. Of the amounts provided in title II of this Act under the heading, "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$20,000,000 is available for the Regional Defense Counter-terrorism Fellowship Program, to fund the education and training of foreign military officers, ministry of defense civilians, and other foreign security officials, to include United States military officers and civilian officials whose participation directly contributes to the education and training of these foreign students.

SEC. 8113. (a) EXCHANGE REQUIRED.—In exchange for the private property described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Veterans Home of California—Barstow, Veterans of Foreign Wars Post #385E (in this section referred to as the "recipient"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately one acre in the Mojave National Preserve and designated by section 8137 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107-117; 115 Stat. 2278) as a national memorial commemorating United States participation in World War I and honoring the American veterans of that war. Notwithstanding the conveyance of the property under this subsection, the Secretary shall continue to carry out the responsibilities of the Secretary under such section 8137.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the property to be conveyed by the Secretary under subsection (a), Mr. and Mrs. Henry Sandoz of Mountain Pass, California, have agreed to convey to the Secretary a parcel of real property consisting of approximately five acres, identified as parcel APN 569-051-44, and located in the west ½ of the northeast ¼ of the northwest ¼ of the northwest ¼ of section 11, township 14 north, range 15 east, San Bernardino base and meridian.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE; APPRAISAL.—The values of the properties to be exchanged under this section shall be equal or equalized as provided in subsection (d). The value of the properties shall be determined through an appraisal performed by a qualified appraiser in conformance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (Department of Justice, December 2000).

(d) CASH EQUALIZATION.—Any difference in the value of the properties to be exchanged under this section shall be equalized through the making of a cash equalization payment. The Secretary shall deposit any cash equalization payment received by the Secretary under this subsection in the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

(e) REVERSIONARY CLAUSE.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the recipient maintain the conveyed property as a memorial commemorating United States participation in World War I and honoring the American veterans of that war. If the Secretary determines that the conveyed property is no longer being maintained as a war memorial, the property shall revert to the ownership of the United States.

(f) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT; ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—The boundaries of the Mojave National Preserve shall be adjusted to reflect the land exchange required by this section. The property acquired by the Secretary under this section shall become

part of the Mojave National Preserve and be administered in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations generally applicable to the Mojave National Preserve.

SEC. 8114. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53d Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act.

SEC. 8115. The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, without consideration, to the Inland Valley Development Agency all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain parcels of real property, including improvements thereon, located in San Bernardino, California, that consist of approximately 39 acres and are leased, as of June 1, 2003, by the Secretary to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service. The conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the Inland Valley Development Agency and the Director of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service enter into a lease-back agreement, acceptable to the Director, for premises required by the Director for support operations conducted by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service.

SEC. 8116. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2401 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into a contract for the charter for a period through fiscal year 2008, of the vessel, RV CORY CHOUEST (United States Official Number 933435) in support of the Surveillance Towed Array Sensor (SURTASS) program: *Provided*, That funding for this lease shall be from within funds provided in this Act and future appropriations Acts.

SEC. 8117. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to "Operation and Maintenance, Army", to remain available until September 30, 2004, to be available only for a grant in the amount of \$20,000,000 to the Silver Valley Unified School District, Silver Valley, California, for the purpose of school construction at Fort Irwin, California.

SEC. 8118. Amounts appropriated in title II are hereby reduced by \$294,000,000 to reflect savings attributable to efficiencies and management improvements in the funding of miscellaneous or other contracts in the military departments, as follows:

(1) From "Operation and Maintenance, Army," \$27,000,000;

(2) From "Operation and Maintenance, Navy," \$50,000,000; and

(3) From "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$217,000,000.

SEC. 8119. The amount appropriated in title II for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" is hereby reduced by \$600,000,000 to reflect cash balance and rate stabilization adjustments in the Department of Defense Transportation Working Capital Fund.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 8120. Of the funds made available in chapter 3 of title I of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108-11), under the heading "Iraq Freedom Fund" (117 Stat. 563), \$2,000,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

SEC. 8121. Of the total amount appropriated by this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" to provide assistance to local educational agencies for children of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees with severe disabilities, the Secretary of Defense may use up to \$855,566 to make additional payment under section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (20 U.S.C.

7703(a)) to those local educational agencies whose percentage reduction in the payment amount for fiscal year 2002 was in excess of the reduction otherwise imposed under subsection (d) of such section for that fiscal year. The Secretary of Defense may waive collection of any overpayment made to local educational agencies under such section for fiscal year 2002.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8122. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 8123. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to implement any amendment or revision of, or cancel, the Department of Defense Directive 1344.7, "Personal Commercial Solicitation on DoD Installations", until 90 days following the date the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress notice of the amendment, revision or cancellation, and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 8124. LIMITATION ON DEPLOYMENT OF TERRORISM INFORMATION AWARENESS PROGRAM.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in paragraph (2), if and when research and development on the Terrorism Information Awareness program (formerly known as the Total Information Awareness program), or any component of such program, permits the deployment or implementation of such program or component, no department, agency, or element of the Federal Government may deploy or implement such program or component, or transfer such program or component to another department, agency, or element of the Federal Government, until the Secretary of Defense—

(A) notifies Congress of that development, including a specific and detailed description of—

(i) each element or component of such program intended to be deployed or implemented; and

(ii) the method and scope of the intended deployment or implementation of such program or component (including the data or information to be accessed or used); and

(B) has received specific authorization by law from Congress for the deployment or implementation of such program or component, including—

(i) a specific authorization by law for the deployment or implementation of such program or component; and

(ii) a specific appropriation by law of funds for the deployment or implementation of such program or component.

(2) The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the deployment or implementation of the Terrorism Information Awareness program, or a component of such program, in support of the following:

(A) Lawful military operations of the United States conducted outside the United States.

(B) Lawful foreign intelligence activities conducted wholly overseas, or wholly against non-United States citizens.

SEC. 8125. (a) CLOSURE OF NAVAL STATION ROOSEVELT ROADS, PUERTO RICO.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy shall close Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, no later than six months after enactment of this Act.

(b) DISPOSAL.—

(1) The Secretary of the Navy shall exercise the authority granted to the Administrator of the General Services pursuant to section 545 of title 40 and dispose of the real

property and associated personal property at the former Naval Station by public sale.

(2) The Secretary of the Navy may transfer excess personal property or dispose of surplus personal property located at the installation pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 521 et seq.).

(c) The Secretary of the Navy may use funds in the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 2906 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101-510 to implement the closure.

(d) There shall be deposited into the Account referred to in subsection (c) the proceeds of sale from the disposal of property authorized by subsection (b) for the benefit of the Department of the Navy.

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

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, let me confirm that I think this bill will be supported broadly on both sides of the aisle, and I would simply like to bring three matters to the attention of the House.

First of all, I really do believe that this institution is going to have to take a look at the number of commitments that we have worldwide and compare that to the strain that we have on the available troops for use under these many commitments. I think anyone who looks at the situation will understand that we are dangerously close to having an overextended military; and I think we ought to ask ourselves honestly if we are going to engage in these many commitments around the world, do we need to have a larger Army. In my view if we are, then we do. If we do not intend to enlarge the Army, then I think we must be much more aggressive in asking our allies to help us deal with some of the peacekeeping functions that we face, for instance, in Iraq.

Secondly, I do have some misgivings about the funding levels for SDI in the bill.

Thirdly, I want to talk about something that I think is more important than any of those considerations. This Subcommittee of Defense is perhaps the most bipartisan of all appropriations subcommittees, and the Committee on Appropriations is probably the most bipartisan committee in the House; and it is in that spirit that I raise a matter that I think every Member should be aware of because of its deadly importance. It involves intelligence, specifically the intelligence gathering and analysis used in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

What I am going to say is based on published reports purportedly based on interviews with intelligence officials and military officers. Neither I, nor I suspect anyone in the House of Representatives, knows the extent to which these reports are accurate so there is no possibility of disclosing classified material. We have had the staff of the committee look at the allegations on a bipartisan basis, and I think it is fair to say, while they do not have enough information to reach

specific conclusions, they do find much of what has been said in these stories to be credible.

In addition to the CIA, which is an independent agency, there are four major intelligence organizations inside the Department of Defense. All of these entities are funded in this bill. The press stories I am referring to, and I would be glad to provide copies of them to any Member who is interested, those stories argue that a group of civilian employees in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, all of whom are political employees, have long been dissatisfied with the information produced by the established intelligence agencies both inside and outside the Department. That was particularly true, apparently, with respect to the situation in Iraq.

As a result, it is reported that they established a special operation within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, which was named the Office of Special Plans. That office was charged with collecting, vetting, and disseminating intelligence completely outside the normal intelligence apparatus. In fact, it appears that the information collected by this office was in some instances not even shared with the established intelligence agencies and in numerous instances was passed on to the National Security Council and the President without having been vetted with anyone other than OSD political appointees.

It is further alleged that the purpose of this operation was not only to produce intelligence more in keeping with the preheld views of those individuals, but to intimidate analysts in the established intelligence organizations to produce information that was more supportive of policy decisions which they had already decided to propose. There is considerable discussion regarding the intelligence relating to weapons of mass destruction.

I think it would be unfortunate if this issue were subsumed by the question of whether or not Saddam Hussein had such weapons. First of all, we do not know at this point. My personal suspicion has always been that he did. Secondly, measuring the quality of our intelligence apparatus requires more than determining whether the reporting was right or wrong on any single issue. Is what was reported consistent with the best information that was available? Did we reach the right conclusion based on good information or by happenstance?

These allegations, however, go well beyond the issue of WMDs. It appears that the individuals in question also challenged the consensus within the intelligence community on the number of troops that would be required for a successful invasion. The political appointees within the Office of the Secretary maintained regular contact with sources within the Iraqi National Congress, who in turn maintained contact with sources inside of Iraq.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, based on information transmitted by these sources, the political appointees argued that the conclusions of the intelligence community, the Joint Chiefs, and in particular General Shinseki, were in error and the invasion could be successfully carried out with fewer than 50,000 troops.

While the chiefs in the end got most of the troops that they requested, it appears that the invasion was both lighter than they would have desired and lighter than what was required. The inability to fully protect supply lines did in fact result in the loss of life. The shortage of available personnel did leave certain critical sites such as nuclear facilities unprotected.

We all know this is incredibly serious business. It is important not only to understand what we did or did not do with respect to Iraq, but it is far more important in terms of what we will do in the future. How will the information that the President and the Congress receive on our options in Korea be put together, for instance? Will the long-established collection mechanisms, evaluation and dissemination be used, or will we again fall back on the ad hoc efforts of this self-appointed group of experts?

It is important to note that these same individuals have established a new office with an Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence. This office will have more than 100 people, and it is widely believed in the intelligence community that the office is being created for the express purpose of pressuring analysts to produce information more supportive of predetermined policy. I do not know if that is true or not, but the question remains, Will this office stand between our war fighters and the information they need? Why did they require this small group of civilians to employ this kind of a role? Will the Under Secretary compete with the Director of Central Intelligence in the coordination of these agencies? All I can say is that we are paying for all of this. We ought to have the answers.

I would like to ask Members to remember that there was a reason the National Security Act of 1946 placed all intelligence activities under the control of one man, the Director of Central Intelligence. General Hoyt Vandenberg, who himself served as the DCI, explained that decision in testimony before Congress. He said, "The joint congressional committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor attack found failures that went to the very structure of our intelligence organizations, a failure to coordinate the collection and dissemination of intelligence, and the failure to centralize intelligence functions of common concern to more than one department of the government which

could more efficiently be performed centrally." I think we need to remember those words, and I think the Congress needs to dig and dig hard to get to the bottom of this.

I do not, frankly, know what the right structure for gathering and dissemination of intelligence information ought to be, but I am very leery of the fact that we have a new operation which can deal with information without clearing it with anyone else. The reason the system has served us so well over the past years is because all information has been vetted with other people who are supposed to know the most about it. I think it is dangerous when we get away from that practice.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of California:

On page 103, line 9, strike "\$67,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$96,000,000".

At the end of title VIII (page 116, after line 19), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the following amounts shall be made available for the purposes specified:

(a) The amount of \$5,000,000 is hereby appropriated for "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard", for the nationwide dedicated fiber optic network program;

(b) The amount of \$14,000,000 is hereby appropriated for "Procurement, Marine Corps", of which \$9,600,000 is for the AN/PRC-148 tactical handheld radio, and \$4,400,000 is for combat casualty care equipment;

(c) The amount of \$5,000,000 is hereby appropriated for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", for low emission/efficient hybrid aviation refueling truck propulsion; and

(d) The amount of \$5,000,000 is hereby appropriated for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", for development of novel pharmaceuticals for anthrax.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the minority has seen the amendment and has no objection. I simply ask for its passage.

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

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER: Under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY", insert

after the dollar amount on page 31, line 19, the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE", insert after the dollar amount on page 33, line 4, the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved on the amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I come today with deep respect for the hard work that this subcommittee has done. I think it may be the toughest subcommittee in the House given the amazing pressures in terms of the military requirements of our country during a difficult time. This is a difficult budget, and there are crosscurrents that I cannot even imagine, but I get a little hint as I look from a distance.

My special interest has been in an area dealing with unexploded ordnance, being able to protect people at home and abroad from the consequences of everything from landmines to training munitions that are unexploded. This has been an area that I have been deeply troubled with. It is an area that around the country there are potentially millions of acres in the United States that are so affected; and when we look at what has happened overseas, whether it is in the war in Southeast Asia and Vietnam, Afghanistan, what is going on right now in Iraq, and we just had a boy back home die this week in my community as a result of efforts trying to clear landmines.

Around the world, over 300 million landmines have been built, and 75 million that have been placed remain undetonated.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and I have both talked to the gentleman about this issue. We understand the seriousness of it, and the importance to both the gentleman and to the country; and we are certainly going to work with the gentleman in trying to increase the amount of money in the unexploded ordnance area. We think it is a very important area, and we feel very strongly that the gentleman is right about it. We do not agree with the amendment, and we hope it will be withdrawn; but we do think money needs to be increased in that area.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, echoing the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am deeply appreciative of the spirit of cooperation from the chairman and ranking member and willingness to work with us.

We had made a request initially of \$20 million before the subcommittee. Frankly, as I watched what moved through the process, I thought we had identified an area with the new generation of ballistic missile defense interceptor, additional research that frankly would be a higher priority. But given the strong encouragement to work with the subcommittee and their willingness to work with us, I look forward to working with them to make sure that at least the \$20 million is there to protect Americans at home and abroad. Candidly, Mr. Chairman, it is not just going to save our fighting men and women. I would just conclude on the notion that every single day civilians, including a sad number of children, are killed and maimed as a result of landmines and unexploded munitions. This investment will reap dividends for generations to come. I deeply appreciate the cooperation of the subcommittee.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. In one quick hour of debate, Congress will spend \$368 billion on the military. Amazingly, this massive sum does not fund our troops in Iraq or Afghanistan. If we want to use our Armed Forces, the taxpayers will have to use extra. We all know that the President will be back asking for more billions of more taxpayer dollars for these operations.

This bill funds the wrong defense priorities that will do little to provide for a more secure America. It will fund weapons systems that we all know will not work and will be subject to spiraling upward costs; and yet we cannot fully fund education needs at home. The only needs this Congress will take care of today are the profit-gouging defense contractors. Perhaps we should rename this bill the Lockheed-Martin, Northrop Grumman, United Defense, Raytheon, Boeing and General Dynamics Welfare Act of 2003.

Unlike the Republican majority, I do not believe we should heavily deficit spend to further enrich defense contractors. We can heavily invest in education and reduce the deficit by cutting national missile defense, the F22 fighter plane, the V22 Osprey, space-based weapons and other unnecessary and wasteful programs.

□ 1230

I believe we should cancel the national missile defense, a savings of \$8.9 billion, because it reduces our security here at home, it steals money for more effective security options, and because it will not work as promised, it leaves us more vulnerable.

National missile defense does not work. It has failed three tests that

were much simpler than real-life scenarios. It will not be subject to a real-life test before deployment in 2004. The only conclusion I can draw is that proponents do not care. They do not care if this weapons system works and it harms rather than protects Americans. Any country that decides to attack the United States with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons is more likely to use a less expensive and more covert delivery method than long-range missiles, such as smuggling it on a ship or a truck.

National missile defense would offer no protection against such an attack, and because we waste so much money on this system, we leave our homeland security system underfunded and unable to protect from real threats. We can also significantly reduce our shipbuilding programs funded at \$11.5 billion. Our Navy is not threatened by any other navy; yet it offers little protection from today's real threats. We would do far more for our Nation's security by shifting some of these funds to the Coast Guard.

It would immediately save lives to cancel the V-22 aircraft program, a savings of \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 2004. This aircraft has killed 30 Marines because it has an unsafe design that cannot be relied upon. I cannot support funds for such a program.

The F-22 fighter plane is a relic of the Cold War that suits no purpose in a modern Air Force. Our current fighters are more than capable and far less expensive. The F-22 continues to be subject to massive cost overruns and continued development problems, making it an unaffordable plane. The \$3.6 billion saved in fiscal year 2004 would raise a lot of teachers' salaries, providing our children with better education.

I believe we should roll back our spending in research and development of unnecessary expensive weapons systems such as Army's Comanche helicopter, a savings of \$1.1 billion; the Joint Strike Fighter, a savings of \$4.2 billion; the Space-Based Infra-Red System, a savings of \$617 million; and the Space-Based Radar, a savings of \$174 million.

Do we want to start a new war in space, or do we want to finish the struggle against deteriorating public schools? I believe we can do more for America by our repairing our school infrastructure. The savings proposed here amount to a significant investment in education. I have highlighted \$30 billion in unnecessary defense spending, and this money can be immediately invested in education for our children. A thorough review of the Pentagon budget would likely reveal another \$30 billion in defense waste and unnecessary programs.

Today only 12 percent of the 17 million low-income children eligible for child care subsidies receives assistance. Only 23 percent of all families with children younger than 6 have one parent working and one parent staying at

home. And today the average cost of child care for a 4-year old in an urban-area center is more than the average cost of public college tuition in all but one State.

I ask who will care for our children? And I say that we can. With \$60 billion we could have universal prekindergarten and child care in this Nation. I have a bill before this Congress, the Universal Prekindergarten Act, that would establish and expand prekindergarten programs to ensure that all children ages 3 to 5 have access to high-quality, full-day, full-calendar-year prekindergarten education.

It is time to set our priorities straight. We are arming ourselves to the teeth, and we are missing a chance to make sure our children have decent education.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

Under the heading "RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY", insert after the dollar amount on page 4, line 14, the following: "(increased by \$37,300,000)".

Under the heading "RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE", insert after the dollar amount on page 6, line 6, the following: "(increased by \$8,000,000)".

Under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY", insert after the dollar amount on page 7, line 21, the following: "(increased by \$22,330,000)".

Under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD", insert after the dollar amount on page 12, line 19, the following: "(increased by \$26,400,000)".

Under the heading "AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE", insert after the dollar amount on page 27, line 22, the following: "(reduced by \$273,000,000)".

Under the heading "PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE", insert after the dollar amount on page 30, line 18, the following: "(increased by \$52,100,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to close a gap that I see in the vital needs of the American people. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, as the father of the Civil Support Weapons of Mass Destruction Team, knows well that the National Guard is a unique repository of expertise with capabilities of response to weapons of mass destruction, chemical, biological, or radiological events, events that are far beyond the capabilities of most civilian units even in our major cities. They certainly exceed the capabilities that our States have to fund and train such teams at this point in time; yet we would all admit that a very real threat exists, and we are spending a tremendous amount of time around the

world attempting to prevent such attacks on our country. But if the worst should happen, we are going to need these teams, and we are going to need more than we have. The Congress has authorized 55, but at this point, as I understand it, 27 are fully operational, and another 5 are in training, and yet there are 23 that have not yet received funding.

My intention with this amendment was to push the Congress to make a difficult choice between a weapons system and these teams. We have to make difficult choices around here in the hopes that we can move forward.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman talked to me, and I have talked to the chairman, and we are certainly going to work something out. We were disappointed we did not have more requests for more teams. As a matter of fact, as the gentleman mentioned, we started this 12 to 13 years. The National Guard fought it initially, but now they see the importance. We think every State should have these, and we hope we can work out four or five more times in this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and the chairman, too, because I think they both recognize a critical need. I know there are difficult choices to be made, and I am very hopeful that we will come back from conference with the Senate with the additional teams funded, and I think that that would be a tremendous asset to the protection of the American people.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ACEVEDO-VILÁ

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ: Page 115, beginning line 20, strike section 8125 relating to closure of Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in regard to Section 8125 of this bill which will arbitrarily close Naval Station Roosevelt Roads in Ceiba, Puerto Rico. I have been aware that this facility could be closed and presume that any such closure will occur through the 2005 base realignment closure process. I was, therefore, surprised and dismayed to find language in this appropriations bill authorizing the closure of Roosevelt Roads. I believe that this provision violates the standard procedures of Congress by legislating on an appropriations bill, that it arbitrarily circumvents the 2005 BRAC process, and that it neglects the impor-

tance of this facility both for the U.S. and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

To address this issue, I have two amendments that will permit the normal process of Congress and the Base Closure Commission to take place. My first amendment will simply strike Section 8125. Thus, if the criteria of BRAC finds Roosevelt Roads to deserve closure, then it will take place, but Congress, as with all other bases, will remain out of the process. The economic benefits of Roosevelt Roads estimated by the Navy to be \$300 million per year will continue to accrue.

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

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has talked to me, and I have talked to the chairman about this issue. This is a very delicate issue. We had the same situation in Philadelphia a couple years ago when they closed down the Navy yard there. The Navy insists it needs the personnel. They are very short. They are overly committed all over the world, and they need these 3,000 people in other places.

I have to say to the gentleman he is actually better off with it going with the appropriation process where we could work with him trying to help solve some of the problems that they have in Puerto Rico when they close down a base. For instance, we have done it in San Francisco. We have done it in other parts of California. We did it in Philadelphia. We did it in Texas. And we are very aware of the economic disruption, and if the gentleman would withdraw his amendment, we will certainly work with him. And it is going to take some time because we probably have to make a visit to Puerto Rico and see exactly what we are talking about.

One of the big problems we have, some of this equipment, when they knew they were going to close down, do not take care of it. So we need to see what really needs to be done.

But the gentleman can be assured we will do everything we can to help him. If this works its way through the entire Congress and the conference, we will do everything we can to help him.

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

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would agree with the statement made by my colleague from Pennsylvania. As the gentleman and I discussed on an earlier occasion, it is our intention to work very closely with the Delegate to see that every step is taken to make certain that the people of Puerto Rico have all the flexibility they possibly can have to maximize the potential of this potentially very valuable property, and one that could provide a great stimulus for their economy.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I really appreciate

the support of the chairman and the ranking member. As I have spoken to them, my position and the position of Puerto Rico is we do not want the base to be closed because we think it is important for Puerto Rico and it is important for the U.S. But if that is the final decision, then, as with any other bases that have been closed, we need the support of Congress, we need a package, and we need special consideration to the possibility of transferring the lands to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and to the municipality of Ceiba. Actually the mayor of Ceiba, Gerardo Cruz, is here, and also the senator from that district in Puerto Rico Juan Cancel Alegria is here because this is really a main concern in that area. Unemployment is very high in the eastern part of Puerto Rico.

So if, based on the gentlemen's statements, if we can work this out in conference, again my position is we want to keep the base open, but if it is going to be closed, we need, we need some clear language from Congress that we are going to get an economic development package for that area and that the possibility of those lands be transferred to the Government of Puerto Rico and the municipality of Ceiba are going to be part of that discussion.

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

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I repeat to the gentleman that I very much appreciate his forthright discussion of this matter. I know of the potential difficulty that could be faced, but I want the gentleman to know that we are very committed to working with him to carefully see that this very potentially valuable property is used for the best interest of people of Puerto Rico. Our experience with base closing would suggest there is a variety in mix of approaches that might very well be taken, and we look forward to giving him all the support that we possibly can.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that commitment.

I include the following letters for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, DC, June 23, 2003.

Mrs. CONNIE PATRICK,
Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, FLETC Glynco Facility, Glynco, GA.

DEAR DIRECTOR PATRICK: I recently became aware of reports on the effects of increased federal law enforcement training needs. As was noted in Roll Call on June 2, 2003, Department of Homeland Security law enforcement training needs have increased and as a result, other agencies such as the U.S. Capitol Police, may be required to conduct training at federal facilities other than the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, GA. Rather than address this issue on an agency-by-agency basis, I believe that such trends indicate a new FLETC training facilities.

The FLETC facilities at Charleston, SC and Cheltenham, MD are located at former

military sites. Such a transfer of government property from one agency to another serves valuable purposes, such as the elimination of land acquisition and plant construction costs and maintaining benefits to the local economy. For these reasons, I encourage you to consider the possibility of locating any future FLETC facilities at Naval Station Roosevelt Roads (NSRR), Puerto Rico.

NSRR is currently home to Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, however, many of the military commands located at NSRR are being downsized, relocated, or eliminated with the recent closure of the Vieques training range. Such ongoing changes will lead to excess buildings, land and other infrastructure. Located a short distance from San Juan, NSRR's assets include numerous buildings, dormitories and classrooms, a modern aviation runway, marine berthing facilities, firing ranges, communication facilities, among others. It is my belief that these plant assets, coupled with the downsizing of NSRR, could enable FLETC to make high use of this facility for federal law enforcement training. Further, NSRR could also be a suitable facility for the training of international law enforcement personnel, particularly those from the Caribbean and Latin America.

I would appreciate the opportunity to meet and discuss with you FLETC's future needs and the opportunities that NSRR may afford our nation's future law enforcement officers. Please contact me to determine a time that I could meet with you or an associate of yours to discuss these issues.

Sincerely,

ANÍBAL ACEVEDO-VILÁ,
*Resident Commissioner,
Member of Congress.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2003.

Hon. JOE KNOLLENBERG,
Subcommittee on Military Construction, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KNOLLENBERG: During consideration of Military Construction Appropriations for fiscal year 2004, I respectfully request that the Subcommittee include language that calls for a thorough evaluation of the military facilities in Puerto Rico, including facilities at Naval Station Roosevelt Roads (NSRR). This evaluation should include what excess infrastructure currently exists and what will become available once the Navy finishes downsizing at NSRR in conjunction with the closure of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility's (AFWTF) Inner Range.

The Committee should be aware that Puerto Rico has a longstanding and impressive history of military commitment and sacrifice with the U.S. I am concerned that the difficult environmental and safety issues surrounding the AFWTF inner range have overshadowed this ongoing commitment by Puerto Ricans. Furthermore, Congress cannot let this issue hamper our ability to effectively take on the numerous challenges we face, including: the war on terror abroad and here in the Western Hemisphere; efforts to wage war on drugs; to provide for Special Operations training and missions; and to provide the best facilities and preparedness for homeland security. I feel that should NSRR in particular not be fully utilized to meet numerous security threats, that indeed our preparedness could well be undermined.

An ongoing military presence at NSRR during these uncertain global conditions offers numerous opportunities beyond the traditional naval presence at NSRR. Puerto Rico's strategic location in the Caribbean along with significant base capabilities pro-

vides ready access and other advantages that should be fully utilized. I suggest the following language be considered by the Committee in order to prevent underutilization of a strategic military facility when we can least afford to make such a mistake.

"Therefore the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Transportation and the Department of Justice to conduct an audit of ongoing operations in Puerto Rico and report to the Committee on Appropriations what steps may be necessary to maximize the use of existing infrastructure and what additional investments may be necessary to meet the operational needs of the agencies involved."

I appreciate your consideration of this request and remain available to discuss this matter with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

ANÍBAL ACEVEDO-VILÁ,
*Resident Commissioner,
Member of Congress.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2003.

Hon. HAROLD ROGERS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Homeland Security Appropriations, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS: I write to respectfully request that you include in the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for FY 2004 a feasibility study regarding the potential for Department of Homeland Security facilities to be situated at Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico (NSRR).

Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, a 31,000+ acre naval base located at the eastern end of Puerto Rico, contains 1200 buildings with over 4.6 million square feet of space. In addition to myriad naval assets, this facility also houses the Special Operations Headquarters for the U.S. Southern Command. By virtue of these facilities, NSRR provides a secure location, secure communications networks, and a domestic, forward-deployed location to the U.S. government. Essential DHS functions, such as border and maritime security, customs enforcement and counter-terrorism could be suitably located at NSRR, and would permit a high-degree of coordination between DHS and the armed forces. NSRR's position in the Caribbean is vital due to the growing threat of terrorist groups in Central and South America, drug trafficking to the U.S. from the Caribbean and South and Central America, and the unfortunate possibility that experienced drug smugglers could ferry weapons of mass destruction into the United States. As the nexus between drug trafficking and terrorism emerges, this location can further aid in the interdiction of both threats.

In order to examine the benefits that NSRR may provide to the DHS, I suggest that the following language be considered by the Committee:

"The Committee directs the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Department of Defense, the Department of Justice and the Department of Transportation to conduct a feasibility study to determine the possible benefits of locating facilities of the Department of Homeland Security at Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico."

I appreciate your consideration of this request. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff, Eric Lausten, at 225-2615.

Sincerely,

ANÍBAL ACEVEDO-VILÁ,
*Resident Commissioner,
Member of Congress.*

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. BORDALLO:

Add at the end (before the short title) the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to overhaul, repair, or maintain in a shipyard outside the United States or Guam any naval vessel that has no designated homeport and is located in an area of responsibility of the Unified Combatant Command encompassing a United States or Guam shipyard.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

□ 1245

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to request that the House take action to ensure that Military Sealift Command vessels, known as MSC vessels, are repaired in American shipyards. This would ensure that the money we appropriate here today is used to not only "buy American," but to "repair American" as well.

You would think that if anything would be repaired in the USA, it would be our naval fleet procured with taxpayer funds. Unfortunately, the Military Sealift Command thwarts the will of Congress by exploiting a loophole in the current law to designate its vessels as having no home port. The MSC then repairs the vessels in foreign ship repair facilities in places such as Singapore and Korea. Such repair work is done without regard to American health, labor and environmental standards. Using foreign ports runs counter to force protection requirements following the October 12, 2000, terrorist attack on the USS *Cole*.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, one of the problems we have with this amendment is it should be in the authorization bill rather than our bill. But at any rate, it would really be very difficult for us to apply something like this.

I understand what the gentlewoman is trying to do, but I would hope that the gentlewoman would withdraw this amendment and let us see what we can work out, because we have a lot of "buy American" provisions. This is kind of a new wrinkle to it. But we have an awful lot of operational problems that we might run into if we prohibited some of these things from being done.

For instance, I remember the *Roberts* was first taken into a port in Dubai. I think it was, and then we finally shipped it back to the United States. But I think we need some more time to look at this. I appreciate your

thoughts, and I know we will work with you trying to come up with something.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand, and I would be very willing to work with the gentleman concerning this situation with the MSC ships. I look forward to working with you to resolve this.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I will work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) on the matter.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. INSLEE:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to suspend, modify, or waive any provision of law under chapter 43, 71, 75, or 77 of title 5, United States Code, or any regulations promulgated under those provisions of law.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, our amendment would ensure that no funds would be used essentially to alter our existing civilian personnel system for the proud men and women who are civilian employees of our defense system.

This basically is a response to the work we are now doing in an attempt to find a reasonable and protective reform package that originally left the House as H.R. 1588. We are concerned that the language of that bill, if in fact it would be implemented, would substantially degrade our protections of our civilian employees who are doing workman-like work.

Basically, we had concerns about that bill because it was overly broad and was really a rushed approach to civilian systems, but we are also troubled by a lack of explicit protections for fundamental worker rights. Currently, the bill has a lack of protection for true collective bargaining, a lack of a real right of fair appeals, a lack of adequate overtime and weekend compensation, preference for veterans and equal pay for equal work.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Let me mention that the gentleman and I have had a chance to discuss this, and I am aware of his concerns. The gentleman and I have very similar concerns in this arena.

Frankly, I would hope that, if the gentleman withdraw this amendment, we will have a chance to discuss it further and try to provide the kind of

flexibility we need to give him the assurance and employees the assurance they need so we can go forward in a positive way.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate those comments, and will look forward to working with the gentleman, because we do not obviously want to go back to those bad old days of nepotism and poor performance and political selection. I look forward to working with the gentleman to get an honest, reasonable bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSTETTLER:

Insert at the end, before the short title, the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out sections 2912, 2913, and 2914 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) related to the 2005 round of base closures and realignments.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the FY 2004 Defense Appropriations Act that would prohibit any funds in this act from being used to carry out activities in 2004 related to the next round of Base Realignment and Closure, or BRAC, currently authorized to take place in 2005.

The purpose is to put a hold on the implementation of BRAC-related activities until Congress and the Department of Defense can get a better handle on the expected savings, anticipated force structure and infrastructure changes, and the actual need for additional closures.

As many of my colleagues know, in 2001, the Defense Department testified to Congress that it has 20 to 25 percent excess physical capacity that must be eliminated, so the President's fiscal 2002 budget proposal to Congress requested authorization to carry out another round of base closures.

As part of the FY 2002 Defense Authorization Act, the Senate authorized a BRAC round to take place in 2005. The House specifically refused to include any such BRAC authorization in its version of the bill, but this body did agree to the Senate's BRAC provision when it passed the conference report to the FY 2002 authorization bill.

To date, we have gone through four different rounds of military base closure process, in 1989, 1991, 1993, and

1995. Through these rounds, we saw the BRAC commission's result in the closing of over 450 military installations of various size, mission and stature in the United States.

Nearly everyone currently involved in this process agrees that all the low-hanging fruit have already been picked. Yet the current administration succeeded in enacting another round for 2005 following the horrific events of September 11, 2001. On December 28, 2001, just a little more than 3 months after those deadly attacks, and 3 days after Christmas, the President signed into law the FY 2002 defense authorization bill, which included the BRAC authorization provision at his request.

The administration seems to sincerely believe there is a 20 to 25 percent excess military infrastructure, and the administration has a laudable goal of finding additional savings in the defense budget to free up funds for procurement and new weapons systems.

Specifically, the Department of Defense claims that it could save as much as \$6.6 billion per year with an additional round of base closures. But there are many reasons to question both the Department's rationale and its estimates.

First, this Congress deserves to know the details about the suggested excess capacity. Is it 20 percent? 25 percent? 23 percent? The 5 percent difference is not insignificant, particularly when you are talking about the hundreds of U.S. military bases. And where is that excess capacity exactly?

Furthermore, DOD estimates that it eliminated 71,000 Federal civilian jobs and 39,800 military positions in the past four BRAC rounds. Unfortunately, no one could give me an estimate of how many of those jobs were transferred to private contractors still paid through DOD contracts. Eliminating military positions, only to replace them with private contractors, raises doubts about any potential savings.

Regarding the estimated savings from additional base closures, I must advise the House of an April 2002 Government Accounting Office, GAO, report that indicates the previous four base closure rounds have produced a net savings of \$16.7 billion through FY 2001. GAO, however, admits that these are the Defense Department's numbers and that they could not be independently verified because DOD's accounting systems are not oriented to identifying and tracking savings.

GAO further noted that the estimates do not include a cumulative \$1.5 billion cost incurred by the Federal Government to assist communities affected by the closure process or \$3.5 billion in environmental costs expected beyond FY 2001. Because the BRAC savings estimates cannot be supported by real data, the GAO report had to affirm the DOD numbers, while characterizing the savings as "imprecise and rough approximations."

The Members of this body need to understand that when Defense Department officials talk about so-called savings from a BRAC round, they are not talking about real cost savings. Most of the so-called cost savings are actually cost avoidances.

DOD also claims that it needs savings from BRAC to fund new weapons systems in support of the military transformation. However, the first few years of a BRAC round requires hundreds of millions of dollars in upfront investments costs. This includes upfront costs for new military construction, for relocated troops and families, new MILCON dollars for realigned missions, new money for environmental restoration and base conveyance procedures.

To complicate the problem, DOD still does not have solid data on costs of environmental clean up. Our current information indicates that environmental clean-up costs have exceeded \$10 billion, and the estimated environmental costs beyond 2001 rose from \$2.4 billion in 1999 to \$3.5 billion as stated in last year's GAO report on purported BRAC savings.

Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, Ray DuBois, summed it up well when he told the DOD Roundtable in December 2002 the following: "The excess capacity statistic, which the Secretary and others, including myself, have referred to, is based on a 1998 capacity utilization study. It is true that there is excess capacity in some range of 20 to 25 percent, but that is a clumsy number insofar as it is an aggregate number."

He goes on to say: "Remember that BRAC is not inexpensive. BRAC will probably end up costing the Department of Defense, over a 4- to 6-year period, depending upon how large the BRAC is, depending upon how much capacity you are reducing, and by definition, how much you are realigning it, it could cost 10 to \$20 billion over that period of time."

Mr. Chairman, I ask for my colleagues to support the amendment to limit the funding for BRAC in this appropriations bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is appropriately an item that should be a part of the authorization process. It is my understanding at the subcommittee level there was support for this proposal and there was a decision at the full committee to turn that around, and the authorizing committee has spoken in terms of this question.

It is, in my judgment, poor policy on the part of the Committee on Appropriations, going through the back door by limiting appropriations to essentially undo what is the policy in the existing law, a policy which has not been changed by the authorizing committee.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California still reserve his point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that it does cost a substantial amount of money in the first few years; but there is no question that, long-term, billions and billions of dollars have been saved because of the BRACs we have had in the past. So I think we should move forward on this, and it would be wrong to do it in this bill. It would be an authorization matter. I think it is a mistake, and I support the chairman in his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I very strongly oppose the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote; and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment that would have restated the policy of our country against the use of torture. The reason that I was going to offer that amendment is that I do represent this body in the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and in many of our meetings, the issue of the use of torture has been raised, particularly in light of our war against terrorism. I might tell you there have also been press accounts recently that call into question the use of torture in regards to the campaign against terrorism.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think the President of the United States, along with the representatives from the State Department and Defense Department, have made it very clear on the U.S. policy in this regard.

□ 1300

Let me just point out that on June 26, the International Day in Support of the Victims of Torture, President Bush declared that "Torture anywhere is an affront to human dignity everywhere." He observed that "Freedom from torture is an inalienable human right." The State Department also noted that "Freedom from torture is an inalien-

able human right, and the prohibition of torture is a basic principle of international human rights law. This prohibition is absolute and allows no exceptions." Finally, as the General Counsel to the Defense Department William Haynes wrote to Senator LEAHY recently, "The United States does not permit, tolerate, or condone any such torture by its employees under any circumstances."

Mr. Chairman, I think the record is very clear on the U.S. position in regards to the use of torture, and, therefore, I will not pursue an amendment at this time. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

REGARDING THE ACTUARIAL VALUE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS OFFERED TO MEDICARE ELIGIBLE ENROLLEES BY A PLAN UNDER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2631) to provide that the actuarial value of the prescription drug benefits offered to Medicare eligible enrollees by a plan under the Federal employees health benefits program shall be at least equal to the actuarial value of the prescription drug benefits offered by such plan to its enrollees generally.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NEGOTIATIONS BY THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8902 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(p)(1) A contract may not be made or a plan approved which does not offer to Medicare eligible enrollees prescription drug benefits the actuarial value of which is at least

equal to the actuarial value of the prescription drug benefits which are offered to enrollees under the plan generally.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall establish processes and methods for determining the actuarial value of prescription drug benefits.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contract years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act. Part of this bill recognizes and seeks to address one of the core concerns regarding adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare; that is, with the implementation of such a benefit, lead employers who currently offer prescription drug coverage to their employees to stop doing so. Obviously, we do not want to put a government entitlement plan into operation and drive the private plans out of existence, or the costs over the long term to the taxpayers will go off the charts.

The bill addressed these concerns by providing subsidies to private employers and unions to encourage them to maintain prescription drug benefits for their retirees. With the help of the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS), we were able to clarify that the Office of Personnel Management would also be eligible for these subsidies, something that I believe will lead to lower FEHBP premiums for all enrollees. However, I think it is necessary for us to go one step further.

Coming from northern Virginia, I represent over 50,000 Federal employees and retirees. As chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am responsible for issues pertaining to Federal workers and retirees, along with the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS), the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service. Thus, not only am I acutely aware of the challenges the Federal Government faces as an employer to recruit and retain quality employees, I am also very aware that Federal retirees are sometimes treated differently than current employees in ways that are not always equitable.

For example, current Federal employees are allowed to deduct their health insurance premiums from pretax dollars, but Federal retirees are not. I look at this issue from an employer's perspective. Remember: In addition to the large number of retirees already in FEHBP, 50 percent of the Federal workforce is eligible for retirement in the next several years. With H.R. 2631, we are telling the people that we are going to live up to our end of the bargain. We are saying that with regard to prescription drug benefits, Federal retirees will continue to be placed on par with current employees, that OPM will not reduce their benefits as opposed to the benefit offered to current employees.

In crafting H.R. 2631, I thought it was important to continue to allow OPM as much flexibility as possible in negotiating future prescription drug benefits. And for the record, Senator AKAKA, my colleague in the other body, has offered similar legislation on the other side of the Capitol. Thus, H.R. 2631 does not require OPM to offer a specific dollar amount of coverage that has to be maintained; they can raise or they can lower benefits as they see fit through negotiations with individual plans, but they have to do it for all FEHBP enrollees to treat them the same, regardless of their age. In essence, we are simply telling OPM to continue to do what they have always done.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I believe H.R. 2631 sends an important message to both Federal retirees and current Federal employees. It will be a helpful tool in our efforts to build and retain an effective Federal workforce and give these employees a career path and retirement they can depend on. Therefore, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2631.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 2631, was crafted to ensure that legislation expanding Medicare will not reduce prescription drug benefits for Federal retirees enrolled in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. While I support this legislation because it shields Federal employees from the illusive drug benefit in the Medicare proposal, the reality is it leaves millions of others unprotected.

Federal annuitants are worried, and they should be. They are worried because they see something in the government's subsidized Medicare prescription drug benefit that they do not like, and with good reason. This past Sunday The Washington Post reported that despite the Bush administration's proclamations, and I am quoting, “The reality is that the two Medicare drug bills passed by the House and the other body do not come close to providing the level of coverage given to the 8.5 million Federal workers, including lawmakers, White House staff, and the

President. Both measures would require senior citizens to buy an auxiliary prescription plan, whereas all 188 plans offered to Federal employees include drug coverage, and at far more generous reimbursement rates.”

To remedy this, H.R. 2631 would maintain prescription drug parity between Medicare-eligible retirees enrolled in the FEHB program, and active duty Federal employees and retirees. It provides that the prescription drug benefit offered to Medicare-eligible enrollees by a plan under the FEHB program be at least equal to the prescription drug benefits offered by such a plan to its enrollees generally.

This is obviously a good bill for Federal employees, but it also sheds light on what a bad bill the Medicare prescription drug benefit is for the rest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation and similar legislation for the rest of America's seniors.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS), chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2631, a bill that has a simple, yet powerful, purpose: to protect the health benefits of our valued Federal retirees. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, along with my distinguished colleagues from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

One of the hallmarks of Federal service has been the government's commitment to providing health care for its retired employees, those public servants who dedicated their professional careers to protecting our shores, fighting disease, keeping our air and water clean, and upholding the laws of the land. We not only owe them our thanks, we owe it to them to keep our commitments.

As the chairwoman of the House Committee on Government Reform Subcommittee on Civil Service, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman TOM DAVIS) for sponsoring this legislation and thank the leadership for allowing us to bring this important bill to the floor so quickly.

H.R. 2631 guarantees that Federal retirees will have a prescription drug benefit that is equal in value to the one provided to active Federal employees. This legislation fulfills the promise of the Federal Government not to eliminate prescription drug coverage to its retirees once a prescription drug benefit is also available through Medicare, which the U.S. House of Representatives has wisely decided to add.

This bill also ensures that there is no difference between the total amount of coverage offered to active employees and the coverage available to retirees. This is an important equity, one that we want to maintain.

I want to emphasize that this legislation does not diminish the Office of

Personnel Management's authority to negotiate health care benefits for Federal employees, but assures that drug benefits will still be available for retirees.

Finally, this is a case of the Federal Government leading by example. If the U.S. Government were to cut benefits for its retirees, why would we expect the private sector to act any differently?

I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman DAVIS) for bringing this legislation to the floor, and I urge passage of H.R. 2631.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation that is before us today for one simple reason: Federal retirees deserve an adequate prescription drug benefit just like all America's seniors do. Without the protections of the bill before us, they face the possibility of losing what they have got.

But let us be clear: This legislation is necessary because the prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries that was forced through the House by the Republican majority is inadequate and unresponsive to the needs of America's seniors and disabled persons. The President and House Republicans like to defend that bill by saying America's seniors deserve the same coverage that Members of Congress and the Federal workforce get, but nothing could make it clearer that their Medicare bill fails miserably to meet that test. The drug benefit our Republican colleagues are willing to give Medicare beneficiaries is filled with features that will be laughed out of the room if they were suggested for Federal employees.

The Medicare bill contains large gaps in coverage, like the so-called donut hole, where beneficiaries have no coverage for their drug expenses. Once they have \$2,000 in drug costs, coverage stops. Beneficiaries are stuck with the next \$2,900 in costs, and maybe more. Oh, they get to pay premiums for coverage during that time. They just pay for nothing, because the program gives them no help, and whether coverage ever starts up again is uncertain. It will be a catastrophic situation for many of our seniors.

The hypocrisy of claiming that Medicare beneficiaries deserve what the Federal employees health program has, and then give a prescription drug benefit that the Republicans pushed through which is so inferior, it is breathtaking. And, to add insult to injury, the Medicare benefit is designed so that any help from an employer reduces Medicare coverage. That leads to the likelihood that employers will drop drug coverage for their retirees and make people worse off.

□ 1315

That is a very real possibility that makes the bill that is before us right now necessary. But what about those retirees in the same situation that this bill does not help? Federal retirees deserve to have adequate prescription drug coverage. They deserve to keep the benefits they have, but so do the rest of America's seniors and disabled people. We should live up to the rhetoric and make the Medicare benefit a good one: simple, comprehensive, certain, and affordable. It should truly be as good as what Federal employees have and Members of Congress have. The drug benefit in the Republican Medicare bill fails that test. That is the tragedy that that bill that is now before us highlights today.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a co-sponsor of this legislation and a leader in the fight for Federal employees' rights.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 2631 and am pleased to be an original co-sponsor. Before I make my comments, I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for his efforts.

Those who followed this debate know, through the colloquy that took place on the floor last week, the gentleman from Virginia's (Mr. TOM DAVIS) efforts with regard to this; and I think every Federal retiree and Federal employee will be very very grateful for that. So I want the gentleman from Virginia to know that I appreciate it, as they will also.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary to clarify the intent of H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug Bill, which the House passed on June 27. H.R. 2631 would ensure prescription drug parity between retirees enrolled in the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, FEHBP, who are eligible for Medicare, and other Federal employees in the FEHBP. It is vital to pass this legislation to make sure that the bill now moving through Congress to extend Medicare will not reduce prescription drug benefits for Federal retirees enrolled in FEHBP. Federal employees in their retirement must be assured that the commitment will be kept that their drug benefit will remain unchanged and they will not be forced to pay additional costs for prescription drugs. They deserve that commitment from Congress.

I urge all Members to vote for this bipartisan legislation to protect retired and active duty Federal employees.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2631, but I am just puzzled by this. I guess I must be missing something. This bill concerns the Federal Em-

ployee Health Benefits Program, which covers President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, and Members of Congress and others. Right now the plans offer drug coverage for retired Members of Congress and other Federal employees equal to the drug coverage these plans offer current employees. This bill puts this policy in law, requiring drug coverage for Federal employees must be equal to coverage for current employees.

This bill was introduced the day the House passed the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill. It is clear that this bill is meant to ensure that Members of Congress, this is where I am puzzled, Members of Congress do not have to live under the Republican Medicare privatization plan. That is why I am puzzled. If it is good enough for Congress, it is good enough for seniors of this Nation. That is what President Bush said in Michigan in January about H.R. 1, his Medicare prescription drug plan.

In his statement of administrative policy on H.R. 1, the White House praised the Republican drug plan saying it was just like the coverage that Members of Congress get. That is where I am getting stuck, trying to figure out why the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) has brought this bill to the floor. If the Republican Medicare bill offers drug coverage just like Members of Congress have and as President Bush says, then why do we have to protect Members of Congress and Federal employees from being forced into the Republican privatized Medicare plan? I just do not get it.

The majority leader of the other body who runs that place and the leader on this side, both said the Medicare Republican bills would accomplish the goal of giving health care security to seniors. But if the Republican drug plan provides real health care security, H.R. 1, why do we have to exempt Members of Congress and other Federal employees from the bill that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and other Republicans rammed through this Congress recently?

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, said the Republican drug plan uses private plans to compete to provide beneficiaries better care at lower costs. It is confusing. Why do we need this plan when Congress is exempting itself from what Congress did only 2 weeks ago? I hope that my friends on the other side would explain that.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to help the gentleman solve the puzzle. The fact of the matter is there are 1.25 million Medicare-eligible Federal employees and annuitants. Only 388 retired Members of Congress are in FEHBP. The majority of retired Members of Congress do not even take FEHBP. They are in other plans or have opted out of this.

The fact is they are eligible for that by virtue of their service here. This legislation was not crafted by Members looking after themselves. It was crafted with the help of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees. It was difficult to write out the 388 retired Members who happen to use this, which is a minority of the retired Members. Most Members do not use FEHBP. I want to clarify for the gentleman that in no way, shape or form was this for Members. In fact, this was called to our attention by the National Association of Retired Federal Employees. I do not know any other way to get at the problem.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my friend sits on the Committee on Energy and Commerce where this bill was heard. I just heard over and over people saying that we wanted to give, under the Republican drug plan that passed 2 weeks ago by one vote, that we wanted to give the same coverage to seniors as FEHBPs. Are you saying then that the coverage for Federal retirees is significantly better than the coverage that you are providing or that this House provided under H.R. 1, the Republican Medicare prescription drug plan?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, all it does is ensures that Federal retirees will be treated the same as current Federal employees in regard to the Federal Employee Health Benefit plan. Currently, they are not in some areas. The feeling is that with this other plan, that retirees could have a different benefit program and that creates some difficulty. So we are trying to even this up and give that assurance.

Most Members of Congress do not opt for FEHBP. That is what the record shows after this is done. So that is kind of a misnomer. It is a small percentage that ends up in FEHBP when they retire. A few do, I grant to the gentleman; but that is not the purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2631. Today, about 76 percent of seniors have some form of prescription drug coverage; and less than 2 weeks ago the House passed historical legislation, H.R. 1, to create a prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, when we passed H.R. 1, we did not intend to create a new Federal benefit that would replace the prescription drug benefits that many of our seniors today already enjoy. H.R. 1 does contain a number of incentives to employers to maintain their existing level of health care coverage to their senior retirees. But I personally heard from several constituents of mine, retired Federal workers, who are concerned that the Federal Government in

an attempt to save money will reduce or eliminate their prescription drug coverage once a benefit is available through Medicare. In passing H.R. 1, we called upon employers to maintain that coverage it offers to retirees, and the Federal Government has an obligation to lead by example and ensure that Federal retirees continue to receive the same prescription drug benefit as current employees. So H.R. 2631 does just that.

It is the right thing to do, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) said he was puzzled by this bill, but I am not so puzzled. It seems to me quite clear that the one thing that our Federal retirees were right to be concerned once the Republican prescription drug bill had passed this House, they were right to be concerned that they might some day have to live under those prescription drug benefits which do not even come close to the benefits that they have today.

So it does make sense that as soon as the Republican prescription drug bill was passed that Federal retirees would get worried and Members would come down here and say, boy, one thing we sure do not want to have is to have our Federal retirees forced to participate in the Republican prescription drug bill that we just passed.

Now, one of the reasons that this is happening so fast, and it is happening fast, the Republican bill passed by one vote here in the House. A bill has passed in the other body, but we do not even have a conference. We do not know what the final product will be like. But we know this: it will not be good for America's seniors. It will not be good for those Medicare beneficiaries who are counting on getting some relief from the high cost of prescription drugs.

The Republican bills are a disaster, a looming disaster for our Medicare beneficiaries; but they also fall far short of what Federal retirees are likely to expect. Because under the FEHBP program we have today, there are no additional premiums for drug benefits. There is no deductible. There is a small co-payment. There is no gap in coverage, and that is different from the Republican bills passed here in the House. This bill may make some sense for Federal retirees; but the question remains, if it is good enough for Members of Congress and Federal employees, it ought to be good enough for Medicare beneficiaries. That is what the President said, but the Republican bill does not keep that promise.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from Virginia

(Mr. TOM DAVIS) has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I rise in support of this bill. And I am sure it will pass with near-unanimous support, because under this bill no plan on the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan could be approved that has a prescription drug benefit for retirees that is lesser in actuarial value than the existing prescription drug benefit.

This legislation represents the commitment of the Federal Government not to reduce dues or eliminate prescription drug coverage to its retirees once prescription drug coverage is also available through Medicare. One of the core concerns with the Medicare prescription drug benefit has always been that, in the attempt to provide for those without coverage, we would take from those with coverage. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that one-third of retired employees with employer-sponsored drug coverage could lose it as a result of the Medicare prescription drug bill that passed 2 weeks ago. Currently, there is no different prescription drug benefit for retirees than is available for current employees. Our bill simply seeks to maintain that dynamic.

We do not want the total amount of coverage offered to Federal retirees reduced for the reason that they could simply opt for the Medicare plan alone. This is an issue with the Federal Government leading by example. If the Federal Government cuts its benefits for its retirees, how can we expect private employers to do anything but follow our lead? H.R. 2631 does not tie OPM's hands in the negotiating process by requiring that they provide a plan of a certain dollar value. OPM can still negotiate higher or lower levels of benefits, but they simply cannot target retirees alone for reduced benefits.

The Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan has always led the way in setting the example for employer-sponsored health care. It should have been the standard for the Medicare prescription drug plan, but Federal retirees should not lose benefits because it was not. That is the point that many people have been making. But they should certainly not vote against this bill as a result. There is nothing wrong with this bill. This bill clarifies what the policy is and should be, and for that reason we should all vote for this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I kept hearing my Republican colleagues talk about parity for Federal employees; and I support this billing as well, because I do believe that Federal retirees should have good prescription drug

benefits. But it is not an issue of parity. It is an issue of hypocrisy, hypocrisy because the Republicans say that they want to preserve a generous prescription drug benefit for Federal retirees, but at the same time they were not willing to provide it for the other seniors around the country.

The bottom line is that the Medicare prescription drug benefit that the Republicans have proposed both in this House and the other House is no real benefit. It is a meaningless benefit. It is not generous enough that anybody would even sign up for it.

□ 1330

And they wanted to make sure that the Federal retirees do not get stuck being forced into that Medicare system that they have proposed, which essentially gives an almost worthless prescription drug benefit to most seniors. Well, there is a lot of hypocrisy saying you want to preserve it for the Members of Congress, for the President, and for Federal retirees, but not give it to seniors in general.

There was an article in today's New York Times that had a little grid, and it talked about how Federal retirees' drug benefits stacked up with those under the Medicare prescription drug plan the Republicans have proposed for the rest of the seniors. And guess what? Average premium for Federal employees, nothing. No additional premium for drug benefits. But in the Senate bill, \$35 a month, or \$420 a year; in the House, \$35 a month. What about the deductible? For Federal retirees, no deductible. But in the Senate bill, for the rest of the seniors, \$275; in the House bill, \$250. What about gap in coverage? For Federal retirees, no gap in coverage, but then there are major gaps in the Senate bill, \$4,500 to \$5,800 a year; in the House bill, \$2,000 to \$4,900 a year.

In fact, there is a statement that for the most popular plan among Federal workers, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, the Congressional Research Service estimates that drug benefits under the plan are worth 50 percent more than the proposed Republican bill.

Hypocrisy, not parity. Give the same benefits to the rest of the seniors. That is the fair thing to do.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond that The New York Times chart is absolutely wrong when it says Federal employees have no deductible for their prescription drug coverage. What they get is, they get a set amount of dollars, and it is a cafeteria style. They can spend it on prescription drugs, preventive care, HMOs or whatever. So there is certainly a cost to that. But the way the system is set up, it is a total health care program.

So when the gentleman gets up and quotes this New York Times article, it is entirely misleading. Of course there is a cost to Federal employees opting for that over something else.

The other underlying part of the bill that this body passed 2 weeks ago is

the fact that we did not want to drive private programs out of existence. Should we drive the 60 percent of seniors that are currently satisfied with their prescription drug program out of existence, then the Federal Government ends up picking up the total tab, and the cost rises significantly.

We are setting an example with this legislation that we are, in fact, making sure that the FEHBP program is not driven out of existence; that we maintain the parity it has always had with existing Federal employees. And this program ought not be diminished. It is the same thing that we have incentivized in the program passed 2 weeks ago by the subsidies that are in that program as well.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe this bill is here, and I want to make clear that while I certainly do not object to the effort to insulate Federal employees from negative retirement actions, if there is a rollcall on this bill, I would vote "no." And the reason is because I think this bill demonstrates a rampant double standard.

As I understand it, last week in the prescription drug bill debate that we had on this floor, the majority party in essence told seniors, "Have we got a deal for you. We are going to set it up so that you are going to be able to get the same benefits as your Member of Congress." And now what are you saying this week? You are bringing a bill up that says to your future retiring Member of Congress, "Have we got a deal for you. It is going to be a special deal. You are going to be able to make sure that when you retire, you will have better prescription drug benefits than that poor sucker on Medicare."

That is what you are telling people, and I do not happen to think that is a very straightforward way to deal with our constituents.

I understand what the committee wants to do to protect Federal employees. I would be very happy to vote for this bill once the majority party brings back to this floor a decent deal on prescription drugs for every other American, but not under these circumstances, not under these circumstances.

Right now, if you are a Federal employee, if you are a Member of Congress, if you belong to the Blue Cross plan, you get 80 percent of your cost paid for for prescription drugs basically. But what do you say to seniors under that turkey of a prescription drug bill you passed last week? What you say is, oh, we will help you pay up to \$2,000, but, boy, if you get stuck with drug costs that are somewhere be-

tween \$2,000 and \$5,000, for that \$3,000 hit on your wallet, sorry, you are not going to get any help from Uncle Sam.

And my colleagues think that is a square deal? I mean, with all due respect to the effort behind this bill, it does not meet the laugh test, as far as I am concerned. If the majority party in this House wants to be considered a serious legislative force on this issue, they will pull this bill from the floor and bring it back when they can also bring back to the floor a bill with a decent, sustainable, consistent, reliable, affordable benefit under Medicare for all seniors for prescription drug costs. Until that happens, do not ask me to vote for a special insider deal for Members of Congress. That is what this bill does.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and let me just say in all candor that we have 1.25 million FEHBP employees covered by this, with 388 former Members of Congress. The vast majority of former Members do not even sign up for FEHBP, those who would be eligible for the plan passed by this body 2 weeks ago, and do not even use FEHBP, which is a more comprehensive option for retired Federal employees, including Members of Congress. So this really has nothing to do with Members of Congress.

The other question I pose is, why, when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle controlled this body for 40 years, did they not bring up any prescription drug benefit plan before this body for a vote? We have passed plans now the last 3 years, only this time has the Senate passed a plan as well, and we are giving meaningful relief to seniors who want it. It is a voluntary plan. It is not a perfect plan by any means, but it is within the budget limitations passed by this Congress. Their plan was outside the budget limitations.

I think we have to get real. I think we have a good deal for Americans in the plan that we passed 2 weeks ago. As we work with the Senate, we will try to refine it and make it better. I think this legislation today makes it better as well, recognizing that as we look at our Federal workforce, trying to make sure we have the right incentives to attract and retain the best and the brightest to fight for homeland security, to fight the battles for this country, to develop cures for cancer, that we are treating our employees well.

So I am very proud to support this legislation. I think it enhances and goes with the underlying theme of the legislation passed 2 weeks ago, and that is we do not want to drive current prescription drug benefit plans out of existence, which, if we do not pass this, we will be setting a terrible example here at the Federal level.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am here to expose the hypocrisy of my

Republican colleagues. The previous speaker just said that this bill has nothing to do with current Members of Congress. Well, we will just wait and see.

Over on the Senate side, Senator DAYTON successfully offered an amendment to the Medicare prescription bill to ensure that no Member of Congress would receive a better prescription drug benefit than that which is included in the Medicare bill. And guess what? It passed, 93 to 3. And Roll Call reported the following hypocrisy. According to Roll Call, indeed, many Republicans, 50 of whom helped add the Dayton provision to the Senate version of the Medicare bill this week, acknowledged that they were told by their leaders to vote for the Dayton amendment with the understanding that it would not show up in the final version of the legislation.

That is hypocrisy. What is good enough for America's senior citizens is good enough for those of us who serve in this Chamber. I am circulating a letter to the Speaker, and I am asking all Members of this House to sign this letter in support of the Dayton amendment. If this House, if this Congress does not support the Dayton amendment, we are little more than hypocrites. If this language is stripped from the conference report, it can only mean that Members of Congress believe that they deserve better health coverage than the seniors they represent.

America's seniors are watching us, and I hope my Republican colleagues will sign my letter to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), and I hope all of my Democratic colleagues will sign my letter in support of the Dayton amendment. We ought not to do for ourselves what we are unwilling to do for America's senior citizens. It is as simple as that. And to do less is to be hypocritical.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I think the points that have been made by some of my Democratic colleagues about the impact of the bill passed when we were last in session to cover prescription drugs for seniors is a point well taken. That bill is inadequate, and the reason we are passing this legislation is that we want to protect retired Federal employees.

Well, we do want to protect them, but we have to protect them because we passed a Medicare prescription drug bill that will give incentives for employers, public and private, to drop insurance coverage for their retirees for prescription drugs. What in effect we are saying is we do not want Federal retirees to face the plight that other seniors are going to face when they are retired and their employers decide to let them go get their Medicare pre-

scription drug benefit under the Republican-passed bill. It will be a lot less expensive, but it will be much less a benefit, in fact, a very inadequate benefit, for those retirees.

That leads me, however, to say that we should oppose the bill that the Republicans passed for the Medicare prescription drug benefit and make sure that we pass a really decent prescription drug benefit for all Medicare beneficiaries. That is not to say that we ought to leave our Federal retired employees without the protections that we promised them, which is that they would have the health care plans that they paid into during their working years available to them as retirees.

So I commend my Democratic colleagues for their pointing out the hypocrisy, and I support what they have to say, but urge, however, that we adopt this bill because we do not want to be against Federal retirees. But in doing that, we certainly need to acknowledge that the reason we are passing this legislation is because the prescription drug bill for Medicare that was passed by the House is so filled with holes and so inadequate.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say two things. This vaunted Senate bill that passed a couple of weeks ago, Senator AKAKA has also offered legislation in the Senate for their legislation as well. I think whatever happens under whoever's bill that passes, we want to ensure that we do not get that separation between the retired Federal employees and current employees in their health benefit premiums, and that is what this bill is about.

We had a spirited debate 2 weeks ago on a health benefit plan, and I do not think we need to continue to air this today. But I think this is good legislation, it is good protection for our retired Federal employees, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and thank them for the bipartisan support this bill is getting today.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think we have heard a great deal of debate, and we understand the merits of this legislation. It is unfortunate we did not have a bill last week that would have covered all of the seniors looking for relief under Medicare.

I certainly agree that we do not want Federal retirees to be at risk for giving up what they have already got, and so I would agree with my colleagues that we should support this legislation to make sure that our Federal retirees maintain the benefits they have already received.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, we've heard the President, Republican Members of Congress, Administration officials, and Republican Senators claim time and time again that their Medicare prescription drug plan will provide seniors with the same choices as Members of Congress get. They've said that if FEHBP is

good enough for Federal employees and Members of Congress alike, it should be good enough for seniors.

That's a great message and I'm sure it sells well with seniors. Unfortunately, their rhetoric fails to match the reality. The drug benefit they are willing to provide to Medicare beneficiaries is far less than the drug benefit provided to Federal employees.

We've been trying to expose this hypocrisy for months. Today, the Republicans point out the truth themselves.

This bill, authored by Representative TOM DAVIS, requires that each health plan in FEHBP agree to provide the same drug benefits to Federal retirees as they do to active employees.

In other words, it protects Federal employees from ever having their retiree drug benefits reduced to the level that the bill's author just supported for the rest of our nation's retirees!

Representative DAVIS represents an awful lot of Federal employees and he knows that the Medicare drug benefit is inadequate. Therefore, he's here today—the very first legislative day we are back in session after having passed the Republican Medicare drug bill—to get a fix for his constituents and himself.

If the Republican drug bill was as good a benefit as Federal employees and Member of Congress receive, Representative TOM DAVIS and others would not be here today ensuring that Federal employees are never forced to give up their FEHBP coverage and find themselves with only the Medicare drug benefit his party has legislated.

But, the Medicare drug benefit isn't as good. That's why they're here.

Unfortunately, they are ignoring the problems that will be faced by the millions of seniors and people with disabilities who are not Federal employees or Members of Congress.

The Congressional Budget Office has told us that if the Republican Drug Bill becomes law, one-third of employers will drop their retiree drug coverage. That will cause millions of Americans to lose the coverage they have today only to be replaced with the inadequate benefit put forth by the Republicans. Yet, nothing in this bill will help them.

Put frankly, we can't buy a health plan in FEHBP with as poor drug coverage as is included in the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill that was passed last week.

Rather than protect us from having to suffer with inadequate coverage with the rest of America's seniors, we should be considering a bill that guarantees all America's seniors and people with disabilities with a drug benefit as good as Members of Congress get.

Unfortunately, Republicans refuse to go along with that.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2631.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1345

GARNER E. SHRIVER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1761) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9350 East Corporate Hill Drive in Wichita, Kansas, as the "Garner E. Shriver Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1761

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GARNER E. SHRIVER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9350 East Corporate Hill Drive in Wichita, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the "Garner E. Shriver Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Garner E. Shriver Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1761.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1761, introduced by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9350 East Corporate Hill Drive in Wichita, Kansas, as the Garner E. Shriver Post Office Building. All members of the Kansas congressional delegation have cosponsored this legislation.

Garner Shriver represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas in this House for 8 terms, from 1961 to 1977. He was a lifelong resident of the Sunflower State; he spent nearly his entire adult life working for other Kansas residents, first as the State legislator and later as a U.S. Representative. This legislation is a fitting commemoration of his service to his home State and to the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Garner Shriver was born in Towanda, Kansas, July 6, 1912. He and his family moved to Wichita in 1925, and he graduated from the University of Wichita in 1934. Following his

college graduation, he enrolled in the Washburn School of Law and received a law degree in February, 1940.

After he was admitted to the bar, he entered into public service for the first time by enlisting in the U.S. Navy. He spent 3 years as an officer in the Navy; and after being honorably discharged, he chose to run for public office. He was elected to the Kansas State House where he served 2 terms. In 1951, he left the State House to run successfully for the Kansas Senate, which he served from 1953 to 1960. Finally, in the fall of 1960, the voters of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas sent Garner E. Shriver to Washington for the first of 8 distinguished terms in the House of Representatives.

In Congress, he was an influential member of the Committee on Appropriations. He accomplished much during his 16 years in the House, but he fought extra hard for his fellow veterans, particularly working to secure health and education benefits for his peers when they completed their duties with the U.S. Armed Forces.

Moreover, even when he left the House in 1977, he stayed in Washington to fight for veterans by moving a few blocks north and becoming the staff director for the Committee on Veterans Affairs. He worked in the Senate for 5 years before returning home to Kansas in 1982 to practice law.

Garner E. Shriver passed away on March 1, 1998, at the age of 85. He was a remarkable American who succeeded at everything he tried in life, and I know the citizens of Kansas still feel very grateful to him for his years of dedication. Congressman Shriver preceded the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) as the representative of the fourth district, and I congratulate my colleague for his work on this measure.

I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 1761 that honors the life and service of Congressman Garner E. Shriver.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform in consideration of H.R. 1761, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9350 East Corporate Hill Drive in Wichita, Kansas, as the Garner E. Shriver Post Office Building, which was introduced by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) on April 10, 2003. The bill has been cosponsored by the entire Kansas delegation.

Garner E. Shriver served in both the Kansas House of Representatives and the State Senate before being elected to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas. Reelected seven times, Representative Shriver served on the House Committee on Appropriations. He left the House in 1977 and went to the United States Senate where he served as the minority staff

director and general counsel for the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs from 1977 until 1982. He practiced law until his death in 1998.

He was obviously a person who spent all of his life working from one career to another career doing outstandingly well in each and every one of them. I think the designation, or the naming, of a postal facility in his honor is appropriate and serves as an indication of the tremendous legacy of service that he left. I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), the author of this legislation.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a former Member of this distinguished body, the late Congressman Garner E. Shriver. Congressman Shriver was born July 6, 1912, in the small Butler County town of Towanda, Kansas. His family later moved to Wichita in 1925 where he attended public schools and graduated from Wichita East. He remained in Wichita to receive his undergraduate degree from the University of Wichita, now Wichita State University, in 1934. Today his congressional papers are kept in the Ablah Library at Wichita State.

In 1940, he graduated from Washburn University School of Law in Topeka, Kansas. He put himself both through undergraduate and law school by working odd jobs, including serving as a doorman.

In 1941, Garner Shriver married Martha Jane Currier, his wife for the next 50 years of his life. However, before he and Martha had a chance to begin raising a family, World War II pulled him away from home. Mr. Shriver enlisted in the Navy; and after 10 months, he received a commission as lieutenant, leaving the Navy after 3 years as an officer. At the end of the war, Lieutenant Shriver found himself commanding a boat group in the Pacific for the Navy.

Not long after the war effort ended, Mr. Shriver made his first attempt at elected office. In 1946, he ran for the Kansas House of Representatives. He entered the race because, as he said, he felt he did not have anything to lose. Representative Shriver etched out a victory by a slim margin of only 222 votes. And so began the long and distinguished career of a great Kansas statesman.

After serving 2 terms in the Kansas House, Representative Shriver had greater ambitions and was elected to the Kansas State Senate where he served for two 4-year terms. During his 12 years of service in the Kansas legislature, he championed many worthwhile causes, including education for handicapped and mentally challenged children, keeping reckless drivers off the highways, creating the Kansas State Park Authority, important flood control legislation, and setting up the 4-H livestock show.

In 1960, he left State politics to run for Congress. Winning what was characterized as "a very spirited race," Garner Shriver became the new Representative of the Fourth Congressional District. At that time, the district included Sedwick and 14 other counties which are considered to be heavily Democratic. Congressman Shriver went on to win eight consecutive races before losing in a narrow defeat of 3,200 votes in 1976 to former Congressman and former Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman.

During his 16 years in Congress, Mr. Shriver became an influential voice on significant issues of the day, including health care and education benefits for our Nation's veterans, as well as landmark civil rights legislation. Congressman Shriver served on the committee that drafted the Civil Rights Act of 1964. His family is very proud of the fact that they have one of the pens President Lyndon Johnson used to sign the historic legislation into law.

While Congressman Shriver worked on various issues of national concern during his time, he was a relentless advocate of his constituents back in Kansas. As a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, Representative Shriver was in a unique position to protect the vital interests of the fourth district of Kansas and the State of Kansas.

When Representative Shriver left Congress in 1977, he was ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and third ranking Republican on the full committee. In that important capacity, Congressman Shriver was able to make sure Kansas was never overlooked during the Federal budget process.

Although he left the House in 1977, he did not leave Congress. He moved over to the Senate and served as minority staff director and general counsel for the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee until 1982 where he made a significant impact on the lives of his fellow veterans.

Upon completion of a near-lifetime of public service, Congressman Shriver returned home to Wichita where he practiced law and spent the rest of his life alongside his loving and dedicated wife, Martha Jane, until his death on March 1, 1998. Garner Shriver is survived by his wife and three children, David, Kay and Linda. He also has seven grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

During the nearly 30 years of elected public office, the name of Garner Shriver became synonymous with Wichita and south central Kansas. Simply put, Garner Shriver was a political giant. I am honored to succeed him as the current fourth district Representative, and I am pleased to have an opportunity to commemorate his service to our Nation by sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Shriver's beloved wife, Martha Jane Shriver, receives her mail from

the United States post office at 9350 East Corporate Hill Drive in Wichita, Kansas; and this is an especially appropriate location to designate the Garner E. Shriver Post Office Building.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I commend the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for introducing this legislation. Garner E. Shriver during his years in Congress lived in Lake Barcroft, which is the community I live in and represent in Congress. He was a good family man and neighbor there as well. This is a fitting commemoration for a very distinguished statesman, and I urge all of my colleagues to support adoption of this measure.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the rest of the Kansas congressional delegation in supporting H.R. 1761, which will designate a post office in Wichita, KS, as the "Garner E. Shriver Post Office."

As a Kansas native, who was raised in Wichita, I well remember Congressman Garner Shriver. My father, Warner Moore, served as Sedgwick County Attorney in the 1950s and was the Democratic nominee in 1958 for the congressional seat later held by Shriver. My father came within less than 2,400 votes of defeating Representative Edward Rees, who had held the seat since first being elected in 1936. Two years later, Representative Rees retired, and my father lost a very close primary battle with William Robinson, who was defeated for the open seat by Garner Shriver, who won with a margin of over 22,000 votes.

Garner Shriver served as a U.S. Representative for 16 years. He was born in Towanda, KS, in 1912; his family moved to Wichita in 1925. He graduated from University of Wichita in 1934; after postgraduate study at the University of Southern California, he graduated from Washburn University School of Law in 1940. The following year, he married Martha Jane Currier, who would be his wife for 56 years—they had three children: Kay, David, and Linda. He worked for Fox-Vliet Drug Company of Wichita from 1934–36, and taught speech at South Haven High School, of South Haven, KS, in 1936–37. Shriver joined the Navy at the outset of World War II and served 10 months in the enlisted ranks before being commissioned as lieutenant, senior grade. He was a boat group commander in the Pacific at the end of the war.

Shriver agreed to run for the Kansas Legislature in 1946, because, as his wife was later quoted as saying, "he figures he didn't have anything to lose. When we went to bed that night, we didn't know anything about elections. We woke up in the morning and he'd won by 22 votes." He served two terms in the Kansas House and two terms in the Kansas Senate before being elected to the House of Representatives in 1960. Senator Bob Dole, who was in Shriver's freshman class of House Members, recalled at this funeral that he "was known as a quiet and effective legislator and someone who kept his word. He was an exemplary husband and father." Former Representative Dan Glickman, who defeated Shriver in 1976, recalled him as "one who helped his district and state a lot, while being very congenial, civilized; not noisy, not polarizing."

Garner Shriver rose to be the ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Foreign Operations Subcommittee; he also was one of the original appointees to the House Budget Committee upon its establishment. Low key and moderately conservative, he was an active supporter of medical benefits for World War II veterans and for combat pay for Vietnam-era servicemembers. Early in his career, he served on a House subcommittee that originated the Civil Rights Act of 1964; his family still treasures one of the pens used by President Johnson in signing the measure into law. As the Wichita Eagle's obituary put it, Garner Shriver "embraced politics, seeing public service as a mandate for living a truly Christian life." As the Shriver family's minister and eulogist at his funeral, the Reverend George Gardner said, "Garner Shriver was always mindful of the people. They were not his people but God's people. And he thought they must be served with generosity, kindness and compassion."

Following his defeat in 1976, Shriver remained in Washington, DC, until 1982, working as the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee's minority staff director and general counsel. After concluding that service, he returned to private law practice in Wichita, where he died in 1998.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we come together today to commemorate the life and service of Garner Shriver with the naming of this post Office. As Reverend Gardner said at his funeral, "Garner Shriver came to us with energy and compassion and from his life we were called to a higher standard of principle. In him, we saw the value of public service as he revealed to us the great privilege of living in America."

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1761.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FRANCISCO A. MARTINEZ FLORES POST OFFICE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2396) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 Highland Avenue in Duarte, California, as the "Francisco A. Martinez Flores Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2396

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FRANCISCO A. MARTINEZ FLORES POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 Highland Avenue in Duarte, California, shall be known and designated as the “Francisco A. Martinez Flores Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Francisco A. Martinez Flores Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2396.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 Highland Avenue in Duarte, California, as the Francisco A. Martinez Flores Post Office. All 53 members of the California delegation have signed on to this bill as cosponsors.

The story of Lance Corporal Flores is one of remarkable courage. Born in Guadalajara, Mexico, Francisco came to the United States with his family at the age of 3. His family settled in the community of Duarte, California, east of Los Angeles. He grew up in Duarte, attended Duarte High School where he was a standout in the jazz band and on the football team. When Francisco graduated from high school in the spring of 2000, he bravely enlisted in the Marine Corps despite not yet being an American citizen. He was assigned to the First Marine Division and sent north to Twenty-nine Palms, California, the home of the Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center. After 2½ years of active duty in California, Lance Corporal Flores courageously journeyed with many of his fellow Marines across the globe to Iraq in January of this year for the military buildup to Operation Iraqi Freedom.

On March 25, 6 days into the war of liberation of Iraq, Lance Corporal Flores was killed in action outside of Nasiriyah in southeastern Iraq.

□ 1400

Sadly, he was less than 2 weeks from earning his United States citizenship, something that was his lifelong dream.

Mr. Speaker, Lance Corporal Francisco A. Martinez Flores lived an extraordinary life, albeit a tragically

short one. He represents the best of what American immigrants bring to this country. I commend the gentlewoman from California for introducing this bill, that it will appropriately honor his sacrifices to our Nation.

I want to let all Members know that Lance Corporal Flores was deservingly granted his U.S. citizenship posthumously on April 6, right on schedule. Therefore, I urge all Members to support the passage of this bill that will name this post office after Lance Corporal Flores in his hometown.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2396, which designates the facility of United States Postal Service located at 1210 Highland Avenue in Duarte, California, as the “Francisco A. Martinez Flores Post Office” was introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) on June 9, 2003. The bill has been cosponsored by the entire California delegation.

Mr. Speaker, Francisco A. Martinez Flores was 3 years old when his family moved from Mexico to California. He joined the Marines so that he could go to college. Unfortunately, at the early age of 21, Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores, who was assigned to the 1st Tank Battalion, 1st Marine Division in Twentynine Palms, California, was killed in Iraq on March 25, 2003. He died when his tank went over a collapsing bridge and tumbled into the Euphrates River.

The oldest of four children, Corporal Martinez was to have become a citizen of the U.S. in April of this year. Unfortunately, he died before he could take the oath of allegiance. He was buried as an American after being granted his citizenship posthumously.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores, with commendations, who gave his life before being granted or having the opportunity to have been granted his citizenship. I express condolences to his mother and to his siblings, and I commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) for seeking to honor the memory of a fallen hero, a soldier who gave his life so that others may experience the freedom, the liberty, and the opportunities that he never got an opportunity to fully enjoy. One cannot give much more than that, and I would urge swift passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the author of this resolution, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member and also the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform. We just came back from celebrating July 4, and on that occasion I had the opportunity of attending one of the local parades in one of my cities, Rosemead, California. I met four soldiers that had just returned from Iraq, about the same age as Francisco Martinez Flores, and their stories were also heartening and compelling. They came back to their families, and I had a chance to meet them.

Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores, a young man of 21 years of age, did not come back. And people ask me, Congresswoman, why is it that you want to name a post office after this young man? He was not an elected official. He was very young in life and was just barely starting out in his own career and finding his way. One of the things I have to tell the Members is that what when I read the tragic story of his death, one of the first soldiers to die among those in California, I was very moved, very moved to see his family and the community of Duarte that I now represent in the 32nd Congressional District come together. I attended his funeral where there were 1,200 people from outside of that city who came to gather to pay witness to this young man who had served and given his life.

As was stated earlier by my colleagues, this young man was not originally from the United States. At 3 years of age, he came to this country with his parents from Guadalajara, Mexico, but he attended our local high school in Duarte, participated in many activities, extracurricular, football team and the jazz band. He even wanted to be a member of our government, serving as a police officer. He will never get to realize that dream, and I saw that this was an opportunity for us to pay tribute to someone like him, like many other soldiers who are now serving and some that have not returned that we should pay tribute to, for they made and they make the ultimate sacrifice without a doubt and without question. In fact, his mother was quoted, and I recall at the church the mass that I attended at that funeral, her name is Martha Martinez, and she said of him, “He loved the United States so much. He was from Mexico, but he was fighting for America and its ideals.” Everyone was touched and moved by that statement.

Lance Corporal Martinez Flores was not just a brave and self-sacrificing marine, but he was a loving son, a brother and a friend to many who live in the 32nd Congressional District. He was the eldest of four siblings that emigrated to the country, and as I said, he served a short time there at high school in various extracurricular activities.

And on that day January 23, 2003, he was sent abroad to fight in Operation Iraqi Freedom, probably not knowing that he would never come home. He

was just 2 weeks shy from gaining his United States citizenship. Lance Corporal Martinez Flores was killed in the line of duty near Nasiriyah, Iraq, on March 25, 2003, and after his death, Lance Corporal Martinez's family proudly accepted a certificate of naturalization granting to Francisco posthumous U.S. citizenship on April 6, 2003. He was one of thousands of lawful permanent residents who have volunteered their service to protect the United States by joining the U.S. military.

Lance Corporal Martinez Flores was a courageous and dedicated marine who grew up in our local community of Duarte, and I am privileged that we will be naming a Federal building after him in his hometown.

Local residents in the city there have also shown their support to honor him. They have come together to put together their own funds to develop a scholarship in his name. And all 52 Members on a bipartisan effort from California support this initiative. The mayor and the city council of the city of Duarte are also bipartisan and support this piece of legislation. These efforts now will lead to the post office at 1210 Highland Avenue in Duarte, California, to be named Francisco A. Martinez Flores.

I want to thank all of them for their support for the bill, all those that had the ability to be a part of this to help us move this along in an expeditious manner, and I want to especially thank the family members and those people that represent that community that came together to fully unify themselves behind this young man. It is devastating for us to know that someone has to lose their life under such turbulent time and hardship to have a community come together like that. This was one of those moments in our history. The bill is a tribute to all those who have died to our country, and it is a tribute to all the families who have lost a loved one. The bill symbolizes the gratitude and admiration we have for our Nation's soldiers who risk their life to uphold their way of life and the American ideals of liberty, justice, and equality. And I urge all my colleagues to join me in recognizing this American hero, Lance Corporal Francisco A. Martinez Flores, who fought and died for our country, by supporting this bill today, H.R. 2396.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say I commend my colleague for bringing this legislation to the floor. In our usual order of things, it is individuals with power, prestige, and notoriety that get postal namings, but it is the Francisco Floreses of this world, many of them immigrants, who built this country, who make it run every day, and who fight to keep it free. He is in a larger sense, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) says, an American hero, and I urge adoption of this legislation.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand before the Members today in support of H.R. 2396. This legislation designates the post office located at 1210 Highland Avenue in Duarte, California, after a courageous young marine, Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores.

Lance Corporal Flores was killed in the line of duty near Nasiriyah, Iraq, on March 25, 2003, protecting the rights, beliefs, and values of a Nation that he could not yet call his own. He was just 2 weeks away from gaining his U.S. citizenship, which was granted posthumously on April 6, 2003.

According to the Department of Defense, an estimated 37,000 legal permanent residents are currently serving on Active Duty in our Armed Forces. These young men and women have willingly volunteered to carry out one of the most solemn duties any nation can ask of its people, and they have more than earned the right to become citizens of the Nation they have sworn to uphold and protect. Their contributions should always be remembered.

Naming the post office after Lance Corporal Flores is not just a way to honor his memory, but also a small way to show appreciation and respect to the other 200 soldiers who have made the ultimate sacrifice. Each day when a person walks through the Highland Avenue Post Office located in Duarte, California, they will be able to read about this hero and remember that it is the people in their community who contribute to the freedoms that we all enjoy as Americans.

I would like to thank every man and woman currently serving in the U.S. military. I hope they stay safe, and I wish them a speedy return, and I sleep better at night knowing that they are doing such a tremendous job, and I sleep better at night knowing that people like Francisco Martinez Flores are there serving our country. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2396.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With the understanding and recognition that I agree with the gentlewoman from California that if one has the right to fight and die, one certainly has the right to citizenship, I would urge swift passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House sus-

pend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2396.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1610

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON H.R. 2660, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. REGULA, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-188) on the bill (H.R. 2660) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1834

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to speak out of order, to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, this morning the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader,

and I had the honor of bestowing on four of our former colleagues the Congressional Distinguished Service Award. The four honorees were John Rhodes of Arizona, Louis Stokes of Ohio, Don Edwards of California, and Bob Michel of Illinois.

I first discussed creating the award last Congress with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the then Democratic leader. We thought it appropriate and fitting to have an award that is dedicated to former Members of Congress whose service to the country exemplifies the best traditions of the United States House of Representatives.

Today we honored four former colleagues, two Republicans, two Democrats, who had widely different political views, but who shared a love for their country and for this Congress. John Rhodes, Louis Stokes, Bob Michel, and Don Edwards shared certain virtues even as they pursued different political agendas. The words integrity, humility, honesty, and steadfastness describe all four of these individuals. None of them, none of the men that we honored today, pursued political ambition at the expense of common decency. None sacrificed their souls on the altar of political expediency. They inspired many with their political insight and their remarkable ability to bridge differences when seeking compromise.

All of them left their mark on this institution. Some were succeeded by a former staff members who they mentored. All were giants in their district who cultivated many to go into public service. All of them left this institution a better place by their service, and for that we give them our humble thanks.

It was an honor to award these individuals, to hear them speak from their hearts today about what this House meant to each of them. It is a very special place for them and their generation and for us today. I wish them Godspeed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter the entire proceedings of this morning's proceedings into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

REMARKS FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD CEREMONY, JULY 8, 2003

HASTERT. Several years ago, in conferring with then-Democrat Leader Dick Gephardt, we thought it was very fitting and proper for us to recognize members of Congress of this House of Representatives who've gone before us, who've laid the cornerstones of the good things that we enjoy in this Congress: the ability to communicate with one another, the ability to move forward good legislation, people who have shown the very best human attributes in this pursuit that we carry forth day in and day out.

I just want to thank every one of you, for being here today in Statuary Hall as we honor and recognize the first recipients of the Congressional Distinguished Service Award.

In doing this, we said, "Here are thousands of great people, people that we deal with, people that we live with in a sense day in and day out. But yet there are certain people who add a very special meaning to serving in this Congress and this House of the Representatives of the U.S. Congress."

The Distinguished Service Medal Award is dedicated to former members of Congress whose service to the country exemplifies the very best traditions of the United States House of Representatives.

We are honoring four men today, two Republicans and two Democrats. The purpose of this was to start two years ago, but because of illness and some extenuating circumstances called 9/11 and others we have put both the Congresses together today in this presentation.

The two Republicans and two Democrats who had widely different political views but who shared a love for their country and for this Congress, all four are members of the greatest generation—who those Americans who lived through the Great Depression, who fought in the Second World War, who played a critical role in making America the brightest beacon of freedom in the darkest days of the Cold War.

It is altogether appropriate that we honor these four men with this new award.

Since my colleagues selected me as their Speaker, I've had the distinct pleasure to participate in ceremonies recognizing recipients of the Congressional Gold Medal, our nation's highest civilian award given by the United States Congress.

I have had the pleasure to participate in ceremonies honoring Rosa Parks, the World War II Indian windtalkers, Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul II with the Congressional Gold Medal. The gold medal awarded by the Congress is an important way for our nation to pay tribute to leaders who make this world a better place with their service.

The Distinguished Service Award pays tribute to those who make this House a better place with their service.

John Rhodes, Lou Stokes, Bob Michel, Don Edwards—all of these men shared certain virtues even as they pursued different political agendas: integrity, humility, honesty, steadfastness.

None of these men pursued political ambition at the expense of common decency. None sacrificed their souls on the altar of political expediency. They always respected each other's differences and opinions. They inspired many with their political insight and their remarkable ability to bridge differences when seeking compromise.

They're all war heroes who served their country during World War II, then continued to serve their country as leaders in this United States Congress.

John, Louis, Bob and Don will always be remembered not just as the first recipients of this award, but also as great leaders who truly made a difference in the lives of so many Americans.

You're all very deserving of such recognition.

Congratulations again for being the first recipients of the Congressional Distinguished Service Award.

And now it's my privilege to introduce the Democratic leader, Nancy Pelosi. (Applause) PELOSI. Good morning.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for those very, very inspiring words about the people whom we are gathered here today to honor.

Thank you also, Mr. Speaker, for having the idea, along with Congressman Richard

Gephardt—then-Leader Richard Gephardt, to recognize the distinguished service of our former colleagues.

Those of us who served with them are blessed to be able to call them colleague.

As you know, it's a privilege to be here in this role to honor the first-ever recipients of the Congressional Distinguished Service Award and their families. It's an honor for all of us to be part of this historic ceremony.

I'm so pleased that we've been joined by some of the pages, because they, of course, were not here when these distinguished gentlemen served. But what they should know is that all four of them had public service as a high calling, all four of them were an inspiration to other generations to serve to be attracted to public service. And that's one of the reasons we're honoring them today.

Again, I want to commend the speaker and Dick Gephardt for their foresight in establishing this award.

Today's ceremony offers the opportunity both to honor these individuals and to remind ourselves how outstanding the character of a few fine people through sheer measure of their decency can elevate the institution for everyone.

These former members were on different sides of the aisle, but they took a shared oath and recognized a greater obligation to serve the country together, both to find common ground where they could and to stand their ground where they could not. No one has come closer to the ideal, the perfect member of Congress, perfect public servant, than John Rhodes, Lou Stokes, Don Edwards and Bob Michel.

Though John Rhodes cannot be with us today, we are honored that his award will be received in the most appropriate way. John Rhodes earned the love and the respect of his colleagues and constituents for his service to his district, to his beloved house and to the country. We remember his calming strength and the dignity he displayed during the last days of the Nixon Administration, when his leadership was so important to the country.

I hope that you will convey, in addition to the award, all of the good wishes of all gathered here today to your distinguished father.

Lou Stokes and I served together for many years, both on the Appropriations Committee and the Ethics Committee. A man of humble beginnings and high principle through his integrity and his commitment to the less advantaged was unsurpassed. He came from a strong public tradition of public service, as did Mr. Rhodes—continuing that. His colleagues were blessed to see Lou's character in action every day. But, the whole country caught a glimpse and were affected by what made his so special, and his moving personal statement during the Iran-Contra hearings.

He comes, again, from a distinguished family. His mother has a federal building named for her, and rightly so, because she produced two great public servants. And I have a personal connection because my brother served as mayor of Baltimore when Lou's brother was mayor of Cleveland, and went on, of course, to represent our country with great distinction as an ambassador.

And part of that family tradition is, obviously, the service of Lou Stokes in the Congress of the United States. On the Intelligence Committee, where he was chair, he introduced diversity into the mix: integrity, diversity, mission success.

On the Ethics Committee, it was always the highest possible standard. And on his work on the Appropriations Committee, he did a great deal to put forth the values of our country into our spending priorities, and he has been recognized for that at the National Institutes of Health, among other distinctions.

I had the privilege of naming this—Lou was named by Dick Gephardt when he was leader, and as the speaker said, the service of this presentation was deferred.

I, in my capacity as Democratic leader, had the privilege of naming Don Edwards, a great patriot in the finest sense of the word, absolutely committed to his country, to our country into making it better. Don spent his entire adult life defending the Constitution and protecting our civil liberties. Successfully demonstrating that neither our security nor our liberties need to be sacrificed. In order to have both, we need leadership; Don Edwards provided that.

Don is the only member who upon his retirement received both the American Civil Liberties Union Award and had a dinner honoring him hosted by the FBI.

And while in Congress, he was a mentor, a gentleman, a floor leader of the ERA. Well, you're going to hear so much more about all of these from our distinguished presenters, but suffice it to say, as a Californian, I am particularly proud of Don Edwards.

Bob Michel—anyone who served with Bob Michel knew that it was a special privilege to do so. He always had a basic respect for his political friends and political foes alike. He never questioned the motives of his colleagues.

A great Republican leader, Bob's strong working relationships and personal friendships with the Democratic speakers of the House, Tip O'Neill and Tom Foley, were on full display when then-Speaker Foley invited Bob to take the chair on the last day of the lame duck session in 1994. That spoke volumes as to the respect with which Bob Michel was held as a member of Congress as a Republican leader, and is held as a statesman for our country.

It is a joy always to see him as a source of great intellectual power, political strength and dignity in his service to the Congress.

I am honored to be part of any program that Bob Michel is being recognized.

As individuals, our honorees today are some of the finest people ever to pass through these halls. Together, they are a welcome reminder of what our country and our Congress can be at its best. These first recipients of the Congressional Distinguished Service Award call all of us to a higher standard.

Again, thank you, Speaker Hastert, for your vision and leadership in establishing this award with Leader Gephardt.

Congratulations to all of our honorees, and thank each and every one of you for being with us this morning.

Thank you, (Applause)

HASTERT. Thank you, Leader Pelosi.

Now I'd like to introduce the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, a 25-year veteran of the House, a distinguished gentleman from California, the distinguished Congressman Jerry Lewis. (Applause)

LEWIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Leader Pelosi, Reverend Dan and friends (inaudible).

Ladies and gentlemen, it's my distinct privilege and honor to say a few words about John J. Rhodes and remind all of us a bit of his service.

I first met the then-Republican leader in 1969—'79—'89—1979 as I came to the Congress a part of a band of wild men who arrived on the scene recognizing that the House had been dominated by one party too long and by golly it was our responsibility to do something about it.

The wild men led by Newt Gingrich and the likes of then-Congressman-elect Dick Cheney were counseled early on by Bob Livingston, who had arrived about six months before us, and he had special tools in mind to help us carry forward our quest.

At that point in time, we were fortunate enough to have a Republican leader who recognized that there was much to be done, including changing the House, but who also recognized that there were ways to accomplish things. And his advice and counsel, over that period and over the years, has been very, very important to me personally and to all of us.

John J. Rhodes, a man of the House, served in the House as the first Republican elected from Arizona. For 30 years, a member of the House of Representatives. John J. Rhodes, first and foremost a Republican but beyond that a public servant committed to representing his people and his state well and committed to bringing about change in our national government.

Over the years, John served on several committees in the House: the Education and Labor Committee, the Interior Committee, the Appropriations Committee, in which he served on my Subcommittee on National Security, and on the Rules Committee. During all of that service, he made many a contribution to the work of the House in terms of impacting public policy.

During those early years, he had a direct involvement in developing Republican policy or perhaps an alternative to the then leadership direction that might be a bit more conservative. He was chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, and he did a fantastic job helping the leadership to hold our band together to impact the direction of our government.

In 1973, his life changed rapidly for the then-Republican leader, Gerald Ford, was tapped to become our vice president. And by acclamation, John Rhodes was selected to be our leader. His advice and counsel, his stability, his solid commitment to the House made all the difference for the minority of those days.

He was a gentleman who everyone recognized as a person who cared about the House, the institution and public policy first. He reached out to the leadership on the other side of the aisle, seeking compromise, where possible, to impact the best possible of directions.

John J. Rhodes developed an interest in water because of its importance to Arizona. And while serving on the Interior Committee, he literally developed more base knowledge regarding the challenges in this difficult arena than anybody in the entire body.

John J. Rhodes, a public policy specialist, who early on expressed concern about the direction of our country in terms of national security. It was his voice that was heard time and again talking about the challenge and the problem of decreasing defense budgets. It was his voice that suggested we should have an intertwining between foreign policy and national defense that projected itself not for five years but for 10, 20, perhaps 50 years, to make certain that America played that leadership role that was necessary to make certain that we were the force for peace and freedom in the world, a voice that's heard today in many a circle, the first echoed in these halls by our leaders, John Rhodes.

A fabulous Arizonan who would be with us today if it were not for the fact that he is fighting another battle, the battle of cancer that we all know about affecting our country.

John J. Rhodes, a man to be remembered, a man of the House who indeed served out his destiny, making a difference in strengthening the House and laying the foundation for the future of this great institution. (Applause)

HASTERT. At this time, I'd like to call up Jay Rhodes.

Jay. (Applause)

On behalf of the Congress of the United States.

JAY RHODES, son of John Rhodes. Thank you, Speaker, and thank all of you for being here today. It's a great privilege and it's such a great honor for me to be here. I wish I weren't. There are so many of you in the audience that I recognize, members of my dad's staff, members who served with him, members who served with both of us.

As you all know, service in this House is a great honor and it's a great privilege. One of my honors and privileges was to serve with both Speaker Hastert and Leader Pelosi. And I thank you both very, very much for the kind words that you've mentioned here this morning.

And, Congressman Stokes, Congressman Edwards, Congressman Michel, it's an honor to share this podium with you.

We are here to award four longtime members of the House, members who lent a significant part of their lives and of their dedication to service to the House of Representatives, and that's quite appropriate.

But in many ways these four members are simply reflections of the House, because the House, while it's made up of a group of fiercely independent individuals, when it is the House, when it's the House acting on the country's business, it's a grouping of Americans, a grouping of Americans who have ideals and thoughts and aspirations and hopes and goals which basically can be boiled down to a peaceful, free, harmonious United States.

And those are the goals of every member of this body, regardless of the time that they served and regardless of the party that they served.

And so you award four very deserving former members of the House, but at the same time you're honoring yourselves and you're honoring the institution, and rightfully so.

And were my dad able to be here today—and let me hasten to say to you that he is not currently at death's door, he just simply would be physically unable to make the trip—but were he here he would tell you that service in this body is an honor that has been conferred upon and enjoyed by very few in the history of this country, and it's an honor that cannot be replicated and it's an honor that can sometimes barely be described.

But he would tell you that service here made him when he left a better person than he was when he arrived, and I think that each and every one of us who's had the honor to serve here would concur in that. I think that being here makes you a better person. Having the opportunity to be of some measured service to your country has to make you a better person.

If I could use two words to describe my dad, they would be service and they would be loyalty. Service is self-described in terms of the amount of time that he spent, both in the military and then here in this body, and what he has done since he's left the body.

Loyalty, of course, to his family, tremendous loyalty to his family. Tremendous loyalty to his wife, to my mother. But loyalty to this institution, because he felt and feels very strongly that this is democracy's cradle, this is where the work of keeping people free and hopeful starts and sometimes is concluded, hopefully always positively.

And were he here he would tell you that he appreciates this from the bottom of his heart, as do I for him. Thank you all very much. (Applause)

HASTERT. Thank you, Jay.

When Louis Stokes decided to retire after 30 years of service in the House many in Ohio thought it would be impossible to fill his shoes. But when a certain prosecutor by the

name of Stephanie Tubbs Jones decided to run for his seat, the people chose her as their candidate to do that job.

Please welcome Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones. (Applause)

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES (D-OH). To Speaker Hastert, Leader Pelosi, Reverend Coughlin, my colleagues, current, my former colleagues who I have not had a chance to meet, imagine this: In 1968, I was completing my freshman year in college at Case Western Reserve and I had the opportunity to work in the campaign for the first African American to be elected to the U.S. Congress from the State of Ohio. Imagine this: He didn't know who I was. (Laughter)

Imagine this: Some 30 years later, I would be running to hold that very same seat in the U.S. Congress, and today, 35 years later, I have the opportunity to participate in the presentation of this Distinguished Service Award to the Honorable Congressman Louis Stokes, to celebrate and recognize his outstanding service and achievement.

Let me fill in the blanks. Prior to serving in Congress, Congressman Stokes practiced law for 14 years and was one of the founders of the firm Stokes, Character (ph), Terry (ph), Perry (ph), Whitehead (ph), Young (ph) and Davidson (ph) law firm. His brother Carl (ph), the first African American mayor of a major American city, was also a partner. Congressman Stokes argued three cases before the U.S. Supreme Court, one of the most famous the stop-and-frisk landmark case of Terry (ph) v. Ohio. On November 6, he ran and was elected to Congress, serving 15 consecutive terms. When he left the Congress he was 11th overall ranking in the House.

But during his tenure he served as chair on several important committees, including, most notably, the House Select Committee on Assassinations, the Ethics Committee, the House Intelligence Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, HUD and Independent Agencies.

He was the dean of the Ohio delegation and was one of the founding members of the infamous Congressional Black Caucus.

It is through his work and leadership that he became the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus health brain trust, and his name is marked across the country for his service in this area. He has worked in health care in so many different areas that he is recognized for the Alliance for Minority Participation program that was created under his leadership and funded by this Congress, and more than 20 programs across this country are participating in this wonderful program.

His work in the area of health care has also been recognized by the National Institute of Health, the Louis Stokes Libraries, the Case Western Reserve University Louis Stokes Health Center, the Department of Veterans Affairs Louis Stokes VA Hospital campus, Howard University Louis Stokes Health Science Libraries.

I'm smiling, Congressman Clay, because Congressman Clay said if another building in Cleveland is named after Louis Stokes they might as well call it Stokes, Ohio. (Laughter)

He has received more than 26 honorary degrees from colleges and universities across this country. The Congressional Black Caucus, in association with the Heinken Company (ph), created the Louis Stokes Congressional Fellows Programs.

Now, why do you think that a man like this would be recognized in so many instances? It is because of his leadership. It is because of his willingness to stand up and talk about issues that are important for all Americans.

In Cleveland, the Cleveland Public Library has a Lou Stokes wing. The public transit

station is named after him. A street is named after him and his brother. A day care facility. A post office after his wonderful mother, Louise (ph) Stokes.

Yet with all of this recognition, he takes time to talk to children at schools, to teach at Case Western Reserve, to serve as an adviser to the National Committee on Minority Health.

And you would think after retiring, at least in my conversations with Jay, that he would get a fishing pole and find a cool stream. Not my congressman. He, in fact, says, "How would you characterize successful aging?" These are not my words, these are his. "I'm not sure I know precisely what the term successful aging means. If by successful aging you mean continuing to be active and involved and productive, notwithstanding that I am older than 65, then that might be a good definition of successful aging. I've worked since I was 12 years old. I have never been without a job. I love work. I—"I need my glasses—" (inaudible) when I am productive and I am involved in being active. I perhaps overdo it in that one should have hobbies. Perhaps, people say to me all the time, 'What are your hobbies?' I don't know. I don't have any hobbies. My hobby is work. I just love work. If anything has enabled me to fill a category of successful aging, it is that I have spent my lifetime working."

And quote he says—well, the question is, "With your public service career behind you, to what are you looking forward to now?"

"The challenge of engaging a third career at the age of 74 is very exciting. To think that now I come back to the city to practice law is thrilling. I practiced law for 14 years as a criminal defense lawyer before I went to Congress. I spent 30 years in Congress. Now to come out and have a worldwide law firm, Squire (ph), Sanders (ph) & Dempsey (ph), accept me as senior counsel in the firm is very flattering. Most law firms kick you out at 65. The fact that they have a lot of seniors and juniors in respect to one of the myths that after 65 you don't have much utility to a law firm, for them to reach out and take a man who is 74 years old and say, 'Oh, he does have value,' should cause some of the law firms to rethink that myth."

It goes on, but I won't spend time reading it.

I have been personally blessed to have the ear, the heart and the support of the Honorable Congressman Louis Stokes. On each occasion that I've asked for help he was there for me, and occasionally when I didn't ask he was there. (Laughter)

People often ask, "Is it hard coming behind an icon like Congressman Louis Stokes?" I answer, "Of course it is. But I'm not trying to fill his shoes, I'm standing on his shoulders."

He's blazed the trail for me, cleared the bushes, and it's my obligation to keep moving forward. God has truly blessed me. I viewed Congressman Stokes from afar and I watched him on that TV doing that cross-examination or standing up on issues or bringing people in Cleveland out to vote or turning out people in support of issues important to our community. I sat at his feet, and now I can sit at his table.

What a great country we live in and what a wonderful and mighty God we serve that I've had the opportunity to go from afar and to come this close to my icon, the Honorable Congressman Louis Stokes. (Applause)

HASTERT. Would Louis Stokes please come forward?

Louis, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives.

FORMER U.S. REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS STOKES (D-OH): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you, Stephanie.

To our leader, Nancy Pelosi. Distinguished members of the dais. Ladies and gentlemen.

I want to thank Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones for being my presenter on this occasion and for her very warm and kind remarks.

The choice of who in the current Congress would present me was not an easy one because I still have many friends here. But I chose Stephanie because she is not only my friend, she is the embodiment of all that I hold dear about this institution. She is now the current and the future for the people who gave me the honor of representing them in the United States Congress.

The torch I placed in her hands is burning brightly, and I anticipate her exceeding any accomplishments that I may have had in this house. She is now the pride and the joy of the 11th congressional district of Ohio.

Stephanie, I thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this honor bestowed upon me today. It is humbling to be accorded this honor by the speaker of the House of Representatives. Having served in this house with you prior to and during your speakership, I have great admiration and respect for both your leadership of the House and the great service you are giving to our nation. Thank you, sir.

Madam Leader, Nancy Pelosi, as you and I know, before Stephanie Tubbs Jones arrived you were my favorite female in the House. (Laughter)

Madam Leader, I am so proud of you, and I am proud of our friendship over the years. As members of the Appropriations Committee and the Ethics Committee, as you've already stated, you and I stood and fought together on many issues on behalf of health, education, housing, women, children, minorities, the poor and the disadvantaged. We didn't always win, but we always fought.

I want to thank you, Nancy Pelosi, also for this great honor.

I'm also indebted to my friend Dick Gephardt, who last year, while still Democratic leader, selected me for this honor. When I served in the House I was proud to be a member of his leadership team. His leadership in the House was exemplary, and I am grateful to him for deeming me worthy of this high honor.

In this audience today are a few people whose presence I would like to acknowledge. I share this great honor today with my lovely wife and closest friend, Jay Stokes, with whom next month I will celebrate 43 years of marriage. (Applause)

We have with us here today our four children, Shelley, Angie, Chucky, Lori, Lori's husband Brian. We also are privileged to have with us five of our seven grandchildren. My children and my grandchildren have been my greatest inspiration.

Also present is my best friend in the House, former Congressman William "Bill" Clay, who came into Congress with me, with whom I served for 30 years.

I'm also proud to acknowledge the presence of a number of my current colleagues at Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, a worldwide law firm, including the chairman of that firm, Tom Stanton (ph).

The word "ultimate" seems to best describe the award being given me, John Rhodes, Bob Michel and Don Edwards. Serving with each of them was a great honor.

I have always thought that to be one of the small group of Americans privileged to have been elected to serve in the greatest legislative body in the world was the highest honor that one could achieve. But to be given this ultimate award here today by my former colleagues in an institution which I revere is the most humbling experience of my life. No greater honor can ever be accorded than to be honored by one's own peers.

In accepting this award today I'm reminded of my first day in Congress, January of 1969, 34 years ago. My mother, my wife and family had been specially seated in the gallery, in the section usually reserved for the family of the president or other special guests. My mother had just been honored as Ohio's mother of the year. Seated next to her was my brother Carl, the mayor of Cleveland, who was America's first black mayor of a major American city.

Growing up on welfare in the housing projects of Cleveland, in the heart of Cleveland's slums, this mother, who scrubbed floors and cleaned houses for a living, constantly admonished Carl and me to work hard and grow up to be somebody. That day, 34 years ago, as I stood on the floor of the United States Congress and looked up in the gallery at her, painfully aware that Carl and I were the first in our family to ever go to college, I was determined to make her proud.

Thanks to all of you in my prayers tonight I can say, Mom, I worked hard, and Congress said I grew to be somebody.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

HASTERT. Thank you, Louis.

I'd now like to introduce the distinguished gentlewoman from the state of California, who for eight years worked for Congressman Don Edwards before his retirement from Congress. She then ran for his seat and was elected to serve the people of the 16th District of California.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren. (Applause)

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ZOE LOFGREN (D-CA). Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi. It is great to see all of you here today, and especially so many Members of the House. I know how hard it is to take time to be at a ceremony. We're pulled in a million different directions. But someone who's probably even busier than us is a Cabinet secretary, and I's especially like to thank Secretary Norm Mineta, and who shared San Jose with Don Edwards for so many years, for being here. (Applause)

Norm was the Watergate class, the class of '74. And I see people who served with Don Edwards, and I know that there was a scramble, every one of them would have wanted to introduce Don Edwards. And I guess I was lucky enough because not only was I elected to represent the people that he represented so well for 32 years, but I also served on his staff for nearly nine years.

And you know, those of us who were on the staff sort of divided up our service. I mean, there were different decades, the '60s, the '70s, the '80s, and the '90s. And some of those who served in the '90s never really knew the people who served in the '60s, but we knew that Don Edwards made a difference in every one of those decades.

It's worth noting that Don Edwards was not always a Democrat, hard to believe. A native of San Jose, he grew up on 13th St., just a few blocks from where I live today, on 16th St. He graduated from Stanford, passed the bar exam. He was a scratch golfer, he was "AM" in the winning Pro-Am at the Crosby one year. He established and ran a successful business in San Jose and looked like he was going in one direction when all of sudden the world turned.

And in 1960, John F. Kennedy was elected president of the United States, Don Edwards came to his senses and became a Democrat, and he got elected to Congress in 1962 to join the country's new president in changing the world. And he did.

As floor leader during the omnibus civil rights act in the '60s, he also led on the voting rights act; he was a key figure in the establishment of fair housing laws.

You know, he was part of the greatest generation in World War II. He was not afraid to

fight for our country as a gunnery officer and later as an intelligence officer, but he also wasn't afraid to stand up for what he knew was right. And so he was one of only nine people who voted against the first funding for the Vietnam War, in the '60s. And he knew that he was right and he wasn't afraid to stand up for it.

In the 1970s, he was the floor leader for the equal rights amendment, and we all called him the Father of the Equal Rights Amendment, but he was gracious enough to make sure that women got to be the mothers and the authors. He was a gentleman.

In the 1980s he led the fight for the ADA. And although he and Congressman Henry Hyde had sharp differences of agreement on many issues, he was able to work with Congressman Hyde together on the assault weapons ban, and also on voting rights issues, because he is the kind of person who would not let a disagreement stand in the way of reaching an agreement when you could if it served the public interest.

There are things that he did that people don't even know about. I remember in the '70s, and you'll think back, when the junta threw out the democratically elected government in Greece, and his office became the center of the Greek parliament in exile. And they would meet in his office, and we would come in and find all the parliamentarians from Greece plotting their return. And I think actually the democracy in Greece today has a lot to do with what Don Edwards was willing to do then.

As a former FBI agent, he knew about and had the stature to go after misconduct in the FBI, the CoIntelpro, the misuse of FBI resources for politics. J. Edgar Hoover was not a fan. But the FBI has now become a better place because of the efforts that he did to make sure that we had standards and that law enforcement could not be misused.

I remember during 1974 in the impeachment inquiry of Richard Nixon, President Nixon, and having served on the Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiries here, I am especially impressed by the dignity and the fairness with which Don Edwards dealt with that issue. He was never interested in getting to an end, to reaching a conclusion; he was only interested in making sure that the facts were out and that fairness was applied and the country was served.

As chairman of what was then known as Subcommittee Number 4, later the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, he spent full time securing constitutional rights for Americans, and, yes, trying to expand civil rights. He spent every day thinking how he could expand freedoms for America, not just in his bills: I think you can tell a lot about someone not just by their voting record and by the bills introduced, but how they act in their daily life.

And I remember so clearly a situation where the least powerful employees of the House of Representatives, workers in the cafeteria, were being unfairly treated, and the one person they felt they could come to in the House was Congressman Don Edwards. And this group of totally powerless people came to see him and he sat down with them and listened to them and became their advocate so that they could receive fair treatment.

I first saw Don Edwards in Mitchell Park in 1964. He was running for reelection. And Larry O'Brien, then the postmaster general, was with him. He gave a speech and I was totally inspired. I was totally impressed. And although he didn't know it, I walked a precinct for his election.

Later, on the staff, I was inspired again. And I will say, also, on a personal level, I would not be here today as a member of Congress except for the help and assistance and

encouragement that he gave to me, both in terms of working here and helping me to go to law school and always inspiring me to do my best.

You know, when I got elected in 1994, after Don's retirement, members would come up to me and say things about him, and I think you can learn a lot by what people—the words used to describe someone they had served with, and let me just give you some of those words: "a gentleman, fair, decent, honest."

"Even when I didn't agree. I knew he was a principled person. He was someone who actually listened to other points of view. He stood up for his country."

I was inspired when I first saw Don Edwards in 1964. I'm inspired today that even in his retirement he continues to fight for civil rights, for civil liberties.

He continues to stand up for what is right and decent in America. Our country is a better place because of his service. We are all in his debt. And I am very, very honored to be participating in this ceremony today. Thank you very much. (Applause)

HASTERT: Will Don Edwards please come forward?

On behalf of the House of Representatives. (Applause)

EDWARDS. Thank you, Zoe.

And thank you, Mr. Speaker and Leader Nancy Pelosi, The people's house is in very good hands with your leadership.

I'm pleased today that my wife, Edie Wilkie Edwards (ph), can share in this happy day, and also that I have members of my family have come from a long way, from California, to share in this lovely day. My grandson, Eric Edwards (ph), and his fiancée, Susan Parret (ph), are here. They're going to be married in September in Carmel, California. Carmel is a little village...

(Laughter)

... out of the Third World...

(Laughter)

And we're looking forward to the ceremony.

Also, Eric's mother, Dr. Inger Sagatin Edwards, who is Norway's great gift to the United States. Inger is a professor, got her doctorate at Stanford University, and is the head of the Administration of Justice Department at San Jose State University.

We also have other people from different parts of the country, and welcome to all of you.

No member of Congress would be anything without a staff that is competent and skillful, and I was very lucky for all the many years to have a marvelous staff. And from Portland, Oregon, Terry Pocué came all this way to share in this celebration. Catherine LeRoi was the chief counsel for the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, where I was chair. Stuart Ishimaru from the Department of Justice and a valued staff member. And Virginia Stone, Ginny Stone, was a valuable lawyer, and she and I worked very closely on a lot of issues.

So I couldn't have gotten along without these valuable staff members, and I thank you all for coming.

I am very grateful to have had the privilege of being a member of the House of Representatives. It's a glorious organization, and I have many happy and important memories of my service.

One day in 1983 I was sitting in my office and the sergeant at arms called and said that You, as the senior member of the California delegation, have the honor of escorting the president into the House chamber tonight so that the can deliver his State of the Union message.

And I said, fine, and so I showed up at quarter of nine in the speaker's formal sitting room, I walked into the room, and there

was only one person: It was President Ronald Reagan.

And I said, I said, What in the heck am I going to talk to President Reagan about? (Laughter)

All by myself. So I walked over and shook hands, and then I, there was a moment of silence, and I said, Mr. President, at your ranch in San Diego, do you have rattle-snakes? (Laughter)

And his face lit up, big smile, he said, We sure do. He said, And I wear boots up to my knees because they're pretty dangerous. And he said, When I see one on the path, I just stomp on it with those big boots.

Oh, but, he said, Two weeks ago Nancy and I had been riding, and we were walking back from the stable to the ranch house, and I saw a rattlesnake and I stepped on him, and I looked down and I had on tennis shoes. (Laughter)

But the most glorious moment in 32 years in Congress was in 1964, when the House enacted the omnibus Civil Rights Bill that did away with segregation and American apartheid in this country.

The House was the leader, and we didn't have the votes on the Democratic side because we lost so many votes in the South. And the Republicans joined us in enacting this glorious piece of legislation.

Bill McCulloch of Ohio was the Republican leader, and other great ones there were Bob Michel, John Rhodes, and the Republicans did better in the vote than the Democrats, and then next year this same thing happened with the Voting Rights Act.

So that was my glorious moment, when the House in a bipartisan way did this great movement. Now, if anybody asks me what's your advice as you leave the House—nobody ever asked me, but I said anyway—

(Laughter)
And all I would say is do good. Do good for the American people, don't do any harm. And the same would apply to the billions of people throughout the world. Do good for them, too. Be a good neighbor. Thank you very much. (Applause)

HASTERT: Thank you.
Now I'd like to introduce a congressman from my own state of Illinois, who also is known for his fair and balanced approach in the House, just like his former boss, Mr. Bob Michel.

Please welcome Congressman Ray LaHood. (Applause)

REP. RAY LAHOOD (R-IL): Thank you very much. Thank you, Speaker Hastert, for the honor you bestow on me and to my friend, Bob Michel, and the opportunity to say a few words of introduction to our great leader.

I've had the honor to know Bob Michel for over 20 years, so that I know there are three things that he dislikes very much. The first is to miss a three-foot putt at Burning Tree. The second is to see his Cubs lose a game they should have won. And the third, worst of all, is to sit quietly by while a former staffer sings his praises in public.

So Bob, I ask you to bear with me this morning. I'll try to make this as painless as possible.

We all know Bob as a great legislator, a combat veteran, a great singer, a patriot and as a man devoted to his beloved Karin (ph) and his great family.

But today I want to speak of Bob in another capacity. I want to speak about Bob Michel the teacher. I consider myself a graduate of the Robert H. Michel school of applied political arts and sciences, and there are some in this room who are also students, like our friend Billy Pitts, who's now at the Rules Committee; like John Feehery, who works for the speaker; and Ted Van Der Meid, who works for the speaker; and Karen

Haas who works for the speaker, all students of Bob Michel. And Paul Vinevicy, who works at the House Administration Commission.

And my own staff, Diane Liesman and Joan Mitchell and Erin Reif, all students of the Bob Michel school. We went to one of the finest schools anywhere in the world.

His classrooms were his office, the floor of the House, its committee rooms, and the farms and towns of the 18th Congressional District. Everywhere he went, he taught his staff by his example what it means to be a great public servant.

President John Adams once said the Constitution is the product of, quote, "good heads prompted by good hearts." Bob Michel taught us that both of these qualities, head and heart, are necessary in order to make this institution work. Bob taught us by his example that the House floor should be a forum for reasoned debate among colleagues, equal in dignity.

He inherited an old-fashioned Peoria work ethic from his beloved parents, and he came to the House every day to do the work of the people and not to engage in ideological melodramas or political vendettas. And he expected, in fact he demanded, that all his staff do the same.

Bob knew warfare first hand. Not a war in a Steven Spielberg movie, or war fought on the pages of books, but real war. I guess that's the reason he never used macho phrases like "warfare" and "take no prisoners" when discussing politics with his staff. To Bob, the harsh, personal rhetoric of ideological warfare had no place in his office, no place in the House, and no place in American politics. He knew that the rhetoric we use often shapes the political action we take.

Bob Michel was a superb Republican leader. And he would have been a great speaker of the House. But fate decreed that this was not to be.

So Bob, today I want you to know that you are, in the opinion of many, the greatest speaker this House never had.

Bob, in a sense, you have never left this place you love so well. Whenever there is a debate on the House floor conducted by men and women with good heads and good hearts, treating each other with mutual respect, you are there among us, and will be so long as the House endures.

You are a great congressman, and you remain, as ever, a great teacher.

And if I may just indulge—I was told we only had three minutes, and some of the other people didn't get that memo, so I'm not going to abide by it either. Right after I was elected in 1994, and Bob was obviously a big help and came to our victory party that night. Right after we were sworn in, I had the great privilege of chairing the House of Representatives. And during that chairing of the House, there was a phone call to our office from our great leader, Bob Michel, and he said to one of our staffers, You know, I served in the House for 38 years. LaHood's been there three months and he's chairing the House. How could this happen?

And it happened because of the great leadership that he showed to all of us. He was a great teacher, he is a great teacher, and we all—we all, not just those of us that worked for him, but all of us who stand in the House, or serve in the House, stand on his shoulders.

Thank you, Mr. Leader. (Applause)
HASTERT: Bob Michel, will you please come forward.

Bob, it's my great honor to present this to you on behalf of the House of Representatives. (Applause)

MICHEL: Well, thank you, Ray, for your introduction. And Mr. Speaker and Mrs. Pelosi and my erstwhile colleagues in the House and those currently serving, and my

friends, I thought when I retired from the House, nine years ago, that I had received far more than my share of plaudits and awards. And yet, today there is one more.

I wouldn't feel right accepting it if I didn't share it in a way and acknowledge those over the years who made it all possible, those closely associated with me, working in my office back in Illinois, here in Washington, here in this Capital building.

And of course it would also include my dear wife of 54 years, members of the family.

When I first came—well, let me begin by saying that I decided upon embarking upon a career in politics without the blessing of my parents. I remember Dad and Mother telling me, why would you want to get involved in this dirty, rotten, nasty game of politics? And I had to respond to my mom and dad, Folks, you've taught me the different between right and wrong.

Michel: And while my father was a French immigrant, probably didn't quite understand our system all that well, and my mother was first-generation American, I told them that I was quite sure that politics could be a very noble profession, and that I'd give it a try, and then from time to time, Dad, we'd come back and we'd check signals with one another and see if you were right or if I was right.

And, well, time passed, and I went up the ranks, leadership, and became leader, and before my parents passed away, they changed their mind. And I think they were proud of their son.

But I mentioned that only because, well, for several reasons, because of the nature of things today, and how we have changed as a country. And mention has been made, or surely should be made, of my 38 years, all as a member of the minority party. All those were frustrating years, believe me. (Laughter)

And there wasn't many cheers. But I tell you, I never really felt that I was out of the game, or that I had no part to play. Under the rules of the House, the traditions of the House and practices of the House, there is a role to play for the minority and a solo voice from here and there.

And for me to have all these voices from around the country, men and women, of different persuasions, come to this body and argue those differences, the clash of ideas and views of members. And then I guess the more exhilarating fays from me as I became leader and took on more role of responsibility, that those differing vies, those classes of ideas, verbally, not personally, but on the issue, had to be harmonized, they had to be rationalized, and we struck a deal, we made a bargain, hopefully, and the joy of bringing dissonant factions together, to work together, to craft good legislation for the country.

That was the joy of it, and I can honestly say today, emotional as this is for me, that my service in the Houe was a real joy. And my colleagues, particularly John and Luke, with differing views than John Rhodes and I, were always just good friends.

And we went at it hammer and tongs from whatever it was, 12:00 to 6:00 or 7:00, but then after all the arguments, back and forth, you know, you could still be good personal friends.

That's the way I like to see these deliberative bodies work, and I hope we can continue to keep our eye on striving toward that end, because in that way, I think, we bring credit to ourselves and for our country to the rest of the world.

I tell you, this has been just some, such memorable day for me, Mr. Speaker, and Nancy, Majority Leader, thank you for the high honor that you do me by once again honoring me as you do today.

I shall surely treasure this moment for the rest of my life. Thank you. (Applause)
HASTERT. Thank you, Bob Michel.

As somebody has said several times today, we do stand on the shoulders of giants. That's how we can make this a better place. I think we can all learn from lessons passed and those heroes that have gone before us.

I want to thank everyone, including all the families and friends who have joined us for today, as we honor John Rhodes and Lou Stokes and Don Edwards and Bob Michel. Please stand and join me in a very deserving round of applause for all recipients of the first-ever Congressional Distinguished Service Award. (Applause)

And now please welcome the House chaplain, the Reverend Daniel Coughlin.

COUGHLIN. Every blessing comes from our eternal father. May divine providence continue to guide this nation, hold this House together with clear ideals, civility toward all, aware of the deepest needs of the people.

May God grant all who have gathered here, especially the family and friends of the honorees, his continued blessings. And let the honorees assure them happiness and health in the future, with unwavering faith, constant hope and love that will endure to the end.

God, order all our days and grant us peace of heart, hear our every prayer and bring us all to everlasting joy and life forever. Amen.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for his very inspiring words about the people who were honored today and for having the idea along with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our former leader, recognizing the distinguished service of our former colleagues.

Today's ceremony was an opportunity to honor these individuals and to remind ourselves how the outstanding character of a few fine people through the sheer measure of their decency can elevate the institution for everyone. It was a sincere pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to see our friends and former colleagues today, and it was a moving occasion to thank them for their service and to rededicate ourselves to the ideals by which they lived. Those of us who served with them are indeed blessed to be able to have called John Rhodes, Louis Stokes, Don Edwards, and Bob Michel our colleagues. These former Members, as the Speaker indicated, were on different sides of the aisle, but they took a shared oath and recognized a greater obligation to serve the country together to find their common ground where they could and to stand their ground where they could not.

No one has come closer to the ideal of a perfect Member of Congress, a perfect public servant, than John Rhodes, Republican of Arizona, who could not be with us, but his son accepted the award for him, accepted the award and the very good wishes of all assembled. And let me say that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) had the opportunity of making the presentation on behalf of Congressman Rhodes, and moving it was indeed; Congressman Louis Stokes, who was presented by

the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), his successor, and with great pride; Congressman Don Edwards, who was presented by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), his successor; and Congressman Bob Michel, who was presented by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), his successor.

Any who have served with these people know what giants they were, and as individuals they are some of the finest people ever to pass through these halls. Together they are the welcomed reminder of what our country and what our Congress can be. These first recipients of the Congressional Distinguished Service Award call all of us to a higher standard.

Mr. Speaker, it is so appropriate that this ceremony took place in the days following July 4, because all of these people honored the memory and the sacrifice of our Founding Fathers, every one of them, in their service to this country. And in the course of these holidays, and July 4 being a great one for our country, we are all singing God Bless America, and we know that God in the service of Louis Stokes, Don Edwards, Bob Michel, and John Rhodes in their service to this country, God truly blessed America.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Democrat leader for her remarks, and I think in the spirit of Bob Michel, God Bless America was probably a very fine resemblance.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 26, 2003, and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2658.

□ 1840

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) had been postponed, and the bill was open for amendment through page 116, line 19.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTLER

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 57, noes 358, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—57

Abercrombie	Hostettler	Platts
Allen	Jones (NC)	Pomeroy
Bishop (UT)	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Bradley (NH)	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Cannon	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (OK)	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Carter	Lucas (OK)	Scott (VA)
Costello	Marshall	Shimkus
Cubin	Matheson	Shuster
Cummings	McInnis	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	McIntyre	Stearns
Davis, Jo Ann	Meek (FL)	Strickland
Farr	Michaud	Tauscher
Filner	Miller (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Foley	Moran (KS)	Thompson (MS)
Forbes	Musgrave	Tiberi
Gingrey	Napolitano	Udall (CO)
Hefley	Ortiz	Waters
Hinojosa	Paul	Wilson (NM)

NOES—358

Ackerman	Chocola	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Clay	Gordon
Akin	Clyburn	Granger
Alexander	Coble	Graves
Andrews	Cole	Green (TX)
Baca	Collins	Green (WI)
Bachus	Conyers	Greenwood
Baird	Cooper	Grijalva
Baker	Cox	Gutknecht
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Hall
Ballance	Crowley	Harris
Ballenger	Culberson	Hart
Barrett (SC)	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (AL)	Hayes
Barton (TX)	Davis (FL)	Hayworth
Bass	Davis (IL)	Hensarling
Beauprez	Davis (TN)	Herger
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Hill
Bell	Deal (GA)	Hinchee
Bereuter	DeFazio	Hobson
Berkley	DeGette	Hoefel
Berman	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Berry	DeLauro	Holden
Biggert	DeLay	Holt
Billirakis	DeMint	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Deutsch	Hooley (OR)
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Houghton
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Dicks	Hulshof
Blunt	Dingell	Hunter
Boehlert	Doggett	Hyde
Boehner	Dooley (CA)	Inslee
Bonilla	Doolittle	Isakson
Bonner	Doyle	Israel
Bono	Dreier	Issa
Boozman	Duncan	Istook
Boswell	Dunn	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	Ehlers	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	Janklow
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Jefferson
Brown (OH)	Engel	Jenkins
Brown (SC)	English	John
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Johnson (IL)
Ginny	Evans	Johnson, E. B.
Burgess	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Burns	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Burr	Feeney	Kaptur
Burton (IN)	Ferguson	Keller
Buyer	Fletcher	Kelly
Calvert	Ford	Kennedy (MN)
Camp	Fossella	Kennedy (RI)
Cantor	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Capito	Franks (AZ)	Kilpatrick
Capps	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Capuano	Gallegly	King (NY)
Cardin	Garrett (NJ)	Kingston
Cardoza	Gerlach	Kirk
Carson (IN)	Gilchrest	Kleczka
Case	Gillmor	Kline
Castle	Gonzalez	Kolbe
Chabot	Goode	Kucinich

LaHood	Osborne	Sherwood
Lampson	Ose	Simmons
Langevin	Otter	Simpson
Lantos	Oxley	Skelton
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Smith (MI)
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Pastor	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Payne	Smith (WA)
Leach	Pearce	Snyder
Lee	Pelosi	Solis
Levin	Pence	Souder
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
Linder	Peterson (PA)	Stark
LoBiondo	Petri	Stenholm
Lofgren	Pitts	Stupak
Lowey	Pombo	Sullivan
Lucas (KY)	Porter	Tancredo
Lynch	Portman	Tanner
Majette	Price (NC)	Tauzin
Maloney	Pryce (OH)	Tauzin
Manzullo	Putnam	Taylor (NC)
Markey	Quinn	Terry
Matsui	Radanovich	Thomas
McCarthy (MO)	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Ramstad	Thornberry
McCollum	Rangel	Tiaht
McCotter	Regula	Tierney
McCrery	Rehberg	Toomey
McDermott	Renzi	Towns
McGovern	Reyes	Turner (OH)
McHugh	Reynolds	Turner (TX)
McNulty	Rogers (KY)	Udall (NM)
Meehan	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Meeks (NY)	Rohrabacher	Van Hollen
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Velazquez
Mica	Ross	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Rothman	Vitter
Miller (NC)	Roybal-Allard	Walden (OR)
Miller, Gary	Royce	Walsh
Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Wamp
Mollohan	Ryan (WI)	Watson
Moore	Sabo	Watt
Moran (VA)	Sanchez, Linda	Waxman
Murphy	T.	Weiner
Murtha	Sanchez, Loretta	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Sanders	Weldon (PA)
Nadler	Saxton	Weller
Neal (MA)	Schakowsky	Wexler
Nethercutt	Schiff	Whitfield
Neugebauer	Schrock	Wicker
Ney	Scott (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Norwood	Serrano	Woolsey
Nunes	Sessions	Wu
Nussle	Shadegg	Wynn
Oberstar	Shaw	Young (AK)
Obey	Shays	Young (FL)
Olver	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—19

Cramer	Gutierrez	Millender-
Crane	Harman	McDonald
Flake	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Frost	Knollenberg	Pickering
Gephardt	Lipinski	Rush
Gibbons	McKeon	Sandlin
Goss		Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1900

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Messrs. BURNS, RADANOVICH and HOLT changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If there are no other amendments, under the order of the House of June 26, 2003, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY)

having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, pursuant to the previous order of the House of June 26, 2003, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1900

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 19, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie	Camp	Dunn
Ackerman	Cannon	Edwards
Aderholt	Cantor	Ehlers
Akin	Capito	Emanuel
Alexander	Capps	Emerson
Allen	Capuano	Engel
Andrews	Cardin	English
Baca	Cardoza	Eshoo
Bachus	Carson (IN)	Etheridge
Baird	Carson (OK)	Evans
Baker	Carter	Everett
Ballance	Case	Fattah
Ballenger	Castle	Feeny
Barrett (SC)	Chabot	Ferguson
Bartlett (MD)	Chocola	Fletcher
Barton (TX)	Clay	Foley
Bass	Clyburn	Forbes
Beauprez	Coble	Ford
Becerra	Cole	Fossella
Bell	Collins	Franks (AZ)
Bereuter	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Berkley	Costello	Gallely
Berman	Cox	Garrett (NJ)
Berry	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Biggett	Crowley	Gilchrest
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gilmor
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Gingrey
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Gonzalez
Bishop (UT)	Cunningham	Goode
Blackburn	Davis (AL)	Goodlatte
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Blunt	Davis (FL)	Granger
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Graves
Boehner	Davis (TN)	Green (TX)
Bonilla	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (WI)
Bonner	Davis, Tom	Greenwood
Bono	Deal (GA)	Grijalva
Boozman	DeFazio	Gutknecht
Boswell	DeGette	Hall
Boucher	Delahunt	Harris
Boyd	DeLauro	Hart
Bradley (NH)	DeLay	Hastert
Brady (PA)	DeMint	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	Deutsch	Hayes
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hayworth
Brown, Corrine	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hefley
Brown-Waite,	Dicks	Hensarling
Ginny	Dingell	Herger
Burgess	Doggett	Hill
Burns	Dooley (CA)	Hinchey
Burr	Doolittle	Hinojosa
Burton (IN)	Doyle	Hobson
Buyer	Dreier	Hoefl
Calvert	Duncan	Hoekstra

Holden	Meehan	Sanchez, Linda
Holt	Meek (FL)	T.
Honda	Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Hooley (OR)	Menendez	Saxton
Hostettler	Mica	Schiff
Houghton	Michaud	Schrock
Hoyer	Miller (FL)	Scott (GA)
Hulshof	Miller (MI)	Scott (VA)
Hunter	Miller (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Hyde	Miller, Gary	Serrano
Inslee	Miller, George	Sessions
Isakson	Mollohan	Shadegg
Israel	Moore	Shaw
Issa	Moran (KS)	Shays
Istook	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Jackson-Lee	Murphy	Sherwood
(TX)	Murtha	Shimkus
Janklow	Musgrave	Shuster
Jefferson	Myrick	Simmons
Jenkins	Nadler	Simpson
John	Napolitano	Skelton
Johnson (CT)	Neal (MA)	Slaughter
Johnson (IL)	Nethercutt	Smith (MI)
Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Smith (TX)
Jones (NC)	Northup	Smith (WA)
Jones (OH)	Norwood	Snyder
Kanjorski	Nunes	Solis
Kaptur	Nussle	Souder
Keller	Obey	Spratt
Kelly	Olver	Stearns
Kennedy (MN)	Ortiz	Stenholm
Kennedy (RI)	Osborne	Strickland
Kildee	Ose	Stupak
Kilpatrick	Otter	Sullivan
Kind	Oxley	Sweeney
King (IA)	Pallone	Tancredo
King (NY)	Pascrell	Tanner
Kingston	Pastor	Tauscher
Kirk	Payne	Tauzin
Klecicka	Pearce	Taylor (MS)
Kline	Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
Knollenberg	Pence	Terry
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (CA)
Lampson	Petri	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Pitts	Thornberry
Lantos	Platts	Tiaht
Larsen (WA)	Pombo	Tiberi
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Tierney
Latham	Porter	Toomey
LaTourette	Portman	Towns
Leach	Price (NC)	Turner (OH)
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Turner (TX)
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Udall (CO)
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Udall (NM)
Linder	Radanovich	Upton
LoBiondo	Rahall	Van Hollen
Lofgren	Ramstad	Velazquez
Lowey	Rangel	Visclosky
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Vitter
Lucas (OK)	Rehberg	Walden (OR)
Lynch	Renzi	Walsh
Majette	Reyes	Wamp
Maloney	Reynolds	Waters
Manzullo	Rodriguez	Waxman
Markey	Rogers (AL)	Weiner
Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (FL)
Matheson	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Weller
McCarthy (MO)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wexler
McCarthy (NY)	Ross	Whitfield
McCollum	Rothman	Wicker
McCotter	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
McCrery	Royce	Wilson (SC)
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McHugh	Ryan (OH)	Wu
McInnis	Ryan (WI)	Wynn
McIntyre	Ryun (KS)	Young (AK)
McNulty	Sabo	Young (FL)

NAYS—19

Baldwin	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Brown (OH)	Lee	Stark
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Watson
Farr	McCotter	Watt
Filner	McDermott	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Paul	
Jackson (IL)	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—17

Cramer	Goss	Millender-
Crane	Gutierrez	McDonald
Flake	Harman	Owens
Frost	Hastings (FL)	Pickering
Gephardt	Lipinski	Rush
Gibbons	McKeon	Sandlin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1918

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, my return flight to Washington was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather, and I therefore missed two votes this evening. I ask that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been here, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 334, the Hostettler Amendment, and "aye" on rollcall vote No. 335, final passage of H.R. 2658.

GARNER E. SHRIVER POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1761.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1761, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Bradley (NH)	Cunningham
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Davis (AL)
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)
Akin	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Davis (IL)
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Davis (TN)
Andrews	Brown-Waite,	Davis, Jo Ann
Baca	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Bachus	Burgess	Deal (GA)
Baird	Burr	DeFazio
Baker	Burton (IN)	DeGette
Baldwin	Buyer	Delahunt
Ballance	Calvert	DeLauro
Ballenger	Camp	DeLay
Barrett (SC)	Cannon	DeMint
Bartlett (MD)	Cantor	Deutsch
Barton (TX)	Capito	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bass	Capps	Diaz-Balart, M.
Beauprez	Capuano	Dicks
Becerra	Cardin	Dingell
Bell	Cardoza	Doggett
Bereuter	Carson (IN)	Dooley (CA)
Berkley	Carson (OK)	Doolittle
Berman	Carter	Doyle
Berry	Case	Dreier
Biggart	Castle	Duncan
Bilirakis	Chabot	Dunn
Bishop (GA)	Chocola	Edwards
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Ehlers
Bishop (UT)	Clyburn	Emanuel
Blackburn	Coble	Emerson
Blumenauer	Cole	Engel
Blunt	Collins	English
Boehler	Conyers	Eshoo
Boehner	Cooper	Etheridge
Bonilla	Costello	Evans
Bonner	Crane	Everett
Bono	Crenshaw	Farr
Boozman	Crowley	Fattah
Boswell	Cubin	Feeney
Boucher	Culberson	Ferguson
Boyd	Cummings	Filner

Fletcher	Lewis (GA)
Foley	Lewis (KY)
Forbes	Linder
Ford	LoBiondo
Fossella	Lofgren
Frank (MA)	Lowey
Franks (AZ)	Lucas (KY)
Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)
Galleghy	Lynch
Garrett (NJ)	Majette
Gerlach	Maloney
Gilchrest	Manzullo
Gillmor	Markey
Gingrey	Marshall
Gonzalez	Matheson
Goode	Matsui
Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Granger	McCollum
Graves	McCotter
Green (TX)	McCrery
Green (WI)	McDermott
Greenwood	McGovern
Grijalva	McHugh
Gutknecht	McInnis
Hall	McIntyre
Harris	McNulty
Hart	Meehan
Hastings (WA)	Meeke (FL)
Hayes	Meeke (NY)
Hayworth	Menendez
Hefley	Mica
Hensarling	Michaud
Herger	Miller (FL)
Hill	Miller (MI)
Hinchee	Miller (NC)
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Hobson	Miller, George
Hoeffel	Mollohan
Hoekstra	Moore
Holden	Moran (KS)
Holt	Moran (VA)
Honda	Murphy
Hookey (OR)	Murtha
Hostettler	Musgrave
Houghton	Myrick
Hoyer	Nadler
Hulshof	Napolitano
Hunter	Neal (MA)
Hyde	Nethercutt
Inslee	Neugebauer
Isakson	Ney
Israel	Northup
Issa	Norwood
Istook	Nunes
Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
(TX)	Obey
Janklow	Olver
Jefferson	Ortiz
Jenkins	Osborne
John	Ose
Johnson (CT)	Otter
Johnson (IL)	Oxley
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Johnson, Sam	Pascrell
Jones (NC)	Pastor
Jones (OH)	Paul
Kanjorski	Payne
Kaptur	Pearce
Keller	Pelosi
Kelly	Pence
Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)
Kildee	Petri
Kilpatrick	Pitts
Kind	Platts
King (IA)	Pombo
King (NY)	Pomeroy
Kingston	Porter
Kirk	Portman
Kleczka	Price (NC)
Kline	Pryce (OH)
Knollenberg	Putnam
Kolbe	Quinn
Kucinich	Radanovich
LaHood	Rahall
Lampson	Ramstad
Langevin	Rangel
Lantos	Regula
Larsen (WA)	Rehberg
Larson (CT)	Renzi
Latham	Reyes
LaTourette	Reynolds
Leach	Rodriguez
Lee	Rogers (AL)
Levin	Rogers (KY)
Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher	Ros-Lehtinen
Ross	Rothman
Roybal-Allard	Royce
Ruppersberger	Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)	Ryun (KS)
Sabo	Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta	Sanders
Saxton	Schiff
Schrock	Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)	Sensenbrenner
Serrano	Sessions
Shadegg	Shaw
Shays	Sherman
Sherwood	Shimkus
Shuster	Simmons
Simpson	Skelton
Smith (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)
Snyder	Solis
Souder	Spratt
Stark	Stearns
Stenholm	Strickland
Stupak	Sullivan
Sweeney	Tancredo
Tanner	Tauscher
Tauzin	Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)	Terry
Thomas	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)	Thornberry
Tiahrt	Tiberi
Tierney	Toomey
Towns	Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)	Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)	Upton
Van Hollen	Velazquez
Visclosky	Vitter
Walsh	Walden (OR)
Wamp	Waters
Watson	Watt
Waxman	Weiner
Weldon (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Weller	Wexler
Whitfield	Wicker
Wilson (NM)	Wilson (SC)
Wolf	Woolsey
Wu	Wynn
Young (AK)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Burns	Goss	Millender-
Cox	Gutierrez	McDonald
Cramer	Harman	Owens
Flake	Hastings (FL)	Pickering
Frost	Lipinski	Rush
Gephardt	McKeon	Sandlin
Gibbons		Schakowsky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). There are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1935

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1063

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors for H.R. 1063.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO NORMA KIPNIS-WILSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand before the House today compelled to share the inspirational story of a most extraordinary constituent. At 75 years of age, Norma Kipnis-Wilson remains a dynamic philanthropic force in the wonderful Miami-Dade County community which I am proud to represent. Norma fondly recalls making flower wreaths for the USO

during the Second World War, and in her own words reflects, "I have always been an activist. I am a patriot, greatly influenced by my being born on the 4th of July."

A native of Jacksonville, Florida, Norma came to Miami in 1959. She studied at the University of Miami and later worked as a stockbroker and real estate agent. Although always involved in service, she entered the business world more out of necessity. After gaining financial security, she drove right back into her lifelong passion, extending a caring hand to those less fortunate.

According to Norma's daughter, Deahni Kipnis, philanthropy runs in her blood. In the late 1970s, Norma pioneered gender equality on the University of Miami's campus by breaking into that institution's male-dominated board of trustees. "It was wonderful to be a part of this change," she recalls. Deahni feels very grateful to her mom and remembers her mother's advice. "Don't ever learn how to type or take shorthand." In Deahni's own words, "She is a very forward-thinking, modern woman."

Norma's son, Dr. Douglas Michael Kipnis, adds, "It is a great honor to know that your mother was a pioneer in women's equality."

Deahni, considering her mother's struggle for female ascendancy, recalls an instance when she observed Norma sitting with a female Jackson Memorial Hospital nurse. Deahni promptly declared, "You're sitting in the presence of a legend. Your life is easier today because of the work my mother has done."

After her work at the University of Miami, Norma focused her attention on Jackson Memorial Hospital, serving as the chairman of the board of the Rape Treatment Center. She is also a member of the board of the Foundation at Jackson, where she raises money for many causes, ranging from the renovation of the Holtz Children Hospital to funding the Breast and Ovarian Cancer Center.

According to Norma's son Douglas, "She works effortlessly for the masses, people she will never see; but she knows that they will benefit from her work."

Striving to better her community, Norma Kipnis-Wilson, with her colleague Rosey Cancelli, founded the Guardian Angels, an organization dedicated to lovingly supporting sick kids at the Holtz Children's Hospital. Norma was not content to just sit on a board; rather, she has always tried to make a difference.

In addition to her extensive local service, Norma Kipnis-Wilson has reached out to the international Jewish community as a lifetime contributor to and leader of the Greater Miami Jewish Federation, where she helps foster support and expedites programs for Miami-Dade and Israel. Indeed, Norma has recently been named as a life member of that institution's

board of directors. Through her involvement with the Jewish Federation, Norma developed the Lion of Judah pin, which signifies outstanding generosity.

Considering the Lion of Judah to be her greatest contribution, Norma marvels at how her idea has become a benevolent global sorority, over 7,000 strong, helping to raise millions of dollars every year.

According to Norma's son, Captain Daniel Carlin Kipnis, "I have to credit her with my becoming a moral person." This is just one example of Norma's far-reaching influence, an influence that has helped better many lives and has inspired many others to adopt the cause of community service as their own. In the words of her lifelong friend, Roxcy Bolton, "Norma cares about the human race and cares about Israel."

Norma is also a tough survivor, recently triumphing in her battle against cancer. Never complaining about her pain, she continued to attend board meetings at Jackson Memorial Hospital throughout her chemotherapy and radiation treatment.

Norma Kipnis-Wilson is a remarkable woman who has had a profound effect on her immediate community and, indeed, on the world. In addition to her legacy of uncompromising perseverance in the face of obstacles, Norma encourages the young people of today with a challenge: Care about others as much as you care about yourself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Norma and her entire family for their selfless contributions to our community.

BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight, and I want to especially thank my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for bringing us together tonight to talk about Africa.

The United States' focus on Africa has been sporadic at best, despite our extensive ties to the continent. I strongly believe that our past, present, and future is closely intertwined with Africa.

□ 1945

The United States is the leading foreign investor in Africa. Last year the total U.S.-African trade approached \$30 billion, and America is Africa's largest single market. Over 30,000 Africans study in America today, and we have almost 35 million citizens of African descent.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that about 200 million people in Africa are

chronically hungry. At least 25 percent of the world's undernourished people live in this region. Millions of Africans, mostly children under the age of 6, die every year as a result of hunger. Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have visited Africa a dozen or more times and have seen both the continent's problems and its promise. From Zimbabwe to Kenya, Gambia to Cape Town, I have been both saddened and inspired.

Just 2 weeks ago, I met with the Gambian President, A.J.J. Jammeh, in my office, and we spoke about how our nations can work together to promote economic reform, end conflicts, and build sustainable peace. We also discussed our partnership against crime and terror, which know no borders. I welcome the President's courage and farsightedness in supporting the democratic institutions and accountable government. There is an opportunity to build a true partnership between the United States and Africa, to leave behind the attitudes and habits of the past and seize opportunities to work together to achieve our shared goals.

I pledge to work to return American assistance to Africa to its past high levels. I join my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues in making the case to the American people that Africa's peace and well-being are closely bound to our national interests, whether fighting crime and terrorism or promoting exports and trade. The fight against poverty and underdevelopment is a critical part of our struggle of democracy and stability in Africa.

I am a passionate believer in the power of biotechnology to boost food production and fight hunger in this developing world. I know that the African continent is in special need of agricultural biotechnology, including transgenic crops. I believe that biotechnology is an indispensable tool that can produce dramatic benefits in food production on the African continent.

Biotechnology research has the potential to help the nations of Africa increase food security and improve the quality and nutritional content of food. Additionally, biotechnology can also improve the health of citizens of developing African countries by combating illness. Substantial progress has been made in the developed world on vaccines against life-threatening illnesses. Unfortunately, infrastructure limitations often hinder the effectiveness of traditional vaccinations methods in several developing nations.

For example, African clinics sometimes lack the electricity necessary to properly refrigerate and store vital vaccines. Even if a health clinic is able to effectively deliver the vaccines, the cost of multiple needles may hinder vaccination efforts. Additionally, the improper use of hypodermic needles can spread HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. Biotechnology offers the prospect of orally delivering vaccines to

immunize against life-threatening illnesses through agricultural products in a safe and effective manner.

Mr. Speaker, during the 107th Congress we successfully created a competitive merit-based grant program at the National Science Foundation to conduct bio genome research on crops that can be grown in developing countries. I strongly believe this program can make invaluable contributions to the fight against hunger, malnutrition, and disease by providing research grants to the U.S. institutions and scientists in developing countries to address their agricultural challenges.

It is my hope that trade disputes between the United States and the European Union and the African countries do not prevent this promising technology from benefiting ordinary Africans who face ongoing food shortages due to agricultural challenges such as pest, drought, and disease. Indeed, the continent may be able to reduce dependency on food aid and increase self-sufficiency through increased investment in generic engineering.

We cannot hope to combat poverty without winning the war on HIV/AIDS. The HIV/AIDS epidemic has killed more people than all of the wars of this century combined, and it will leave 40 million children homeless and orphaned by the end of the next decade. The way to beat AIDS is not to ignore or deny it, but to actively prevent it. Countries such as Uganda and Senegal that have faced the threat squarely have begun to see reductions in their infection rates.

However, in order for these reforms to take place, Africa must have sustainable stability and peace. I have said repeatedly that our involvement in peacemaking in Afghanistan and Iraq, East Timor and elsewhere around the world is not an excuse for inaction in Africa. It is a challenge to do better. Crises in Congo, Liberia, or Sudan are serious roadblocks to the way of Africa's development, and ending them will be crucial to securing long-lasting prosperity.

One of the areas where the international community must improve is in developing the resources of our African partners—so that we can move together, quickly and effectively, to prevent and respond to crises.

Mr. Speaker, there is an Arab proverb that says, "He who drinks of African waters will drink again." Africa is too big to ignore, and too rich and too important to be the object of our pity. Africa matters. We will drink, and drink again.

Africans will determine their own fate, but our help can make a difference. Our support for democracy, conflict resolution, market reform and sustainable development—these policies serve our national interest and help give Africa hope.

LEAVE IRAQ TO THE IRAQIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that every day we read about a young American soldier being killed in Iraq. Three were killed in a 24-hour period from Sunday to Monday. In its November 25 issue, "Fortune" magazine, long before the war started, said an American occupation would be "prolonged and expensive" and that it "could turn U.S. troops into sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists."

Unfortunately, this prediction has turned out to be deadly accurate. This past Saturday, the top of the front page of The Washington Post had a headline reading "Attacks By Iraqi's Growing Bolder." The next day a young American soldier was shot in the head at point blank range as he stood in line to buy a soft drink.

A few days ago, the leading Shiite cleric, the most respected figure of the largest population group in Iraq, demanded that the U.S. get out and leave Iraq to the Iraqis. It is so politically correct today and sounds so fashionable and intellectual to say that the U.S. will have to be in Iraq for several years and that it will not be easy and that we must be prepared for the sacrifice and the difficulties ahead.

Well, someone should ask why. Saddam Hussein was a very evil man, a tyrant, a dictator; but his total military budget was only about two-tenths of 1 percent of ours. He was no threat to us, as this 3-week battle, with almost no resistance, proved. Our military did a great job, as we all knew they would. Now we should bring them home.

President Eisenhower, as everyone knows, was a retired Army general, a graduate of West Point. He loved the military. Yet he warned us as strongly as he possibly could against what he call the military industrial complex. Pressured by this complex, we have now spent over \$100 billion on the operation in Iraq. The Congressional Budget Office originally estimated that a 3-month war followed by a 5-year occupation would cost us at least \$272 billion. Most estimate that we will stay in Iraq for 5 to 10 years, at a cost of 200 to \$300 billion, or more. And because we already face a \$400 billion deficit for this year, and hundreds of billions more in the years ahead, we will have to borrow the money to do all this. Once again, we should ask: Why?

Already we have had demonstrations by Iraqi soldiers demanding back pay, and similar demands from Iraqi retirees. Why should Americans taxpayers borrow hundreds of billions to pay the Iraqi military or Iraqi retirees to rebuild Iraq? We are jeopardizing the futures of our children and grandchildren. I believe our Founding Fathers would be shocked if they knew what we were doing today.

I remember reading a few years ago in The Washington Post that we had our troops in Haiti picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. Later I read that we had our troops in Bosnia building latrines and giving rabies shots to Bosnian dogs. I have nothing

against the people in either Haiti or Bosnia, but they should pick up their own garbage and build their own toilets.

Now we are told that the military will build or rebuild 6,000 schools in Iraq and give free basic health care to any Iraqis who need it. We will stay in Iraq for many years, at great expense to U.S. citizens, because several large multinational companies will benefit from large contracts there. We will stay there because all the pressures and money and power and glory within the Department of Defense, the State Department, the National Security Council, and our intelligence agencies are to continue to do more and more in other countries.

These people are not seen as world statesmen and men and women of action unless we get involved in every dispute around the world. They never debate or discuss the merits of all this; they just label all opponents of an interventionist foreign policy as isolationist. However, whenever anyone uses this term, they are simply resorting to mindless name-calling.

Now I suppose we are going into the chaos in Liberia, as we have Haiti, Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, and Lord knows where next.

What we really need are more Calvin Coolidges, more people in government who believe in a humble foreign policy. None of these countries were any threat to us. Should we now change the name of the Defense Department to the Department of Foreign Aid or the Department of International Social Work?

I believe in and have always supported a strong national defense, but I do not believe in massive foreign aid. Most of our foreign adventures are creating great resentment toward the U.S. around the world.

The Iraqi people may have hated Saddam Hussein, but they do not want Americans or our puppets running their country either. They have humongous oil wealth. Let them rebuild their own country. The only Iraqis who want us to stay there are the ones we are paying or who believe they can get money from us in the future.

Our first obligation should be to America citizens, and the lives of American soldiers should be precious to us. Let us bring our troops home before more and more of them are murdered. We can be friends with the Iraqi people without making our soldiers sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, let us leave Iraq to the Iraqis.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO TOMAS SOTELO, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay a posthumous tribute to Tomas Sotelo, Jr.,

one of the fallen sons of the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas, whose funeral today was commemorated and celebrated by his family and friends and by the city and by those who loved him.

Tomas Sotelo, Jr., Army corporal, lost his life in Iraq on June 27, 2003, fighting for the values and virtues of this Nation. This young man, barely 21 years old, lost his life in battle. Today was his funeral at his beloved Reagan High School, and I had the honor of saluting him at that service.

But more than that, I think it is appropriate to come today to raise up this young man for he was well admired and respected. In getting to know his family during this very troubling and trying time, I can say they love this country; and this family gave the ultimate sacrifice, their loving baby son.

Corporal Sotelo is immediately survived by Mr. and Mrs. Tomas Sotelo, Sr.; his brother, Jose; and his sisters, First Lieutenant Flor Lopez and Erica. Sitting in their living room, I got to know the family and heard them talk about the love and friendship and fellowship that this family engaged in. I heard the mother tell me that she had spoken to her son just 3 days before his death, that he always told them that he missed them and he loved them. He was never far from their hearts and minds.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we be reminded as we stand in this body that we have an obligation to those young men and women who now are in Baghdad. We have an obligation to them to be reminded of their willingness without question to give the ultimate sacrifice, and we owe them not only the tribute and salute on the day of their death and funeral, we owe them a tribute as we conduct ourselves in determining the future that holds for this country and for Iraq.

I am told by Tomas' friends that he was a person of great humor, always lively and always engaging in some activity to make people smile or laugh. He loved Reagan High School, and graduated in the year 2000. He was a member of the ROTC. Let me say how proud I was to be able to have worked with the family to hold his funeral ceremonies at Reagan High School. I thank the Houston Independent School District for their courtesies in making every arrangement for that to be possible today.

□ 2000

Let me acknowledge his grandparents, who traveled more than 24 hours by bus from Mexico to be with his family. And let me acknowledge the fact that though this family may not have had its original origins in this Nation, they stand equal to any of us by having given the ultimate sacrifice, the loss of their young and their most beloved son.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with great humbleness, great sorrow that I ex-

press on behalf of the United States Congress our deepest sympathy, for on this day there are conflicting emotions, the emotions of having lost its fallen son and hero, a recipient of the Purple Heart and Bronze Medal for his heroic achievements, and, of course, the ultimate sacrifice. And yet I stand here representing the fact that this young man, this Army corporal, Tomas Sotelo, Jr., was a hero of the 18th Congressional District of the State of Texas and, yes, the Nation. And might I say as he was a member of the Howitzer Battery, Squadron 2, Armored Cavalry Regiment from Fort Polk, Louisiana, that as he lays with the angels, we will not forget him, and we will simply thank him and bid farewell to this young man, dying in the prime of his life, being reminded that we will never forget him and that we will continue to thank his family for the ultimate sacrifice that they made.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, in closing that he remains a true American hero, and we will tell his story over and over again so the young people of his high school will know that a hero walked this way.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Army Corporal Tomas Sotelo, Jr., a hero to the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas and to the people of the United States of America.

Corporal Sotelo died last week while valiantly serving his country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Corporal Sotelo served his country as a member of the Howitzer Battery, 2nd Squadron, 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment, from Fort Polk, LA. Corporal Sotelo is also a cherished resident of Houston, TX.

Since his days as a youth in Houston, Corporal Sotelo has been dedicated to serving Americans as a member of our uniformed services. He was a member of the Reserve Officers Training Corps at Reagan High School in Houston, TX, where he received his high school degree. Dedicated service runs deep in the Sotelo family. Corporal Sotelo's sister is a First Lieutenant in the Armed Services as well.

As with every brave member of our military who has died in service to our country, the United States of America owes Corporal Sotelo an immeasurable debt of gratitude. His willingness to put himself at risk to create a world of peace will never be forgotten. He made the ultimate sacrifice by giving his life in service to our Nation during Operation Iraqi Freedom, and he has contributed immeasurably to the freedom and security of both Iraq and the world.

Corporal Sotelo epitomizes the best of the United States of America—bravery, selfless service, dedication, and honor. Corporal Sotelo possessed all of these attributes, and many more, in abundance. Corporal Sotelo's life and sacrifice should be celebrated by all Americans, and his contribution to this country should be remembered always. He will truly be missed.

To the family of Corporal Sotelo, I extend my deepest condolences and sorrow at the loss of their loved one. The memory of his bright life will remain an inspiration to all of us.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I ask every Member of Congress, and every American to join me in

paying tribute to the life and courage of Army Corporal Tomas Sotelo, Jr.—a true American hero.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KOLBE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SOCIAL SECURITY'S COMING CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Social Security's coming crisis. The actuaries and trustees of the Social Security Administration have long understood, at least for the last 15 years, the challenges facing our Social Security program. With the impending retirement of the large baby-boom generation starting around 2012, there will be a shift in the proportion of workers paying into Social Security compared to those retirees drawing benefits. As a result, there will not be enough money as benefits going out will exceed taxes coming in by about 2015.

Recently I met with White House staff and political director Karl Rove to encourage Presidential leadership and Republicans and Democrats in Congress to deal with the coming crisis. It is easy to put off. There is even a greater need to face up to the Social Security problem now with the probability of more money being spent for a very expensive prescription drug benefit that probably is going to be added to Medicare.

Let me talk about what is happening to the population 65 years old and older. It is going to increase from currently 37 million today to 75 million in 2035 and to 95 million by 2075, so a huge increase in the number of retirees while the birth rate is going down, so fewer workers to pay their in taxes to cover those benefits. This population will grow much faster than the workers due to increased life expectancy for seniors and lower birth rates. Because Social Security is a pay-as-you-go system, with workers' payroll taxes going immediately to pay benefits to seniors, these demographic changes are going to lead to the program's insolvency in a little over 10 years unless something is done.

The options for Social Security are straightforward, I think. We can increase payroll taxes, which are already

too high. Seventy-five percent of American workers now pay more in the payroll taxes than they do the income taxes. We can cut benefits, or, instead of using all the extra money coming in now from Social Security taxes for other government spending, get a real rate of return on payroll taxes we already collect.

It is obvious, to me at least, that the last option is best, but it cannot work unless we give money time to grow with interest. If we wait another decade to act, there will be no choice but to take drastic action.

I have introduced my own reform proposals in each of my last five terms in Congress. They have been based on slowing down the increase in benefits for high-income retirees and having a real rate of return on some of that extra money coming in. I am working on the final aspects of this year's bill, which I plan to introduce in the next 2 weeks, and as I finalize provisions to make the system more fair for women in this bill.

One thing I have learned over the last decade is that time is running out for reasonable solutions. As I have introduced each new bill in each new session of Congress, the way to solve the problem has been more drastic as we have been giving up the extra funds coming into Social Security that are dwindling, that are running out. It is this situation that gives me such a sense of urgency to act so we can avoid burdening our children and grandchildren with more debt, more taxes, and a failing Social Security system.

Many people are concerned that a Social Security system with worker-owned accounts is unsafe because people might invest poorly or lose their savings. I have studied the problem as chairman of the bipartisan Social Security Task Force and think that investments can be limited and protected as they have been in other countries such as Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Chile. My bill requires the government to start paying back what has been borrowed from the trust fund, and that current payroll taxes go someplace safe, earn interest and end up keeping Social Security solvent.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, government officials here in Washington need to act on Social Security, but they are too often focused on the next election to deal with problems that are still a decade away. The truth is that Social Security is headed for a cliff, and if we begin to turn and slow down now, we can avoid it smoothly. If not, a panicky swerve and screeching brake is coming. Let us avoid that. Let us stand up to our responsibility and deal with Social Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, we are members of the Congressional Black Caucus here tonight, and we stand here tonight to speak on the state of Africa as the first day of President Bush's trip concludes. The President's trip shows a level of commitment that surprised many of us when we read in the newspaper that he was intending to visit Africa, but African journalists recently said Africa appreciates the words, but is awaiting the deeds.

Many people have written Africa off as a place that has too many grave problems, and that it is irrelevant to the United States' interest. Indeed, there are still a lot of people whose views of Africa are certainly limited by disasters and civil wars. However, engagement with Africa is a vital U.S. interest. From the war on terrorism to the supply of critical resources, from the campaign against threatening diseases to the opportunities for economic trade and investment, Africa is a global player. We ignore the continent at our own peril.

If we had paid a little more attention to Africa and Sudan, where Osama bin Laden lived from 1993 to 1997, recruiting and planning the al Qaeda movements that terrorized our U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania and then went on to organize the Taliban and to have havoc wreaked through Afghanistan, if we had paid attention to Africa, if we had looked at some of the requests for us to intervene in some way by assisting John Garang and the Sudanese Liberation Movement with trucks and telephone equipment and other things they were appealing to, perhaps Osama bin Laden would have been put out of existence, because the liberation movement from John Garang and his organization could have defeated the Khartoum government which gave haven to Hamas and to al Qaeda and many of the other terrorists. By our ignoring Sudan, where 2 million persons have died and 4 million have been displaced, where food has been used as a weapon, if we had decided that that was an important country for us, then we perhaps could have avoided many of the things that we see today as our soldiers are in harm's way in Iraq and we continue to move through Afghanistan and Africa towns.

I will talk briefly between our speakers, but I do want to quickly bring focus to our main concern, my main concern tonight, and that is the situation in Liberia. On July 2, I wrote a letter to our Secretary of State and a week before that had the opportunity to be in his presence and asked the Secretary of State if attention could be given by the Bush administration to the country of Liberia. First of all, the Liberians have been asking us to come

in and assist. People are in the streets with American flags and signs asking President Bush and Secretary of State Colin Powell to come to their aid, and people are saying, why should we be concerned about Liberia? There are 50 sub-Saharan African countries on the continent. Why should we be concerned?

I think many of our citizens in this country and it appears many of our lawmakers in the House and in the Senate have no knowledge at all of where Liberia's beginning came from. It was in 1822 that President Monroe, the Monroe document, President Monroe said that we should have a return to Africa movement and free black men. Many people have the opinion that these were simply illiterate slaves, ex-slaves that went to Liberia, but these were free men, some slaves, but free men, lawyers and businessmen, who went to Liberia to start that country in 1822. And in 1847, Liberia became a republic, started by African Americans who returned to Africa, to Liberia, to start this republic.

Their Constitution was based after the United States Constitution. Their laws were based on laws of the United States of America. There were very strong ties between the United States and Liberia. In World War II, the West African country allowed American troops to be positioned on their soil. Again during the Cold War Liberia was an important ally when it served as a leading U.S. base for intelligence activity against Moammar Ghaddafi of Libya and other threats to the United States. Even Samuel Doe, even though he came to power in a bloody coup, the United States in the midst of the Cold War supported the government because Liberia served such a great interest to the United States during World War II when the Pacific region was cut off for rubber supplies. Liberia with Goodyear Rubber Company that had been established in Liberia for decades, for perhaps close to a century, Liberia was there to help the U.S. war effort.

So when people say why should we go there, there are many problems around. We should go there, and the reason that the British have asked us to intervene, the reason that President Kofi Annan of the United Nations have said the United States should lead a peacekeeping force, these are because Liberians, the world, look at the United States as the power that could come in and change the situation.

□ 2015

So I wanted to give that brief background of the country of Liberia and to say that is why this particular country is different, if we want to remove ourselves from other countries in Africa.

As I conclude my portion and will yield to the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I would like to say that in Sierra Leone currently the British went in. They went in and they prevented the RUF, the terrible group that terrorized people in Sierra Leone,

the British went in, because that was a former colony of theirs, and they made peace; and now Sierra Leone is on a peaceful track.

In Cote d'Ivoire, the French troops went in several months ago because of disorder there, and they have saved thousands of lives and are still there.

Just last week, the French, British and Belgian troops went into Eastern Congo, the city of Bunia, where there had been a civil strife between two ethnic groups. The French came in and said that this must stop, we are coming in; we give you 3 days to get out. And they have saved thousands of lives just last week.

So why the United States? Why Liberia? We are in Iraq right now and are receiving a terrible time. It is because we are being asked. President Taylor said he will step down, he will leave the country. We could really save lives there. It is a totally different situation.

With that, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield to the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who has done an outstanding job in his chairmanship of the Congressional Black Caucus, bringing us to the floor on every important issue to America in general and African Americans in particular.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to also thank the gentleman for his leadership. It is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is by far the most expert in the Congress on Africa and international affairs. His expertise certainly extends to Europe, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, just to name a few places around the world. His expertise is invaluable; and he is a very, very valuable asset to both the Congressional Black Caucus and this Congress.

I have often said of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that so often people, Mr. Speaker, determine their response to a crisis by whether they will be uncomfortable. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) consistently travels around the globe, not concerned about his comfort, but more concerned about the comfort of those he touches. So I want to thank the gentleman for leading our discussion this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor this evening to discuss the state of Africa. Africa deserves and America needs a real strategic alliance with the continent of Africa. It is in the national security of the United States for us to have a strategic alliance with this great continent.

Just some brief facts: Africa is the second largest continent in the world, behind Asia. There are 54 countries in Africa. The population of the continent exceeds 770 million people.

Mr. Speaker, the economic potential and the natural beauty of the continent is extraordinary. Just this past

May, Mr. Speaker, several members of the Congressional Black Caucus visited the nation of Nigeria on the West Coast of Africa. These distinguished members included the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK). Although we mainly went there to attend the presidential inauguration of the Nigerian President, Obasanjo, we gained some valuable insights from our visit.

The people of Nigeria admire the people of the United States for how our democracy works. They also admire our form of government. As such, they expressed shock regarding the controversies surrounding the 2000 Presidential elections. They also noted their disappointment regarding the gradual decline in civil liberty protections post-9/11. In this regard, many of these citizens and government officials pleaded with us to defend the true meaning of our democracy because, as they put it, the best way to impact the world is through what America stands for, not by using our unilateral force as the world's only superpower.

But this feeling is not just present in Nigeria. The many countries of Africa, 54 in all, their governments and the people of Africa are looking to the United States for leadership and a real partnership. They do not just want rhetoric.

Contrary to what many people believe, the people of Africa do not want aid or a handout. What they want is opportunity for a level playing field from the United States, Europe, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as they pursue economic progress.

For many countries, the overwhelming financial debt from loans that were in some cases misused by governments in Africa is now stifling the economic progress of these countries. The payments on these debts are also diverting significant funds away from infrastructure improvements, education and other health needs for the people of Africa.

Through all of this, though, Mr. Speaker, the people of Africa are cautiously hopeful about the future. The African Growth and Opportunity Act, AGOA, legislation that was signed into law by President Clinton, embodies the philosophy that the United States, as the world's largest and most technologically advanced economy, can and should do more to contribute to Africa's economic development. It is one of the most significant pieces of legislation on Africa to be enacted into law in many years. Now the continued implementation and expansion of AGOA offers our country an opportunity to consider how this Nation can construct a comprehensive African policy that will facilitate Africa's success in the 21st century.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I must mention the issues of conflict resolution, hunger and disease in Africa. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, the violence and civil war that has torn so many countries apart, displaced hundreds of thousands of families, killed countless others, and, in my opinion, is one of the biggest impediments to progress on the continent, must end. The people and governments of Africa need to know that it is difficult to make progress if we do not have an end to war and an end to violence.

The United States also has a role and our government and State Department should put forward every effort to help bring an end to the wars and conflicts that trouble so many African countries. The Congressional Black Caucus will also continue our efforts in this regard.

I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE); and I applaud him for all of his efforts over the last several years with regard to Liberia, and wholeheartedly support his opinion and his conclusions that we must have peacekeeping forces from the United States in Liberia.

With regard to hunger, the Congressional Black Caucus has been at the forefront of advocating for hunger relief efforts all around the world, and we will continue to press the issue. In a world with plenty of food for everyone, we have a moral obligation to feed those who are hungry. I am so honored that our former colleague, Congresswoman Clayton, has continued her battle against hunger around the world since leaving the Congress at the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization in Rome.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the medical diseases. HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis and countless other diseases that plague millions of Africans must be addressed. The Congress, following years of advocacy by the Congressional Black Caucus, passed what I would characterize as a 5-year, \$15 billion down payment toward addressing these diseases in Africa. Now we must actually come up with the actual funding to make this commitment a reality. The world is watching, and we must provide the resources to eradicate these diseases.

So, Mr. Speaker, I call on this Congress and this country to renew our commitment to working with the people of the great continent of Africa for our mutual benefit. As I have said, it is in our national security and our strategic interests for the continent of Africa to succeed and prosper in our global community.

I also take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to thank all the members of the Congressional Black Caucus who have taken time out tonight to express their feelings about Africa and for their hard work over and over and over again, giving their blood, sweat and tears to lift up the people of Africa.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Baltimore

for those remarks. As he has indicated, for example, in 2002, the United States exports to Africa totaled over \$5.8 billion, while the U.S. imported over \$18 billion from Africa, more than all of the USSR put together, including Russia. So many people do not realize the importance of Africa to the U.S.

While oil is clearly a source of U.S. interest, it is also something that must be dealt with closely and carefully as we discover new finds of oil. The Chaad Cameroon pipeline, in addition to Nigeria and other places in Africa, 16 percent of U.S. consumption of oil comes from Africa today; and it will grow to 20 percent in the next 5 years. It may exceed the point of being one-fourth, or 25 percent, of oil imports. So Africa is extremely important to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) who 2 weeks ago helped organize a rally of Liberian Americans here and has been very vocal on the issue of Liberia.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for his leadership on African issues and particularly on this Liberian issue; and let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who has been one of the leaders in the Congressional Black Caucus and Chair of our African subcommittee, for his leadership.

The Bush administration sent troops to Iraq, for, so they claim, so they claim, humanitarian reasons. Our troops went over there to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people, to liberate the Iraqi people from a tyrant, to bring justice to the people of that nation, so they claim.

At this very moment, leaders in the United Nations, leaders in various African nations, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, members of the human rights community worldwide, are pleading with the President to send peacekeeping troops to Liberia. Yet the President set off for Africa without any intentions of even visiting Liberia and without bothering to consult with members of the Congressional Black Caucus about his trip, many of whom have worked on issues pertaining to Africa for decades.

As you know, Liberia has always been a faithful ally of the United States. Both nations share close historic ties. Liberia in fact was founded by free slaves from the United States in 1820. The capital, Monrovia, is named after a United States President, James Monroe.

Unfortunately, the situation in Liberia has turned chaotic. Non-emergency staff at the United States embassy were evacuated when fighting broke out in the capital between government troops and rebels. Hundreds of Liberians have been killed and thousands have been wounded. The fighting is not over. Tens of thousands of others have been driven from their homes and aid

workers say that up to 1 million Liberians may end up displaced.

This recent conflict is nothing new. This is a country that has been suffering from civil war for years. About 200,000 Liberians died in fighting during 7 years of war in the 1990s. We have been successful in drawing attention, thanks to the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and others, both nationally and internationally.

The CBC has been strong in its efforts to encourage the Bush administration that the United States play an active role in the conflict in Liberia, especially before it spreads to other nations in West Africa. We do not want this fighting to spread to other West African countries.

Let me repeat that. Liberia is now making headlines in newspaper and TV news across the country, making people around the United States aware of the conflict and forcing the administration to put it on their radar screen. Recently the U.N. secretary asked the U.S. to play a bigger role. African countries and others have pledged up to 3,000 troops if the United States helps out.

On all borders of Liberia, the Europeans are showing that peacekeeping missions can be successful. Clearly, our Nation plays an influential role in world politics. We saw that many times in the past and recently in Europe. And, remember, the State Department, when they argued for intervention for a European country, they always say it is for humanitarian reasons.

□ 2030

We do not want it to spread to other countries. So why should Africa be given the same treatment? The situation in Liberia is critical, and this is a perfect time for the United States to play a leading role in bringing about an end to the misery and suffering of the Liberian people.

In closing, my favorite scripture is "To whom God has given much, much is expected." We are expecting that the administration will come forward and help the suffering Liberian people.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her continued support.

Democracy is moving through Africa. Mr. Speaker, 1990 saw the spread of democracy in many African countries once dominated by military dictators. As the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus indicated, many of us recently went on May 29 and spent several days in Nigeria to see the reelection and inauguration of President Obasanjo. It was Moshood Abiola that started the democracy movement, but it took General Abubakar to say, the time is up, and now we saw the election of President Obasanjo.

We saw in Zambia's recent elections where the former President and member of the same party as the new President was elected, who said he wanted the courts to look into the books to see whether the former President had run

the country legally, and has now had an indictment on the former President Chiluba to look at the books to see if there was illegal activities.

This is a new breed of African leaders. In Ghana, the popular President Rollins stepped down after two terms. He could have run again and probably gotten reelected. President Moya, after many years being the Vice President under General Uhuru Kenyatta during the first movement of the Mau Maus in Kenya where colonialism was fought, stepped down. And, as a matter of fact, the grandchild of former President Kenyatta was the candidate and supposedly was supposed to win as a member of the Kenya Party. However, he was defeated because people wanted a new life, and it went on well. In South Africa we saw Mr. Mandela change from a white majority government.

So there are successes in Africa. In Timbuktu in Mali we have seen great strides going on. So we hear about the negatives, but so many positive things are happening, and that is why it gives me great pleasure to continue our Special Order. We will hear now from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) to have his comments.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for the tremendous leadership that he continues to display as he projects thoughts, ideas, and helps to focus the activities of the caucus.

I would agree with the gentleman from New Jersey that Africa is indeed changing, and that change is seen throughout the continent in many places that one goes. But even as the changes occur, problems have been so profound and so severe until it is difficult to stabilize, it is difficult to have the kind of economy, it is difficult to have the opportunities to grow and develop, and that is one of the reasons why we continue to have instability, one of the reasons why we see the inability to shape governments and hold those firmly in place.

I would also agree with my colleagues who have suggested that if we can spend much of our time, energy, and effort trying to make sure that there is a world order with peace and security, then the African continent is one of those places where our resources and our efforts are needed most.

Yes, I am in agreement that we need to intervene in Liberia, and we need to do it immediately. We need to do it now. We need to make sure that there are peacekeeping forces. We also have to make sure that we do it with a level of sensitivity, that we do it with a level of humaneness, that we do it in such a way that we do not overshadow, overpower; and that we make sure that the local indigenous people have control of the operation and further development of their government, and that they continue to be liberated and be able to produce for themselves the kind

of government and the kind of governmental structures that they find desirable.

So, I say to the gentleman from New Jersey, I am pleased to have been able to join with him and other colleagues to come and simply say that the time is now. It is critical that intervention must come immediately before things escalate and before they reach other countries surrounding Liberia. So I thank the gentleman again for his tremendous effort and for his leadership.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois for his long years of government service in the great State of Illinois, and we look for his continued support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), a real fighter on HIV and AIDS, and a person who has served as an aide to the former Congressman Dellums and made her own footsteps; smaller feet, but very pronounced footsteps.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and commend him for his consistent leadership, his vision and his real purpose as a Member of Congress in terms of really making sure that this Congress understands the connection between our United States foreign and domestic policy, especially as it relates to Africa.

Mr. Speaker, as we have been discussing Africa this evening, I am reminded now of the first day that the President has had in Africa. Now, let me just say, I believe it is always helpful when the President of the United States really visits neglected parts of the world, especially Africa. So I am glad that he finally made it.

Now, one of his first stops on this trip today was Goree Island off the coast of Senegal. It is important, I believe, that the President saw firsthand this real jumping-off point to the murderous Middle Passage. For centuries, millions of Africans were placed in chains and shipped off to generations of enslavement in the United States and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, and I am certain the President understands that now. Many of them passed through Goree Island on that very terrible journey. Millions upon millions died along the way. Families were destroyed. Men, women, and children were locked in chains, forced into the cargo holds of ships, and transported thousands of miles to a life of slavery. They were kidnapped, raped, murdered, and sold into bondage in an enormous crime against humanity. The bodies of those who died were tossed overboard as lost cargo.

But these were human beings. On Goree Island, President Bush stood in their footsteps, peered into their cells, and glimpsed the horror that was slavery.

This morning the President denounced slavery as one of the greatest crimes of history and called it a sin, which it was, but he failed to offer an apology on behalf of the Government of

the United States that engaged in this deplorable, despicable institution for hundreds of years.

It is extremely important that the President understand the history of slavery. It is also extremely important because the vestiges of slavery are still with us in the United States. On Goree Island, President Bush stated that history moves in the direction of justice. But then I had to ask myself, why does he oppose affirmative action?

So let us just look at the facts for a minute. African Americans' income is lower than that of whites. Black Americans have fewer assets and experience far higher unemployment. Economic injustices have persisted long after emancipation. African Americans, on average, make 95 cents for every dollar earned by whites doing exactly the same jobs.

These disparities in the workplace and on the unemployment line are echoed in the health care system. African Americans are less likely to have health insurance and receive poor health care when they do finally see doctors. As a result, of course, our lives are shorter.

In this country, life expectancy projections are profoundly shaped by race. Racial disparities literally follow a cradle-to-grave cycle, beginning with infant mortality, continuing with workplace hazards and increased exposure to toxins, and ending with disparate access to health care, diagnosis, and medical treatment.

Asthma, one of our latest epidemics, is one more example of racial disparities in health care. Death rates from asthma and a host of other treatable diseases are significantly higher among African Americans than any other ethnic group. African American children are also more likely to suffer from lead poisoning, which can have devastating effects on mental development. More than one out of every four low-income African American children suffers from lead poisoning.

Now, some of these realities are realities that I hope the President really understands while he is in Africa. These are still realities of American life in the 21st century, and these are legacies of past oppression and continuing injustice.

In presenting the Bush administration's arguments to the Supreme Court opposing affirmative action on behalf of the President, Solicitor General Ted Olson called for race-neutral admissions policies. That is because the administration apparently believes we live in a race-neutral society, but that is a dangerous fantasy. It means that the administration is blind to the legacy of slavery in our own country and does not really get what the current ramifications are.

So maybe this visit to Goree Island will help the President better understand the legacies of slavery and racism, both in Africa and here at home. It is my hope that this African trip, short though it may be, will also drive

home to the President the importance of following through on his welcomed rhetoric with real dollars. We need him to exert the power of his office to ensure that the HIV/AIDS initiative, the Millennium Challenge Account, and other promises for foreign assistance and development aid will be fully funded. He must support our request for a supplemental appropriation to meet the meager, which is really meager, \$3 billion authorization with regard to the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

Goree Island was the start of a terrible journey for our African ancestors. Hopefully, it will be the start of a journey of enlightenment for this American President.

There is an Akan word called "Sankofa." This means that we must go back and reclaim our past so, of course, that we can move forward, so we can understand why and how we came to be who we are today. When African men, women, and children were dragged into the Slave House at Goree Island where the President was today, they went through the door of no return. As the word "Sankofa" evokes, we have to understand that journey.

This President must understand that journey, and he has to understand what destination we have reached in the United States and in Africa, and how far we still have to go.

I close by thanking all of the Congressional Black Caucus members who have come before all of us in this Congress, who help strengthen the bond between Africans and African Americans, who represented the voice of Africans who were left out of the democratic process here in our own country in terms of foreign policymaking. Especially I would just like to thank the great gentleman from the State of Michigan, Congressman Charles Diggs, who not only chaired the Subcommittee on Africa as the first African American Member, but really did provide an opportunity and an avenue for other African American staff and Members to get involved with international relations issues, especially relating to the continent of Africa.

I also want to thank Congressman Ron Dellums and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who took risks and fought against racist regimes in South Africa and Namibia and Zimbabwe, even when our own government supported those policies. We must not forget that, because the Congressional Black Caucus has to move forward, and the President must understand that we will not rest until Africa flourishes, and those who came before us really charted the course. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, if it had not been for them, there would be no foreign policy as it relates to Africa.

So I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) again for continuing with that legacy and for continuing to ensure that our Black Caucus and the entire Congress understands and really begins to come to grips with the fact that Africa matters

in terms of our policies and our funding.

□ 2045

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the gentlewoman for the outstanding work she has done.

Quickly, as I talked about how democracy was taking over, we also have seen Africans step up to the plate, the Egat process led by President Moi has dealt with the problem of Sudan; and the peace accord, even though fragile, has been done by the Egat countries of Ethiopia and Eritrea. South Africa's Nelson Mandela took over from the late President of Niari, from Tanzania, negotiating the Burundi situation where now President Thabo Mbeki has sent peacekeepers from his country to Burundi to see the new transitional government, and it is working.

We have seen Nigerians go into Sierra Leone and into Liberia, taking leadership on their own. And so when we say why is the U.S. in Liberia, it is because of the ties, as I mentioned, the British were in Sierra Leone just recently to save lives, the French in Cote d'Ivoire and in the Congo right now with Belgian troops. The Australians are going into the Somalian islands right now, as we speak, and we are in East Timor because they are the regional powers. No, we cannot go anywhere and everywhere; but I think that with the traditional history between President Monroe, the whole country of Liberia, it is the responsibility of the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who has done outstanding work for many years. We all know her. She needs no introduction.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for his leadership, for his years of commitment to the continent and for the constant effort that he puts forward in this Congress to draw attention to Africa and to try and negotiate funding to help not only this administration but past administrations understand the role we could truly play in helping Africa to become the continent that it could truly become.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are on Africa. Clearly everyone is watching because the President of the United States is visiting five countries in Africa. We are pleased that the President of the United States has decided to go to Africa. As a matter of fact, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus truly believe that there will never be another President, no matter Democrat or Republican, who can avoid Africa. We are very pleased about the leadership that Bill Clinton provided, and we are proud that this President is following in his footsteps.

We are in a state of confusion about this President and his policies toward Africa. While he is visiting five countries in Africa at this time, it was just a short while ago right prior to his

election in a debate that I believe he said something to the effect that we have no strategic interest in Africa and, no, I would not have intervened in the genocide that took place up in the Congo there with the Tutsis and the Hutus. And so we are perplexed by this visit, that comment; but we are pleased also that we have moved this government to the point where this President came forward with significant funding for HIV and AIDS in Africa, and we hope that it gets into the budget and that that funding will become a reality.

We are perplexed by the recent revelations that, in fact, the President made an announcement in his State of the Union that a country in Africa had supplied Saddam Hussein with materials for biological warfare. We now know that that is not true, that that statement was not based in fact. And while we are pleased that the President is providing some funding for HIV and AIDS in Africa, we are perplexed by the statements and the accusation of the President about a country in Africa supplying Saddam Hussein with dangerous materials, materials for biological warfare, and we expect the President to explain that to us.

The President is visiting South Africa, but the fact of the matter is we do not have, as one of the countries in Africa, we do not have an Africa policy. We do not know where the President is going with all of this. Today he gave a stirring speech from Goree. He went to Dakar, to Goree Island where he said he understood what had happened at Goree Island. He understood that slaves had been sold there, that they had been beaten there. They had been housed and stored and stacked like animals there, and that they had gone through the door of no return where many of them were simply just dumped into the ocean because they were sick or too weak to be sold into slavery from that point.

We listened and most of us read very carefully the words in that speech. But we are wondering as we stand here whether the President truly understands that we are the descendants of those slaves that he talked about. We wonder if the President really understands the connection between our work and our history. We wonder if the President of the United States truly has an appreciation for what we have been trying to do for so many years.

Most of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have been working on the problems of Africa for years. Long before I came to the Congress of the United States, I was involved, as were others, in trying to dismantle the unconscionable apartheid regime of South Africa. We worked to free Nelson Mandela. There are those who are wondering why Nelson Mandela may not be meeting with the President on this trip. The President certainly needs to get to know Nelson Mandela and understand who he is and where he came from. He needs to understand the

struggle that Nelson Mandela was involved in. But he needs to understand why we work so hard to dismantle apartheid in South Africa. He needs to understand why we urge this country not to support Mobutu, not to have a puppet up in the Congo that would dance to the music of the United States and kill his own people.

We tried to get the Presidents in the past to understand why we were opposed to Savimbi that was supported by Reagan and others who were up in the bush causing displacement in Angola. We tried to get them to understand. We visited these places. We have been to Dakar. We have been to Benin. We have been to Botswana. We have been in Zimbabwe and Angola and the Democratic Republic of Congo and Rwanda and many countries in Africa. We understand.

The President of the United States needs to talk to the members of the Congressional Black Caucus. We are pleased that he is now paying attention to Liberia, and we believe that Charles Taylor needs to be dealt with. We do not know if the President is dealing with him in the proper way. And the President does not know whether or not he is dealing with him in the proper way, but he ought to talk with us. Should he be working out an agreement with Obasanjo of Nigeria to give him asylum?

There is a warrant out for Charles Taylor's arrest. He is responsible for working with RUF and the chopping off of the limbs of the people of Sierra Leone and other places. He is responsible for children being soldiers in the war. He is responsible for the rape and the pillage of many people. Should he not have to stand before the bar of justice in the U.N.-supported and -backed court that has a warrant out? Should he be allowed to have asylum and just go off up into Nigeria somewhere with the billions of dollars that he has stolen, the wealth he has reaped from the blood diamonds that came out of Sierra Leone? The President of the United States needs to talk to the Congressional Black Caucus because we understand the complications, and we understand what has been taking place in many of these spots. We would like to engage him on the future of Liberia and what should happen with Charles Taylor. We would like to help this President to build a real policy for the continent of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working on HIV/AIDS, and we are glad that the President has gotten involved in it and we will continue to do this work. We have got a long way to go.

I have been involved for years in working on debt relief for Africa. Africa needs assistance in many ways, but Africa is rich in resources and talent that needs to be developed by people who have Africa's best interest at heart.

Africa has been exploited, not only in many ways by our own government, by other governments and other countries. Everybody comes to Africa to get

a little bit of gold and a little bit of diamonds. Everybody comes for the rich resources of Africa without real thought and planning and work for the development of Africa and the utilization of those resources for the benefit of the people. We can do better.

If this President is not simply reading a speech written for him by others in a photo opportunity, talking about that which he may not really understand, if he really wants to understand what is going on, the President of the United States needs to talk to the members of the Black Caucus. It seems to me that if the President can go to five African countries and talk to Africans about what is going on in Africa, he ought to be able to talk about the descendants who are here in the United States, who are just a few blocks away from him that he refuses to meet with. Yes, some of us are concerned about why the President has not engaged us in any discussion.

I do not believe that the President would travel to Israel, would take actions on Israel without speaking with the Jewish Members of the Congress of the United States of America. We need to talk with the President not only about what he is doing in Liberia, but about the future of that continent and about the possibility, about the importance, yes, there is oil, and, yes, there should be the kind of trade relationships that would help us to benefit from some of those natural resources and oil so that we are not dependent just on one section of the world. But this will never happen unless we go to the continent with good intentions, not unless we are all engaged as a family working in the best interest of our country.

I am not happy about the fact that the President took this as an opportunity to say simply, Mr. Charles Taylor, I want you out of Liberia within so many hours. That is not the way to handle this. We do not want to simply see American soldiers deployed there. This should be an international effort. But there should be international peacekeeping efforts not only in Liberia but in Iraq and other places because we do have to be concerned about stretching ourselves too far and too thin. We do have to be concerned about protecting our soldiers wherever they are. We want to help. We want to help frame and shape how that help should be given.

With that, I know that there will be those who will say perhaps there should be no challenging of the President at this point, no criticism of the President at this point while he is traveling in Africa. If the President wants to talk about Africa, now is the time for us all to do it.

□ 2100

We have been working too long and too hard to get this debate on Africa. We have fought and worked. We have tried to leverage and do everything within our power to get Africa on this

President's agenda. Now perhaps we can do it, and we welcome the opportunity.

Mr. President, we are waiting for you.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from California. As I indicated, she needs no introduction. We appreciate her comments.

At this time we will hear from the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), who is, as we know, our health expert, a physician, and a leader on HIV and AIDS and other health issues around the Nation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I thank him as well for putting together this Special Order and for the leadership that he provides to the Caucus and the Congress on issues concerning Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something briefly about three different issues because of the tremendous and tragic toll they have taken on the people of the countries involved, because they are representative of the challenges facing Africa, and also because of the relative indifference of this country and the global community to addressing them.

The first is the 5-year civil war in the Republic of the Congo, Africa's third largest country and the native country of one of my closest friends and medical school classmates, Dr. Louis Kanda, who often shares the grave concerns he has over the ongoing conflict and his and the frustration of many others over the lack of attention it has received from this country despite repeated calls from members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

With many of its bordering countries involved in the conflict, it has become Africa's first continentwide war. Just today, The New York Times reported that an estimated 500 civilians have been killed in just one province in the northeastern region between July 2002 and March 2003. There is elsewhere children as young as 10 who have been robbed of their childhood and trained as guerilla fighters and terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I join the U.N. Deputy High Commissioner Bertie Rancharam in his call for a speedy investigation of the massive abuses and appropriate intervention in northeastern Congo, and I would add that this country should not only support such action, but be fully a part of it.

I also want to call attention to the longstanding drought, severe food shortages and suffering of the people of Ethiopia. The groups of caring people raising funds, many of whom are from Ethiopia, can only go so far. Despite donations of wheat and other food products from this country and others, Ethiopia still needs much more food. There is no telling when the drought will end, and so the urgency to act and act appropriately to that need is now.

I would be remiss if I did not also support the words and works of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia (Ms. LEE), on HIV/AIDS and the other illnesses plaguing the continent and our need to be, at the very least, appropriating the full \$15 billion and all related funding now, and then to release those funds without condition. To wait here, as in the case of widespread starvation, is to wait until it is too late in the process, and that would mean millions more lives being lost, and the cost to bring this global pandemic under control would multiply.

Lastly, I want to say a word about Liberia, as we in the U.S. Virgin Islands have specific ties to that country, in addition to those shared by African Americans here on the mainland, and all Americans. One of our most esteemed native sons, Edward Wilmot Blyden, born in St. Thomas, became an important Liberian educator and statesman, having served as Secretary of State and Ambassador to Britain and France from that country in the 1880s. He also became president of Liberia College. And there were others, such as Dr. John Moorhead, another of our local treasures, who lived there with his family and practiced medicine during the 1950s.

So I want to join my colleagues on calling on President Bush to work with President Obasanjo while he is in Nigeria to work towards a satisfactory agreement for the departure of President Taylor and peace and recovery for this war-battered and torn country that we helped to establish.

What I would want to leave my colleagues with this evening, though, Mr. Speaker, is a picture of a continent that is rich not only in natural resources, but also in people and in culture and in spirit. On this continent, despite the great and many challenges, democracy is growing, and the standard of life and level of civil liberties are being raised. Africa needs our support, either alone or within the context of multinational groupings, whatever the case might require.

It is my hope and prayer that not out of interest and what we can get from Africa, but in the interest of seeing those on that continent who are brothers and sisters to all of us prosper and develop in ways that are in their best interests, and that this country would continue to increase involvement begun during the Clinton administration and not just mimic a Presidential visit.

Mr. PAYNE. As we conclude, Mr. Speaker, I do want to acknowledge that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) will be allowed to speak for 5 minutes on this Special Order, and we certainly appreciate the participation of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

We hope our message is getting out loud and clear. We think that Liberia has a special place in this country with African Americans who feel very close to this situation. Our young men have fought in every war, from Crispus Attucks, the first person that died in the Revolutionary War, up to just a

week ago, when they buried a young Haitian soldier from my district who was one of the two men who were kidnapped and murdered. So we have fought in all the wars.

We hear people say that there should be a vote in Congress regarding sending 2,000 troops to Liberia. We have not heard that for the Colombians or for Panama. We did not hear that where the President is attempting to go into the Philippines now. Is there a different standard for Africa? Is it that 435 Members must get up and talk about 2,000 troops going into a country that we founded, that we colonized, that we have close ties with, that asked us to come so that the fighting will cease, and that other African countries will be there at our side? Is there a double standard? I hope not.

We have had failures before. There was a failure in Somalia. That did not mean we should no longer then go in on humanitarian issues. I hope this President and administration will have the same standard as we have had throughout this world, whether it was in Panama, whether it was in Colombia, whether it was in the Philippines, whether it is in places like even Haiti, where we went and were not asked to come. I hope that we will send those few peacekeepers, 2,000, to go in and lead the ECOWAS troops so that the cholera can stop, the children can stop dying, and the women can stop dying. They are asking us to come in. I think we have an obligation and a responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to present this Special Order to the House.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 438, TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-189) on the resolution (H. Res. 309) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 438), to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for teachers in mathematics, science, and special education, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2211, READY TO TEACH ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-190) on the resolution (H. Res. 310) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2211) to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON H.R. 2657, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-191) on the bill (H.R. 2657) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON H.R. 2660, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-192) on the bill (H.R. 2660) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

COLOMBIA AND THE ANDEAN INITIATIVE ON NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

THE STATE OF AFRICA

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for his kindness, because I am joining the Congressional Black Caucus in their Special Order regarding the State of Africa.

It is this time, Mr. Speaker, that many of us have come to the floor of the House to discuss foreign policy issues that have great concern to us, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for his leadership over the years as the chairman and

ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa on the Committee on International Relations, and for his leadership and consciousness about the continent of Africa. Likewise, let me thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for his wisdom in having us be pointed this evening, pointedly speaking about these very vital issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on this floor tonight to speak globally about what the continent represents to the United States of America. Besides the historical perspective of Africa's desire to be an ally and a friend with the United States over the years, throughout the 20th century, from World War I to World War II, it should be known that after 9/11, as many of us were quite aware of, some of the loudest voices in opposition to the horrific incidents that occurred in New York on 9/11, in Washington, and in Pennsylvania was the continent of Africa. Their voices were those of support of the United States in our fight in the war against terrorism. So this bond with Africa and the United States is deep, it is strong, and it needs to be further cultivated.

Clearly, President Clinton established one of the strongest bonds in his long and extended visit just about 4 years ago. It was a visit to not only develop friendships, but to develop economic partnerships in the fight against HIV/AIDS. So I rise today to say that this momentum has not been carried forward, and it disturbs me that we are now debating why a friendship with Africa; why the intrusion, if you will, or the assistance in the issue of Liberia. Why? Because there are 700 million individuals, and that number is growing, who desire a strong and related friendship.

I am very impressed with the Global Business Council, headed by Ambassador Holbrooke, that brought together businesses from the private sector to fight the devastation of HIV/AIDS. I think it is important for Americans to be aware of the fact that so goes the continent of Africa, so goes many of the issues here in the United States. Of the 42 million people infected worldwide, over half, 29 million of them, live in sub-Saharan Africa. Also a higher proportion of women are living with HIV infections or suffering from AIDS than men in Africa. As of 2002, women in sub-Saharan Africa represent more than half, approximately 58 percent, of all adults living with HIV/AIDS.

We can applaud the work that has been done here in this country, as I said, with the Global Business Council; also with the work in this Congress, where we passed legislation in a bipartisan manner to give \$15 billion in aid, as well supporting the Millennium Fund to help in our fight against HIV/AIDS and to help in Africa. But it cannot be continued if we do not embrace the momentum and embrace it in a collaborative way. The President needs to

consult with the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and the African American community and others on policies dealing with Africa.

It is sad that on this trip we have not found an opportunity to collaborate and not recognize the voices being raised in the media proclaiming that Africa is a strategic partner. So I rise today to be able to reinforce the fact that we are stakeholders in the continent of Africa. One of the largest oil-producing nations is Nigeria, and just a week ago I hosted the chairman of OPEC, the distinguished chairman from Qatar, who responded that Nigeria and Africa is a very vital partner, just as Iraq is an important partner, as relates to oil production in the world.

There was no hesitancy, no question of whether there should be a vote as related to going into Iraq. And now, not recognizing or maybe failing to recognize the strategic relationship we should have with the continent, and particularly Liberia, there seems to be some debate. I happened to have been one who opposed the war in Iraq, and I can distinguish this. I would hope these troops would be peacekeeping. I would hope they would be a collaboration with the United Nations. I would hope they would be a collaboration with African troops. And I would hope we would recognize that Liberia has asked for us to come.

So I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the state of Africa that we discuss and say that Africa has had many successes; that we have seen the growth in Nigeria. We understand their stock exchange gives a 30 percent recovery on investments. We have heard from the President of Botswana just a few weeks ago speak about democratization and stability, and that country has been a stable government for more than 25 years.

We realize we have work to do, and that means to help them fight in the war against terrorism, help them fight in the war against HIV/AIDS, and help them fight, as our distinguished colleague in Rome, Eva Clayton, has said, help them fight with the issues of food and nutrition. And, yes, we must help Africa build its growth and its opportunities for jobs and give resources for the young people who want to be educated.

There is much that we can do as partners with Africa. Let us not stand a distance back while many are slaughtered and ask the question, why Africa? I would hesitate to say, Mr. Speaker, that it should not be a question of race, whether or not Africa happens to be a continent that is filled with Africans, people of color, black people. I hope that is not the dividing line that gives us reason to question when we ran without being invited to Iraq.

So I hope that as we look at this, and I thank the distinguished gentleman once again as I close, let me just simply say the state of Africa is good, it is a partner, it is a friend. And I would only hope that we look at Africa in our

fight on the war against terrorism, in our fight, of course, for the opportunities to fight against HIV/AIDS, and, yes, to fight for peace and stability, and, of course, Mr. Speaker, to be able to say that Africa is our friend because it has stood with us. It is now time for us to stand with Africa and as well to stand with it as it fights for peace and stability for its people.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ELIJAH CUMMINGS, Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for calling this special order to discuss the very important issues that are facing Africa. The most perilous of those issues is the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The HIV/AIDS pandemic has claimed more than 28 million lives in Africa. Current estimates suggest that 42 million are living with HIV in Africa.

Sadly, as a region, Sub-Saharan Africa has the largest number of individuals living with HIV/AIDS in the world. Of the 42 million people infected worldwide, over half 29 million of them live in Sub-Saharan Africa. Also, higher proportions of women are living with HIV infection or suffering from AIDS than men. As of 2002, women in Sub-Saharan Africa represented more than half, approximately 58% of all adults living with HIV/AIDS. The infection rate is particularly high among young girls.

In some African nations, infection rates are five times higher in young women than young men. What is more, AIDS now ranks as the number one cause of death in Africa and the fourth leading cause of death globally. These numbers are staggering and should strike a nerve in you each time you hear them. You have likely heard these figures before. However, these facts should constantly be reiterated in order to emphasize the dire situation that Africa is in today.

We must recognize that AIDS is not only a threat to the health of populations; it is a threat to the social, economic, and political stability of nations as a whole. In the past, what we had failed to do, particularly in Africa, was to chart a plan of action to address HIV/AIDS as a social crisis that affects all spheres of everyday life. Now we have allocated funds to provide for the prevention of the disease in Africa. Now is the time for a targeted response that aims to address the multiplicative effects of HIV/AIDS in each sector. This includes making sure that young girls have access to educational opportunities and trying to develop methods by which women do not have to rely on their husbands for their economic stability. It is time to stop placing old bandages on fresh wounds and to begin the process of healing our beloved Africa.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN LIBERIA

Mr. Speaker, another great challenge facing the continent of Africa is armed conflict. Clearly, many countries have the need for effective conflict resolution. Liberia is one of the countries. It is on the front page of our paper and it should be at the front of our minds.

Liberia was founded during the nineteenth century by freed American slaves. Once a nation founded on the premises of freedom and opportunity, the Liberia of today is wrought with political upheaval and social unrest. Liberia has been the site of intense devastation and profound loss due to years of civil war. The latest war has lasted for approximately three years and has caused immense disrupt-

tion to the social and political fabric of the region.

The health infrastructure in Liberia has crumbled, schools have become refugee camps, and people have taken the law into their own hands. Nearly half of the Liberian population has been forced to flee to neighboring countries or to internationally assisted refugee camps in Liberia. Large numbers of innocent, young children are being made into child soldiers. Those children that are able to escape the life of forced military service are often left with little to no options aside from living on the streets. This conflict has brought about political destabilization on a mass scale, increased economic disparity, and what can only be described as societal chaos. And although a cease fire was recently agreed upon, fighting and civil disobedience within the country has yet to subside.

The United States has had a long historical relationship with Liberia dating back to its original founding. Liberia has served as an important ally for the U.S. particularly during the Cold War era. It is in recognition of this longstanding relationship that the U.S. should serve as a vigilant presence in the efforts to bring calm and civility to this war ravaged country.

The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) should work diligently to ensure that the basic human rights of those seeking refuge from the war in Liberia are preserved at all costs. A consistent supply of humanitarian aid in the form of shelter, food, water, and medical care should be supplied to the region as well. We must do all we can to ensure that peace and stability return to Liberia.

TRADE AND ECONOMIC INVESTMENT

On the matter of economic development, Africa is a continent rich with some of the most sought after natural resources in the world. Yet, this region has not been able to use its natural resources for activities that will stimulate growth in domestic economies and generate increases in national profit. Mr. Speaker, to create a stable Africa we need to promote the competitiveness of African goods and services. We need to create avenues by which these products can become profitable in the global market economy.

Mechanisms need to be established to promote increased working partnerships between U.S. and African businesses and organizations. Ideally, these initiatives should be directly targeted through existing trade and investment programs like the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) but other possibilities also exist. Established in 2000, AGOA offers tangible incentives for African nations to continue their efforts to open their economies and create free markets. If we hope to encourage our partners in Africa to strive for economic strength, then we need to ensure that they receive the training necessary to comply with the rules and regulations of both AGOA and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Finally, in regions where conflict and civil war have decimated local economies, efforts should be made to provide the necessary technical assistance to help troubled African states, like Liberia and Sudan, transition out of conflict by fostering feasible economic activities that may ultimately lead to effective resolutions.

□ 2115

COLOMBIA

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, tonight's Special Order is going to be on Colombia in particular and the Andean Initiative on Narcotics. I appreciate the gentlewoman's assistance over the years and having gone on a Codel with us down in the Caribbean last summer when we worked on the narcotics issue, and while we may have nuances of differences on the African question, Members are aware we cannot have superficial involvement in any area of the world anymore; and Africa is, indeed, a key area.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, and myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Drug Policy and the co-chair the Speaker's Drug Task Force and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) just returned yesterday from Colombia, and I would at this time yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) mentioned, this past weekend I had the pleasure of going to Colombia by invitation of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS). I am a member of the Speaker's Drug Task Force, and we are going to celebrate the third anniversary of the Colombia Plan. We have spent a lot of money in Colombia; and we have tried to thwart the growing production and distribution of drugs, primarily heroin and cocaine. I really wanted to see firsthand if we were being effective, if we were spending our money wisely.

What I saw was beyond my expectation. I think we are doing very, very well in that area. The Colombians, with our help, are working very hard to eliminate the illegal drug production. They do this by spraying, by intercepting drugs by land, sea and air, and are actively breaking up drug laboratories, places of production.

I had an opportunity to ride in the boats that they use to intercept the drug traffic on the high seas. These are little speed boats. They will basically be watching the radar and they will see a little blip. They run out and jump in the boat and race out and intercept the ship, the boat, whatever. We had an opportunity to do this, and it was a lot of fun to see these guys in action, and they did a great job. I was very, very impressed with their professionalism and the fact that they were doing such a good job. And yet after we left, after the Americans left, the Colombians were there and went about their business. Since then, they have intercepted trafficking in cocaine, heroin, whatever.

The Colombians are fighting this battle. Certainly we are providing some help and resources. We were able while I was there to go to a Colombian hospital and see some of the soldiers that had been injured in the last few weeks.

One of them had lost a leg. One of them had shrapnel blow up in his face and lost an eye and part of his face. But their spirits were high. The young man that lost his leg was talking about going ahead and trying to remain in the military and continue to fight the battle.

So the Colombians are making great headway. They are taking back their country from the terrorists and thugs that are financing this effort by kidnapping their own people and ransoming them and producing illegal drugs. I think what I like about the way that the Colombian Plan is structured is in the sense we have an exit strategy. We are providing a lot of resources, a lot of know-how, but the Colombians have done a tremendous job of picking up on that.

I have a good friend that is an ophthalmologist, an eye doctor; and he will go to Africa and he will work on the natives and do cataract surgery and glaucoma surgery. And while he is there, he will help a lot of people; but where he really helps is while he is there, he teaches the surgeons there how to do the procedures so when he leaves, the surgeons that are there go on about their business and continue to care for people, continue to do a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for asking me to go on the trip. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership in this area, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTER) for taking on this scourge that is a problem to America and so many other places in the world. I really feel like the Colombia Plan is doing just what we want it to do.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and thank him for his leadership in the meth issue. I know that is very important in northwest Arkansas. We are trying to work out doing a hearing on a new initiative on that possibly next week partly because of the gentleman's leadership in encouraging us to do that. We are all trying to deal with cocaine and heroin, meth, and Oxycotin hitting our districts.

Mr. Speaker, let me put this in context. From the world map, Members can see South America just south of the United States. Panama is connected to Colombia, and at one time in the Andean countries, which include Peru and Bolivia straight south of Colombia, that was at one point nearly 100 percent of the world's coca production and a large percentage of the heroin production. The other parts of the world that heroin is predominantly coming from, a little bit from Mexico and a little from the Golden Triangle, that is still significant in Afghanistan and that region kind of northwest or to the left of India, the far part of the map, that Hamas and Hezbollah are using to finance their efforts. Most of the heroin on that side of the world is flowing to China and Europe. But all of the coca in the world is coming out of

this region. At one point it was fairly evenly split between Peru, Bolivia, and Colombia with Colombia being mostly a processing country; but it is increasingly concentrated in Colombia, taking one of South America's oldest democracies and turning it into a battle zone.

One other thing we can see from this is why we have a Plan Colombia and an Andean Initiative. If we look at that as a funnel, as it comes out of Colombia, if we do not get it when it is being grown and it gets to the border, it can go to the north side of Colombia into the Atlantic or to the southwest side of Colombia into the Pacific. Once it gets up to the United States border, it becomes even harder to stop. Or it can go across the Atlantic Ocean to Europe, across the Pacific Ocean to Asia, and the farther one gets from the actual poppy and coca fields, the harder it becomes, which is why we have dedicated and made Colombia the third largest recipient of foreign aid in the United States behind Israel and Egypt because the drug problem in the world right now is centered in that zone; and if we cannot tackle it there, it becomes far more expensive and far harder to tackle the problem as it moves out of Colombia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), who has been leading an effort for Members of Congress to learn Spanish. The gentleman has taken an aggressive interest in that region along with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and commend the gentleman for his leadership and efforts to eradicate the threat of narcotics coming onto American soil. I commend and am thrilled to participate tonight in this Special Order.

Imagine this here in the United States, if our judges were assassinated, our candidates for Congress, our candidates for President were threatened with kidnapping and assassination. Imagine if our elected officials were threatened and ordered to resign their positions at gunpoint, and this threat emerged from narcotraffickers here in the United States. Imagine how the American people would feel about the need to deal with this threat to our democracy and such a threat to our Nation's security.

Well, the people of Colombia have been threatened with these types of threats for decades where you have narcoterrorists organize military groups, in fact three groups, two left wing, one right wing, who are funded through the trafficking of narcotics, cocaine and other drugs. And, of course, they threaten something we hold very dear, which is freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, Colombia is a wonderful country. It is a country of great history, great heritage; and today its democracy is threatened at gunpoint by

those who make their means through the trafficking and production of narcotics.

I support Plan Colombia. I support President Bush's Andean Regional Initiative. Colombia is important to the United States. Not only does Colombia share our values of freedom and opportunity and free enterprise, but Colombia is an important partner in the western hemisphere for the United States. It is a trading and economic partner. We share a culture and heritage. Latin America is important to us, and Colombia is an important part of Latin America. Colombia continues and has always been a strong ally and friend of the United States. It is a significant U.S. trading partner and supplier of oil.

In fact, Colombia, as I noted, is today the longest-standing democracy in Latin America, and it is currently under siege by a number of guerrilla and paramilitary groups that we in the United States have designated as terrorist organizations, designated terrorist organizations by the United States Government. These terrorist groups today obtain their primary means and monetary support by the destructive drug trade.

Unfortunately, our friends in Colombia suffer from this; and today Colombia serves as a source of 90 percent of the cocaine and a majority of the heroin found on the streets of America, significantly contributing to the 19,000 drug-induced deaths in the United States each year. And many of those 19,000 drug-induced deaths here in the United States are children, kids in our home communities back in Illinois and Indiana and Arkansas and all 50 of our great States.

Today, Congress needs to support Plan Colombia. We also need to support President Bush's Andean Regional Initiative, legislation that recognizes the importance of Colombia. Today, as we approach the 3-year anniversary of Plan Colombia, it is important tonight to review the progress being made by the United States' support for the freely elected government of Colombia.

I am proud to say and pleased to say that our support of Plan Colombia has given us positive results that we can point to. In fact, there are many strong indicators that Plan Colombia and the Andean Regional Initiative programs are beginning to bear fruit.

Eradication of coca plants has led to major decreases in cocaine production, and purity of the drug has dropped as well. Law enforcement efforts have led to increased seizures on land and sea. Extraditions of drug traffickers to the United States is at an all-time high, and I note something that is so important for us, and that is the professionalism and the performance and the human rights record of Colombia's armed forces, and in particular that the counterdrug battalions and the Colombian National Police have shown tremendous improvement, as well as getting results.

□ 2130

I would also note that alternative economic development programs are also beginning to show great promise, and utilization of expanded authorities are being fully leveraged by our friends in Colombia to more effectively attack both drugs and terrorism. These are positive things that we can report happening right now today in Colombia, and there are many others. But the job is not done yet, and that is why we stand here tonight to continue our support for Plan Colombia as well as the Andean Regional Initiative. Plan Colombia and the Andean Regional Initiative has put Colombia on the road to success, but as I noted, the road is long, and we must continue to support Plan Colombia.

I would note that Colombia today is in much better position to win this fight against narcoterrorism than they were 3 years ago, not only because of U.S. support, but also because of Colombia's freely elected, democratically elected President Uribe. Since taking office in August of 2002, President Uribe has shown an unwavering commitment to achieving democratic security and has brought new hope to Colombia. He has acted quickly and decisively to address terrorism and narcotics trafficking while also promoting human rights. His national security strategy shows his determination to deny terrorists the drug-related resources they use to finance their operations against the people of Colombia. And President Uribe has made tough decisions necessary to improve Colombia's economic prospects, moving forward and ahead on tax, pension and labor reforms.

Overall President Uribe has energized Colombia, receiving high praise and high job-approval ratings from his own people, the Colombian people. No doubt with President Uribe's leadership, Colombia is on the right track to restoring security and prosperity, and we in Congress applaud Colombia's efforts of late and recognize the sacrifices that Colombian people have made over the last few decades.

Again, Colombia matters, Latin America matters, and I know there are meetings that will soon be held in Europe, and my hope is our friends in Europe will join the United States in supporting the people of Colombia and supporting the freely elected democratic Government of Colombia. And again, I note that no Latin American country has a longer history of democracy and freedom than Colombia. They are our friends. They are our allies. They stand with us in the values that we as Americans stand for, freedom and democracy and free enterprise. We in this Congress want to ensure that the people of Colombia continue to have freedom and opportunity, and that democracy grows and flowers and blooms, and that the people of Colombia have the opportunity to enjoy economic freedoms and free enterprise. So I would urge our European friends to

join with the United States in supporting Colombia in its war against terrorism and to support Colombia's war against narcoterrorism which is threatening democracy right in our own neighborhood.

I again thank the gentleman from Indiana for his leadership in the war against drugs which finances, and let us remember the primary source of terrorism in the Western Hemisphere is narcotrafficking. That is why his leadership is so important, my good friend from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, and as he knows, as a long-time close personal friend of the Speaker, from the State Legislature in Illinois, and since we have been to Congress that our Speaker has been a leader on this issue, and he asked us to do this Special Order tonight. He asked us to go last weekend down to Colombia and has stood firm in making sure that this initiative was funded, make sure that we stayed focused on the narcotics issue. And it is our appreciation for his leadership in addition to each of us trying to take responsibility and work to help solve these problems that are big. Whether it is the streets of Joliet, Illinois, or the streets of Fort Wayne, Indiana, and throughout the rural parts of his district and the rural parts of my district, we see that drug problem, along with alcohol, as being the number one problem of crime and breakup of families, the reason people lose jobs. It is a problem that is not only a world problem, but it is a problem back home where the people are talking about it at their dinner tables, they are talking about it with their kids hopefully, but they are certainly talking about the byproducts of illegal narcotics. So I thank him also for his leadership.

What I would like to do is lay a little bit further out how we got into the Andean Initiative and the Colombian problem, how some of it has evolved over the years here in Congress and with our funding, some of the primary questions that have been coming up often in the news media, but with my colleagues here in Congress and address some of the myths that have been plaguing us in these debates.

First, let me describe a little bit what our Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources Subcommittee was working with. When the Republicans took over Congress in 1995 and reformulated the committee that I now chair to focus on drug policy so we had one committee that pulled together oversight from what was 23 different committees looking at the narcotics problem, as we looked at this, we saw certain basic things that needed to be addressed. One was eradication. Two was interdiction. If we failed to eradicate it, we had to try to intercept it before it got to our borders. If it got inside the United States, we needed to do law enforcement, which explains the DEA, local police forces, State police. Then if we could tackle the problem at

either end through prevention or treatment, we could try to reduce the demand side, too.

So there were five prongs: Eradication, interdiction, enforcement, along with prevention and treatment. And in that part it became apparent that the Andean region and the Colombian region was most in danger because of the drug habits of the United States and particularly Western Europe.

Myth number one is that there is a civil war going on in Colombia. There is not a civil war going on in Colombia. The FARC as well as the ELN, and even counting the paramilitaries, we are talking about a percent of the population that is, quite frankly, less, far less, than the prison population in the United States. What we are basically talking about are terrorists and criminals who have not been captured. Some of them early on may have started with the revolutionary idea that they wanted power and did not want to get it through a democratic process.

We have already heard from my colleagues that this is the oldest Latin American democracy, that has had many stable elections. They have had a history of some violence for numerous geographical reasons and others, but so have we in the United States. So have we in other parts of Western Europe. But a few dissidents that are a tiny minority of a country do not constitute a civil war. It is a rebellion of people who want to take the law into their own hands.

Over time, as we had the ELN which used kidnapping as its main route, we saw the FARC, which was the largest of the groups, decide to finance themselves by providing first protection and then actually running the growing operations after some of the big cartels were broken up; the Medellin and the Cali cartels, for example. Then we saw communities try to form a contract with so-called paramilitaries. Sometimes they were former members of the military. Sometimes they dressed like military and they were really kind of like Pinkerton detectives on steroids, that people wanted to protect themselves, so they hired them. Pretty soon that group got corrupted as well by narcotics, at least much of them, whatever their original intention was, to protect themselves from others because they could not establish order in the community, and the government was not strong enough to do so or whatever. Now we have three groups, still a tiny percentage, maybe numbering 40,000 in a country of 28 million, a tiny percentage of the country. It does not constitute a civil war. Their motives are not civil war. Their motives are to make money on narcotics.

Some of them now would like to buy peace and get power without having to go through a democracy, but President Pastrana, who more than bent over backwards, who turned every cheek times three to try to negotiate with them and wound up with what? Nothing. He had the right motives. I and

others backed him in that effort to try to do that as we tried to rebuild and organize the Colombian military and the Colombian national police. But the bottom line is they did not want to come to the peace table. They are not interested in peace. They are terrorists, they are interested in selling narcotics, protecting narcotics and terrorizing villages.

We were sold to the United States Congress that Plan Colombia and the Andean Regional Initiative was going to be a joint effort, and while I have talked about the United States using the narcotics, the truth is we only consume about 50 to 60 percent of the cocaine production coming out of Colombia. Europe is consuming huge quantities of that, but also Canada, the region itself, and others, and Asia, because that is where they are getting their cocaine, and this should not all be the United States' problem. But some of the European countries and other countries who in the beginning promised huge amounts of dollars to help Colombia have not followed through. Their argument was they did not want to spend money on the military and law enforcement violations.

Okay. Let us accept that premise, which I do not think it was a very good premise, but let us accept that premise. Now as we are making progress in Colombia, and as villages are finally getting stabilized where people are again ready to be a judge or to be a mayor, where is Europe? Where are the alternative development dollars that they said were coming? Where is the help with setting up those law enforcement systems? If the United States has been willing to bear, along with Colombia, 100 percent of the burden even though 50 percent of the problem is not ours, and none of this basically is Colombia's, these groups would not be armed if it was not for drug abusers in the United States, and Western Europe, and Japan, and Canada and other places using cocaine and heroin.

We stimulated and funded the terrorism that is occurring in Colombia, the thousands of deaths, the police who are getting massacred, the individuals who are getting massacred. They are getting massacred with our money. It is our problem, not Colombia's problem. They need the help with it. Their people are using this. Their people are growing it. But they met our market demand. We have an obligation to help put order back and to help them reestablish their country.

The United States is helping Colombia, and Colombia has taken tremendous efforts, particularly under President Uribe, to go after the eradication, to go after the law enforcement, to get some stability in these areas. We need partners around the world now to follow through on their commitments, because if we cannot provide alternative development, if we cannot provide jobs, if we cannot make decent schools, if we cannot get a legal system that works with local police and mayors, we will

go back to chaos with our money, because we have been the drug abusers and we need allies around the world.

Let me step back again and illustrate. Earlier I talked about the funnel, and let me in particular here show one of the problems that we face in the United States before I get into some specifics. My subcommittee has been holding hearings on the borders in the north and south border. We just did a hearing in El Paso. We spent 3 days here in this region of Texas. We did a hearing over here in Sells. We have had a hearing over here at San Isidro. We did a hearing and visited multiple times in Nogales and the area of Douglas, Arizona.

Let me guarantee the Members something. If the American people are saying it is not working, and we are not getting it stopped in Colombia, let me assure the American people something. We cannot get control of that border, and this is the easiest border to control in the south. We have virtually no control over the water coming in from the Caribbean. We have had to pull our boats in for homeland security, but once they are coming in water and going up the coast, it has been very difficult in the Caribbean region. It is even worse in the Pacific. As they come in with little boats up the California coast and out into that water, it has been very difficult to intercept.

We have 1 million plus illegal immigrants making it across the border every year in the south border, 1 million. That is a huge number. Some of them are running small amounts. Most of them are not. But it shows how porous the border is. We have thousands of Border Patrol. We are doing everything we can to control that and will continue to try to close it, but as we start to close the border, let me tell the Members about a hearing we had here in the Tohono O'odham Reservation. That day while we were having a hearing, one person was interdicted. It is a town of maybe 2,500 on an Indian reserve, the Tohono O'odham. Their police did one seizure of 200 pounds, one seizure of 300 pounds, one seizure of 500 pounds, and one of 400 pounds; a total of 1,500 pounds in 1 day. Then seven SUVs went through later in the day, of which one got through, but they managed to catch a number of them. They found a hole in this zone. A National Park Ranger was killed in the Organ Pipe National Monument, and as we squeezed other parts of the border, they moved to that hole. This is important because the previous 3 months they had 1,500 pounds, the previous year they had 1,500 pounds, and in that day between 9 and 2 o'clock, they got 1,500 pounds even though we had Federal people around.

There is so much stuff moving across, we cannot even intercept it all, even though we keep boosting the number of Border Patrol people. We will continue to make the efforts because when that comes in, the two biggest cocaine busts in my district's history, or it appears

to be two of the biggest, if not the two biggest, occurred last 3 weeks in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

□ 2145

One of them came from Texas, and I believe the other through Arizona, and it was Colombian.

Now, as that moves through, it is not a theoretical exercise we are talking about here. When you are driving down the road at night and you do not know whether somebody is whacked out on coke or whether they have injected themselves with heroin or are high on this high-grade marijuana, that has nothing to do with the historic marijuana that you hear about from the sixties and the news media jokes about. That is not what we are talking about in marijuana. We are talking about THC content; in my hometown a lot of the marijuana is selling for more than coke and heroin. This stuff is potent.

Think about it. When you get behind the wheel, whether you want to legalize drugs and whether you think we should back off from the drug war, do you feel safe? Does your family feel safe, knowing that the more that pours across there, the cheaper it is, the more of it there is, the more you could be killed driving home or there could be a robbery at the bank where you get caught in the shoot-out, or watching neighborhoods in your communities get sucked under, or people operating a bus or truck or equipment as they are building, using this drug?

Harmless crime? Harmless drug? Balmoney. This is the biggest threat to the United States, 30,000 people dying because of illegal narcotics. We talk a lot, and I am on the Committee on Homeland Security, but the numbers we are looking at on an annual basis dwarf what we have seen yet.

Yes, one nuclear weapon and we could all be destroyed; but the fact is, while we are talking about that, we are watching people get killed every night. Tonight, in every city of the United States, somebody is going to be impacted. Maybe shot in some cities; in other cities it will be a dad or mom who use their money for drugs when they should have been supporting their family, or not being with their kids or abusing their kids or spouse abuse or not making their child support payments because they used it on illegal narcotics. Those are the real problems with that, and we are not going to be able to control, no matter how hard we try, enough of our borders; but we will improve that, but we have to get it at the source.

Now, let me deal with a couple of other questions. We heard a little bit from my colleagues about is it working? Let me start out with, first off, how do you define "working"? I constantly hear Members saying, well, there is still drugs.

Well, should we stand up when we deal with spouse abuse and say, you know, we funded spouse abuse last year and there is still spouse abuse. In fact,

we funded spouse abuse programs for the last 10 years, and there is still spouse abuse. In fact, we have tried to deal with spouse abuse ever since the American Republic was started, and there is still spouse abuse, so we should give up?

On child abuse, when we come down here on Labor-HHS later this week and talk about funding for child abuse, could you imagine if somebody stood up and said, well, you know, we have been fighting child abuse the last few years. We spent hundreds of millions of dollars over decades here, and there is still child abuse here in America.

Of course there is. There will always be drug abuse. The root problem in my opinion is sin. It may be different variations and different people have different problems; but every day, somebody is newly exposed to the temptations of narcotics, and no matter how much we try to prevent it, and treatment is after the fact, and treatment is very important and I am pretty much on most treatment bills that are moving through Congress, but the truth is, that is treating the wounded.

We cannot just treat the wounded; we have to get into prevention. But there is a funny thing about prevention. You can convince people they should stay off drugs, and then they break up with their girlfriend and go to a party and all of a sudden they forgot everything they learned in the drug prevention program. They lose their job. Somebody packages something more potent or they are smoking cigarettes or having a beer and somebody says you want a little bit bigger high? And all of a sudden, at the very least, they are psychologically addicted, if not physically addicted. New people are exposed by the minute and by the hour. It is not something that you can ever fully eliminate.

But we can control it. And we have made successes. Even though we had a surge between 1992 and 1994, of which we are only making a little progress, the truth was that its peak was at 1994.

Let me briefly mention another method. "Just Say No" does not work. Under Just Say No under the Reagan administration, we had 8 straight years of decline that carried through the first 2 to 3 years of the Bush administration, 11 years of decline.

In that 11 years of decline, it went down so far that even in the surge up in 1991 to 1994, in the last year of the Bush administration and the first two of the Clinton administration, where now we would have to have a 50 percent reduction to get back to Reagan, even that peak in the United States was less than the peak in 1980 before Just Say No. So it is a myth that Just Say No did not work. It worked, because it was not Just Say No. That was one part. We did treatment, we did interdiction, we did eradication where necessary, but we fought and we had a consensus of how to fight it.

When we lost the consensus, the problem "upped" again. Now we have

had a couple of years of success. But now they are better funded.

So among the things we are hearing about Colombia is, for example, everybody violates human rights. It is simply not true. There are degrees of violations of human rights, that human rights are not respected much at all by the FARC and the ELN. Kids are kidnapped, they use 14-year-olds in their military, they terrorize people. They do not respect human rights at all.

There have been problems with the paramilitaries, and the question is, are they too tied to the military? The answer is we have worked hard in this government. Uribe's government is committed to trying, for once and for all, to prosecute them all.

When you go and talk to the counter-narcotics brigades of the Defense Department, off to the side what they will tell you is literally when there is a firefight with the terrorists, they have to have an attorney there. They cannot move the bodies so they can identify and make sure they were not shot in the back, and they do things we do not do.

We are holding Colombia to a different standard even than the United States. Now, that is because we are putting money in. They have had a historic problem with human rights and there is an accountability with it.

But it is just wrong for anybody on this floor or anywhere in the world to imply that there has not been tremendous progress, that we have not vetted these brigades better than we have ever in the past, and there is not accountability, and that when you go to a Colombian military camp, their prisons will have a number of people in it who are being held for possible violations, something that is stricter than any other process we are doing; and it is important they have that, because if the American people are going to put the money in, they want to know we are doing human rights.

But we have been making progress and have made dramatic progress on human rights, and those who want to criticize the Colombian military and the government, I have asked people in my district too, sometimes they are criticizing what we do and sending our money down to violence. Why do they not criticize the FARC? Why do they not criticize the FARC? Why do they not criticize the ELN? Why is it always the government or the paramilitaries?

The FARC are the ones who started it, who have violations. I am not defending any human rights, but let us at least acknowledge that they are the primary perpetrators of human rights violations, that there is still violence, therefore the program has not worked because there is still violence in Colombia.

Yes, there is still violence. You know what? There is going to be violence for quite a while. They have got a lot of dollars from the American Government to work with. They can buy weapons. And one proof we are successful is they are getting more violent.

When we were down there, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BOOZMAN), and I this last weekend, we went to a hospital. There we talked to a bunch of young soldiers, basically 22- to 24-year-olds. One of the soldier's eyes was gone and his leg was gone; and he was in pretty bad shape, generally. A number of them were dead; he was in better shape than them.

They died because they were trying to eradicate the drugs Americans wanted to buy and Europeans wanted to buy. It was not predominantly Colombians who want to buy it. It was our money.

They were attacked from both sides. A number of them said it was the worst firefight they had ever been in. It was homemade bombs, screws coming at them, going into their eyes and their bodies. It was terrorist-type bombs, not traditional.

Now, they have traditional weapons too. For the first time we are seeing it looks like some arms-for-drugs shipments coming in from some of the arms negotiating sales places in Eastern Europe and some of the Mafia-type around it, not the traditional definition of the word, that are shipping arms in there.

We are going to see more sophisticated weapons. This myth that if we suddenly legalize this, that there would not be this conflict, oh, yeah. They are making \$3 billion a year; and if we say we are going to legalize something, forget a second that I do not want to be driving down the highway worried about whether somebody is whacked out on drugs.

Let us say it was not that. But they are going to suddenly give up? Are you going to legalize cocaine and heroin? Are you going to legalize whatever the next thing is? Of course not. They are not going to give up their market. They are going to continue to step people up to more potent drugs.

They are making money on this. They are making buckets, trucks and boatloads of money on this, and they are not suddenly going to say, oh, they legalized marijuana, I think we will quit. We will just retire.

I mean, give me a break. There is going to be violence because there is tremendous money; and to the degree we try to cut off the source of their money, they are going to continue to become more violent.

Another question that comes with this is, yes, but you have not stabilized any villages. I have heard my colleagues on the floor testify that they have been to villages where there still is not order.

We all know that. When you have a place in a country where people, judges are getting shot, mayors are getting shot, we have a president of Colombia whose father was assassinated, we have a vice president of Colombia who himself was kidnapped for 9 months, they know what it means.

Quite frankly, I was sitting there in the presidential palace along with the

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) with the delegation for the inauguration of President Uribe, and we heard this big boom, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) said I never heard a one-gun salute.

They blew off part of the corner of the presidential palace. They were trying to aim with their howitzer, blew up a housing complex, killed many innocent people, shot to the left, shot to the right. They did not care that there were thousands of troops around. They were shooting from a mile and a quarter away with sophisticated equipment. This is a tough battle, and they do not care who they hit. Even President Chavez, who you would think would have some connections, was in the building they were shooting at.

It is an equal-opportunity terrorist. They will hit anybody if they are trying to threaten their money. And we have to understand that this is not something you can just sit down and have a nice negotiation, maybe we can give them some trinkets and they will give us some trinkets and everybody will pat each other on the back and say, yeah, I will give up my \$3 billion business.

We have to establish order in those communities. The plan under Plan Colombia, quite frankly, is taking a little longer than we thought, because they have chosen to fight, because another myth is that it is a balloon: if you squeeze Colombia, it is going to go back to Peru and Bolivia. The truth is that that is hard.

We have made progress in those countries. Some seem to be coming back a little bit, but it is nothing like it was, and they are trapped.

In Colombia, if you look at this map, much of the progress is being made a long the Putumayo. If we squeeze in from the south, and this is a big coca region, the heroin is in the higher elevations. Those mountains, by the way, are up to 18,000 feet. I thought the topography here was important, because you can see most of the people are on this side of the mountain range. That side is the Amazon basin.

They kidnap and harass people and terrorize people on this side, but most of the growing is over there. And as we start to put the pressure on, they move more out in the jungle. This is not an easy task. When you fly over, you cannot see the stuff. And the coca fields are at least big. The heroin poppy, you cannot see it.

Furthermore, I have heard people say, well, they are spraying legitimate crops. Walk on the ground. They are smart. They can make more in coca than they can make in palm heart; and unless you convince them that you are going to provide stability and protection for them and there is going to be an alternative crop, they just grow it underneath.

We are spraying where there is evidence that there is coca or heroin poppy; but as they move further in the

jungle, you are farther and farther from any air base, you are farther and farther from re-fueling places, you are farther and farther from any roads. If you have a helicopter crash, guess what? They go in and capture your pilots, which they have right now with three Americans.

The farther out we go, they are going to get there. But the farther out they go, guess what? They are longer in the air and we can see them longer. They have more risk that we are going to interdict.

It is not true that we do not make progress by moving them. It just is that we are not going to eliminate the problem by moving it. We reduce the problem, we manage it. To the degree we reduce the amount of cocaine coming into the United States, we change the price and purity questions. They do not package it with marijuana as easily. It is watered down. It does not have the same potency. Addicts are not as difficult. You make step-by-step progress; you do not make huge progress.

Now, back to the villages. They have been able to establish a reasonable amount of order in about half the villages. The goal was to establish it in more than that.

Now what are some practical implications of that? Let me first show you something here. On the spraying of poppy crops, there is a discussion of why is this so hard to spray. First off, you have to hit it several times. Heroin poppy is one of the cases. They can replant it, so you need to do it multiple times a year.

But, do you know what? They try to shoot down those planes. This have taken more hits in the last couple weeks than they had in a long time, because they realize the more heroin poppy that we eradicate and the more coca we eradicate, the more they can predict where the planes are going to go for eradication, because there are fewer fields to eradicate. So they can take their armaments and focus better on where we are coming.

Another thing is that you have to have ground protection. My first trip there in 1996 and 1997 when we were doing some of this, I went out to one, I think it was in the Guaviare area, but I talked to some pilots whose concern was this: one of their partners had been killed because they would string up line that you could not see and their plane went through and it crossed their neck as they tried to eradicate.

□ 2200

So now you have groups of soldiers on the ground trying to protect the planes to eradicate.

A couple of other illustrations. You can see here when you are flying the plane over, you have people in the fields on all sides. In different countries we use different things. In Bolivia and Peru, some were ground eradication, some were air eradication, but in that effort, every place you went,

whether you are going after labs or field eradication, you have to be protected. As I have gone into the field and seen some of this, you have to be protected.

I want to illustrate one other point as to why this becomes important. There are somewhere in the vicinity of over 200,000 displaced people in Colombia. These people in these rural villages, as they are out in the villages, what started often is that the FARC will come in, they will say, grow coca. They can make a lot of money, they will bring the planes to it, and they will provide protection and forcibly push them into coca. Then the paramilitaries would come through their villages and say, you put up somebody from the FARC, you are cooperating with the FARC; we are going to kill you; we are going to terrorize you. Then the FARC would come back in town and say, you cooperated with the paramilitaries; we are going to kill you. And these poor villages just decide: I am not staying here. I do not care if my family has had a farm here for 100 years. I do not care if my family has had a business here. I do not want to get myself and my family killed.

We visited the Nelson Mandela village just outside of Cartagena. Mr. Speaker, 35,000 people live in basic shacks with these kinds of streets. Right now Indiana is flooding a lot, and it looks a little like this, but underneath there is actual, real streets. Here, it just turns into mud. AID has tried to develop some alternative development in this area. I had two, I do not think it was these two young girls, but two young girls came up to me and wanted to talk to a Congressman. I had drifted off from the group. I quick got back after they talked to me. But they said, even in this camp, the FARC is hunting them down, as are the paramilitaries, if they believe they cooperated with the other side. They go right in to where we have an AID plan where it might be 100 miles or 200 miles away from the village and terrorize them. The person I was with, the photographer and I decided we were going to go back to the rest of the group because we had not banked on them being in the same camp that we were.

But these kids deal with this every day. They cannot escape. They do not have the type of protection that a U.S. CODEL has, a congressional delegation, when we go in. They have to live with it. One young girl sang a song as opposed to just telling a story, sang a song about how she was in her home and the FARC came in and shot her husband right in front of her and her son, the little kids wandering around in this type of environment.

Now, part of the solution to that is, bluntly put, we can only do so many tar-paper shacks around the world. What we have to do is get their villages safe to the degree we can establish order and security in their villages. They did not want to leave their farms. They did not want to leave their busi-

nesses. Yes, some of them did not have employment and came to the cities. In Rio and in Lima and Buenos Aires and all over the world, you see at the edges of the cities some of this. But Colombia has a middle class. It is not Guatemala. It is not Venezuela. They have a relatively stable middle class and democracy.

The question is, how can we reestablish it? How do we do this? That is why we not only need at this point to finish off what we are doing in Plan Colombia and the Andean Initiative, we need to have the Europeans follow up with their commitment to help us now to get these people back to work and back to their villages if we can get those villages safe.

Now, another part of this is I met an amazing man. His name was Rudolfo Gedeon. He is president of PETCO. But he is doing one of the initiatives that has been so successful in Bangladesh, and that is microloans. In this pattern in Bangladesh, they gave little loans to try to build little capitalism that moves into a little bit bigger capitalism, that moves into a little bit more, because in so many of these countries you have the very wealthy people and the very poor people. In Medellin they started, and now they are doing in the Cartagena areas, a number of these businessmen working with AID are starting these loan processes with AID. Some AID capital, but the real success here is having local people be the monitors. Their loans, \$1.5 million, 8,000 loans over the last year; average loan, \$200, some a little bit bigger, some are \$60. But do my colleagues know what? Ninety-eight percent, two percent default rate. No bank anywhere has that, except in Bangladesh and a couple of these microloans, because they are the people themselves monitoring them.

Now, how does this relate to the broader question?

In this village AID has a project where they are teaching some people metal working, some people how to sew, how to bake, how to make crafts. So they teach them that. Where do they go? What are they supposed to do? Mr. Speaker, it is amazing: \$80, \$100 you can start to sew in your neighborhood. Pay that back, like a credit union, which is really kind of how this is functioning, because your neighbors are all part of this, and you are watching each other, and there is accountability. Then you can get justified for maybe a \$400 loan, then an \$800 loan. You crawl, you take baby steps, you walk, but that is how you build a middle class.

But to do that, you have to have order. Some people do not understand, you can not give somebody \$400 or \$10,000 or \$50,000 to start a business if they think their family is going to be murdered or kidnapped the next week.

Somehow, we have to establish order. We have to establish credible government units that are not involved in human rights violations, which this

government is committed to do. Some people say, well, I cannot make as much growing soybeans as I can selling coca or growing coca. I cannot make as much in palm heart. Do my colleagues know what? The kids on American street corners cannot make as much at McDonald's as they can being a lookout either, but that does not mean we are going to pay them \$400 an hour if they give up being a lookout. There are things that are not legal to do and that are destructive, and there are things that are legal. We need to work to give people a living wage, where they can work to support their family with their income, and we need to help the Government of Colombia, which has been undermined.

For example, they were the eighth largest supplier of oil in the world. There has been so much oil spilled in attacking that pipeline that it would be 8 *Exxon Valdezes* pouring into the north part of Colombia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana, my friend, who has demonstrated a commitment that is extraordinary in terms of this particular issue and to the people of Colombia. I hope that everyone that is watching tonight and listening to the gentleman's Special Order takes note.

Much of what the gentleman said, practically all of what the gentleman said I agree with. And I think it is important to understand that the commitment to Colombia has to be a sustained commitment. Unfortunately, those of us who enjoy the benefits of this country are sometimes susceptible to a lack of patience. This is not a problem that is going to go away overnight in Colombia, but I think that the gentleman made the link that absolutely cries for patience by the American people and by the Congress, and that is that here in the neighborhoods of the United States, there are young people and people of middle age that have been addicted to narcotics and have led lives that reduce them to hostages and prisoners in their own body. And if we are ever going to address that problem and the link that it has to crime and violence in the United States, our commitment has to be sustained.

I felt the need to say that. I know the gentleman has been on the floor. I am here with some colleagues to address a separate issue, but I want to applaud the gentleman's efforts. We have worked a long time on this particular issue, and I believe that the Colombian Government is making great strides. The gentleman pointed out that the Colombian Government is making strides in terms of human rights.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as we near the 3-year anniversary of Plan Colombia, it is important to reaffirm our commitment to this program, to the people of Colombia, and to American citizens. I have led three congressional delegations to Colombia over the past 5 months. I can say firsthand that our significant investment is beginning to pay dividends. Together with the strong commitment of the Uribe Administration and historic levels of support from the Colombian people, U.S. involvement in Colombia is beginning to hit narco-terrorists where it hurts.

We are seeing tremendous results in illegal crop eradication, and Plan Colombia's efforts have produced record reductions in coca production and in the destruction of drug labs. Each week brings news of new seizures of cocaine and heroin—interdictions that are usually the result of U.S.-supplied intelligence. In fact, just this last weekend, Colombian officials seized over a ton of cocaine from a drug trafficking boat off the Caribbean coast. The Colombian government is reestablishing state presence in areas of the country that for decades lacked it. Criminals who have remained at bay for years are being captured and extradited to the United States for prosecution. During the 11 months of President Uribe's tenure, 68 individuals have been extradited from Colombia to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Plan Colombia is working. I have just returned from a trip to Colombia with Chairman SOUDER and have seen first hand the devastation that drug production and trafficking has on this country. To those who question our investment, I would ask them to visit, as I have, Colombian soldiers who have lost their limbs or eyesight or sustained permanent disabilities in their battle to return peace to their nation and keep drugs off American streets. I would also ask them to visit Barrio Nelson Mandela, a USAID sponsored facility for internally displaced people who have been forced from their homes by drug traffickers and guerillas. This facility showed me how our work on behalf of Colombia's millions of internally displaced people is offering men, women, and children a second chance at a violence-free, productive life.

The United States, however, should not have to do this alone. An increasingly significant amount of Colombian cocaine and heroin is being trafficked through Europe for consumption. I would like to urge our European allies to recognize their responsibility to do their share in supporting Colombia in the battle to reduce the supply of drugs entering the world market. The war on drugs cannot be won without appropriate funds, resources and tools. Every contribution possible is needed to disrupt the market and make the drug trade less profitable. The battle going on in Colombia against narco-terrorism is Europe's battle as well. A European contribution to fighting the war on drugs could provide these innocent people with a better life by strengthening the rule of law, protecting human rights, and providing security for all Colombians.

During my recent visit to Colombia, it was evident to me just how effective U.S. assistance is to their government. Colombia's ability to combat both drugs and terror has been strengthened due in large part to our support as well as the will and determination of the Colombian people. With such promising results over the last 3 years, it is important to continue our support and sustain the momen-

tum. Goals are being met, and new goals need to be set. Of course obstacles remain, and progress is slower than we would like it to be. But now is not the time to turn our backs on this battle that is so intrinsically tied to our war on terrorism and illegal drug use. In light of the strong progress being made in Colombia, I urge all of my colleagues to continue their support of Colombia's unified campaign against narcotics trafficking and terrorist activities and their effort to bring democratic security to the country.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to offer some views as part of this evening's Special Order recognizing the third anniversary of Plan Colombia.

As a senior Member of the House Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, I wanted to take note of the significant gains that have been made since Plan Colombia was announced in July of 2000 in strengthening the rule of law and enhancing the stability of this important democratic ally. As important, the strategy set forth in Plan Colombia has achieved major positive results in initially slowing and now reducing Colombia's cocaine production during the past 3 years.

A recent U.S. Government assessment of global coca production trends notes the recent progress achieved under the Plan Colombia strategy: "Coca cultivation in Colombia (in 2002) declined by 15 percent—the first decline in Colombia's coca crop in a decade. . . . This reduction was largely because of a sustained aerial eradication campaign in what had been the country's densest coca growing areas. . . . Cultivation in the Putumayo—site of the country's most intensive eradication effort—declined by 80 percent." Nevertheless, the U.S. and Colombia Governments assessed in 2002 that Colombia's coca production zones totaled nearly 362,500 acres with the potential to produce 680 metric tons of pure cocaine.

With respect to Colombian heroin production, the latest assessment in that in 2002, Colombia's opium poppy production zones totaled some 12,200 acres with a potential yield of some 11.3 metric tons of pure heroin. According to the DEA, Colombian heroin captures approximately 70 percent of the U.S. marketplace and virtually all of Colombia's heroin production is intended for export to the United States. Unlike the aggressive strategies being applied against Colombia's coca production, the bilateral efforts to locate and eradicate opium poppy under Plan Colombia have lacked a consistent strategy and adequate resources and personnel. Both the U.S. and Colombian governments need to work much more effectively to apply new technologies to combat and defeat the heroin industry.

I wanted to briefly cite two initiatives that are elements of the Plan Colombia strategy, which have real potential to improve Colombia's security and to enhance the rule of law within Colombia's borders. With Plan Colombia funding, the United States Southern Command provided resources and training for the establishment of a Military Penal Justice Corps within the Colombian military. Since the establishment of Colombia's Military Penal Justice Corps in August 2000, over 300 military, police, and civilian attorneys have received professional legal education and training focused on military justice, international humanitarian law, and operational law. This legal training has had a direct and positive impact on the

Colombian military's performance in the field against terrorists and narco-traffickers as well as on its adherence to international legal standards in very difficult combat environments.

A second initiative under Plan Colombia is the reestablishment of the binational airbridge denial (ABD) program, which is designed to interdict illegal aircraft engaged in transporting narcotics. The ABD program merits close oversight, but it has real potential to reduce narco-trafficking and to limit illicit weapons support to terrorists and other criminal organizations in Colombia. When I was in Bogota last November, I had the opportunity to discuss this issue at some length with Colombian President Alvaro Uribe. President Uribe was very clear about the urgency of implementing the ABD program. I am concerned that legal disputes over the ABD program's implementation have delayed the renewal of this important interdiction program. I strongly urge the Bush administration to resolve any outstanding issues affecting ABD implementation immediately, and to provide the Colombian Government with the appropriate support to carry out an effective and accountable ABD program.

While these recent trends are somewhat encouraging, it is equally clear that our two governments need to maintain their focus on the Plan Colombia strategic objectives by intensifying ongoing narcotics eradication and interdiction programs, and by restoring security and essential government services to areas threatened by terrorists and narco-traffickers. I am convinced that Colombia's fight is also our fight—as the terrorism and the narco-trafficking that are destabilizing Colombia's democratic institutions pose real threats to America's people and our national security.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to contribute to this evening's Special Order commemorating the third anniversary of Plan Colombia.

As Chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I wanted to discuss the significant and measurable progress that has been made in the past 3 years in Colombia on a variety of fronts as a product of improved coordination and bilateral cooperation between the governments of Colombia and the United States.

Four years ago, the security situation within Colombia was extremely unstable—some were saying that Colombia was unraveling into a failed state where the national government exercised control of less than 50 percent of its territory. Leftist guerrillas from the FARC and the ELN and rightist paramilitary groups were growing rapidly and expanding their reach throughout much of Colombia. These terrorist groups were financed by the surge in cocaine and heroin production in the unsecured areas of Colombia as well as by other widespread criminal activities, such as mass kidnappings, extortion, murder for hire, and money laundering. The rule of law in much of Colombia during that time was uncertain at best; judges, public defenders, prosecutors, and police were being terrorized and killed at unprecedented rates. The political, economic and security future of Colombia was clearly and increasingly at stake.

Given Colombia's economic and political importance as a major democratic ally within our Hemisphere, it was critical that Colombia and its friends jointly develop and fund an effort to enhance Colombia's security, strengthen the

rule of law, interdict and eradicate narcotic crops, and grow its economy. During the past 3 years, the Plan Colombia initiative has provided a comprehensive strategy to reassert government control of Colombia's territory as well as to restore public confidence in the viability of Colombia's democratic institutions. Since the inauguration of Colombian President Alvaro Uribe in August 2002, the Colombian Government has stepped up its implementation of a wide variety of Plan Colombia programs affecting narcotics eradication and interdiction, enhanced law enforcement and other security-related measures, and alternative development efforts.

A recent United Nations study estimates that Colombian coca production has been reduced by 40 percent since Plan Colombia was begun. With the strong support of President Uribe and improved mobility and capacity of Colombia's military and police forces, there is an excellent opportunity in 2003 for our bi-national coca eradication program to eradicate 100 percent of Colombia's coca production zones, an area that encompasses over 150,000 hectares. While this is very good news in the short term, our two governments will have to pursue this nationwide eradication and interdiction strategy for at least the next several years as coca growers are forced out of their illegal business and the Colombian Government is able to establish a stable and effective security presence in numerous coca production zones across Colombia.

While the coca eradication trends show promise, I am concerned that insufficient attention has been given to developing and implementing an effective strategy to locate and eradicate Colombia's opium poppy crop. Our latest U.S. Government poppy crop data estimates that Colombia produced 14.2 metric tons of export quality heroin in 2002; virtually all of this Colombian heroin was exported to the United States and represented the large majority of all heroin consumed by Americans in 2002.

Despite the clear statutory direction and funding guidance in both Plan Colombia and in related Congressional authorizations and appropriations measures during the past 5 years, our bilateral effort against Colombian heroin has been so far insufficient. Given the lethal effects of the heroin trade on both our countries, this key element of Plan Colombia demands senior-level attention by both governments, appropriate resources, and the application of a new, more effective mix of eradication and interdiction technologies to locate and kill the opium poppy on the 12,000–15,000 hectares where it has been grown in Colombia's high Andes mountains.

Plan Colombia has registered some notable successes in the past 3 years. We need to stay committed to this important fight with our Colombian allies—not just for our national security, but for the safety of countless Americans who are threatened by the linkages between narco-trafficking and international terrorism. We need to redouble our efforts to stem the production and export of heroin and coca from Colombia, which harm and kill thousands of Colombians and Americans every year.

I commend the leadership of Speaker HASTERT in this important national security initiative. It was his foresight and concerted effort that has brought us this far. I look forward to working with the Speaker on this effort, and

continuing to build upon the success of Plan Colombia as it enters its fourth year.

NATIONAL POLICIES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on and to include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, we are here this evening to talk about Iraq, to talk about the military activity, to talk about the weapons of mass destruction, to talk about the postconflict steps that have been taken and need to be taken. I am joined this evening by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), and perhaps others, to talk for the next hour about our national policies in Iraq.

Some of us, myself included, voted in favor of the military authority requested by the President to invade Iraq. Some of us who will be speaking tonight voted against that military authority. But all of us have some common questions. We all salute the brave and courageous efforts by our young men and women in uniform. They won a very impressive military victory in short order. That military victory was never in doubt, but it was impressive nonetheless how well our troops performed.

But there are two questions, really: Is our military mission completed in Iraq? And secondly, are we winning the peace?

Now, I would suggest, just to get the conversation started this evening, that first off, our military mission is not complete, because we have not found the weapons of mass destruction. Those weapons are what motivated me to vote in favor of this military authority, because I believed then and I believe now that it was necessary to disarm Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction. But if we cannot find those weapons of mass destruction, there are serious questions. And we need a full accounting, first, of where those weapons are so that we know they are secured or dismantled and in safe custody. Secondly, we need a full accounting of how accurate our intelligence was. Were our intelligence agencies accurate in the information they gave to the administration? Was that information properly used by the administration?

And this is not just an academic exercise. The entire Bush doctrine of the

preemptive use of force requires as a foundation accurate intelligence regarding the intentions of other countries and potential enemies around the world. If we are going to use force preemptively in the face of imminent threats to this country or to our allies, we have to know that our intelligence is accurate.

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

Mr. HOEFFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply add one other item that I would hope that tonight we can discuss and that our friend from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) has really, in my judgment, done an extraordinary job in terms of laying out for the American people what it is going to cost the taxpayers of the United States and the impact in terms of service cuts for Americans that that will entail.

But if for a moment I could just simply go to the issue that the gentleman from Pennsylvania raised about the issue of weapons of mass destruction.

It certainly is well-known that the two premises for the rationale for the military attack on Iraq as articulated by the President was, number one, links between the Saddam Hussein regime and the possession of weapons of mass destruction, coupled with an intent to use them by that regime that presented a clear and present danger to the United States and to our people. Since the end of the conflict, we no longer hear about links between al Qaeda and the regime of the tyrant Saddam Hussein. In fact, I would dare say there is a consensus now that there was no evidence to indicate any collaborative effort or any cooperation between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden, and, most likely, the opposite was true.

I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania remembers and I know the gentleman from Illinois took note of the fact that about, I think it was in April of 2001, there was a report that Mohammed Atta, the ringleader of September 11, met with a senior Iraqi intelligence agent in the Czech Republic.

□ 2215

It was later revealed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that that could not have happened because Mr. Atta at the time of the alleged meeting was here in the United States plotting against the American people. No longer do we hear about links between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. So that argument proved to be false and inaccurate.

Mr. HOEFFEL. If I could reclaim my time for a moment just to point out that the gentleman is pointing out that the Bush administration has a growing credibility gap regarding its prior claims and the evidence that is forthcoming after the conflict. And I know the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) was the first on

this floor to my knowledge to raise the questions about the accusations regarding the country of Niger in Africa.

I wonder if the gentleman would share the latest information that has been made public on that score.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, the latest information is that today, today, the White House announced that when the President made the statement regarding the sale of highly enriched uranium to the Iraqi regime by a country in Africa, they made a mistake. Better late than never.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. I think it is very important to note this fact that 2 weeks after the State of the Union, the Secretary of State was handed that same information as he was preparing his presentation to the U.N., and he rejected that data as insufficient and inaccurate.

Now, having worked in the White House, having worked on a few State of the Unions, which are the most important speech a President will give in their Presidency outside of an oval address, I cannot think of a moment in time where you can have a Secretary of State reject the information as inadequate for their presentation to the United Nations, and yet is adequate and sufficient for the President of the United States to stand in this well at that desk and address the Nation, the world, and for this speech on why we need to go to war.

Now, I happened to have supported the resolution, but the entire credibility of our ability to marshal the resources of the world as we relate to North Korea and Iran are going to be heretofore questioned. And I always think it is interesting if I were giving advice, not that I would be giving advice, nor would they be seeking my advice, that before the President of the United States was back from Africa, he would have the name, the phone number and the forwarding address of the individual that gave that information because they would not be in this White House any longer.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is a point very well taken because several weeks ago, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), our colleague who has joined us, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) and I were having this discussion just as the gentleman pointed out, the President of the United States in the State of the Union Address made that statement to the American people; and one week later before the United Nations Security Council when he made his presentation, Secretary Powell discarded that information. But it has taken until today, today, more than 6 months later, that the White House acknowledged that that information, and let me quote what they had to say, that it was incomplete and perhaps inaccurate information from American intelligence agencies.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my friend, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), if he could give an educated, speculative assessment of what would have taken place had this same circumstance occurred today during the Presidency of Mr. Clinton.

Mr. EMANUEL. Well, heads would have rolled. You cannot allow the President of the United States to have gone up on any speech, let alone a State of the Union, to address the Nation and in this case, this State of the Union was unique, on the precipice of war, the world with information that was clearly, because of Secretary Powell's actions, inadequate, not up to snuff. Heads would have rolled. There would have been an accounting. There would have been an internal accounting to that; and I think properly so, Congress would have asked for it.

I would like to note, I cannot think what is worse, the fact that they have used, since there is ample evidence to say that Saddam Hussein was a dictator who used chemical weapons on his own people and started three wars, why you would go and stretch information, damage your own case. I cannot figure out what is worse, the fact that they used this phony memo, or the fact that they have had no plan for the occupation and no strategy for our exit.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Would the gentleman allow me to venture perhaps an educated guess myself on that score? Because they were trying to establish a new doctrine for the United States of preemptive warfare. Not that citations might not have been made with regard to other military actions by the United States in previous times, perhaps up to and even including President Clinton's Presidency, but that there was to be established with this a new paradigm of preemption based on an imperial view of the world that the stamp of the United States must be placed upon the rest of the world.

I would venture to further my question to the gentleman from Illinois, if President Clinton was in office today and this information was revealed today, what do you think the response of some of our colleagues might have been?

Mr. EMANUEL. I can feel the foam and the lather building up. We would not be arguing for 2 weeks whether Congress should call the inquiry an investigation or not. There would be a full-blown investigation, and it would be proper. Because the President of the United States at that point, at that Chamber, at that speech, at this podium would be addressing the world as the President of the United States speaking for all of us, not just the bodies in here and the cameras up there.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I do not think we would be speaking in a Chamber as we are tonight during Special Orders with, again, the press being absent. I will presume perhaps some of them are watching on C-SPAN. We would not have an empty Chamber. On the contrary, there would be a full-blown cry throughout the opposition to Mr. Clin-

ton indicating that he should be brought to account or those around him who are giving advice should be brought to account. And I agree with the gentleman, that would be true.

Mr. EMANUEL. I want to add one thing to this whole discussion if that is okay with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Yes, it is.

Mr. EMANUEL. Because as we talk about this memo from Niger and how it got into the speech, how it got into the British dossier for the justification for the war, what is equally telling and missing in the debate is the discussion of reconstruction in Iraq. And if you go over and pull over at USAID, an agency within the State Department, the plans for Iraq's reconstruction, I would like to cite some statistics.

They call for 20,000 units of housing. Yet the budget for this country only calls for 5,000 units of housing here in the United States; 13 million Iraqis, half of the population, will get universal health care. Yet not a single penny in the budget presented by the administration or passed by a Republican Congress does anything to support health care for the 42 million working uninsured in this country; 12,500 schools will be given full resources for reconstruction and books and supplies. Yet in our country, teachers have to get a tax credit because they have to take money out of their own budget, personal budget, their salary to pay for supplies. Four million kids in Iraq will be given early childhood education. In the President's budget, 58,000 kids cut from Head Start. We have a deep water port in Iraq being built from top to bottom. Yet the Corps of Engineers in this country is cut by 10 percent, their budget.

I think if we look at the history, the American people are quite generous and quite supportive of our efforts and we support the notion of Iraq having a new beginning. But I do not think they would ever support the notion that we can deconstruct America while we reconstruct Iraq.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Given the extraordinary examples that the gentleman has just cited of American generosity to help reconstruct Iraq, does the gentleman think that we are winning the peace in Iraq?

Mr. EMANUEL. The fact is that there is nothing that has gone on post the war in Iraq that we could not have seen ahead. Nothing new. There was no plan for the occupation. In fact, there is no plan for the exit. We have 158,000 troops based there as far as the eye can see out to the horizon and there is no family member who can count the days of when they are coming home because they have no knowledge of when they are coming home. So nobody can check the calendar at home when the husband is coming, the wife is coming, the sister is coming, the brother is coming.

Remember, this is the heydays. These are the days we are getting the

kisses, the hugs and the flowers. A year from now they will be tired of our presence there.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I may, the day of the hugs and the cheers really could be numbered in hours. Since the official end of the hostility as declared by the President, almost on a daily basis, tragically, American service men and women are losing their lives.

Mr. EMANUEL. I checked that statistic. It has been 69 days since the President on the Lincoln aircraft carrier declared our mission complete and 70 Americans have died; 69 days, 70 Americans since May 1.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And they are all in our prayers. But I would like to make one other observation if I can. I do not want the American people as they watch here tonight to think that this is just simply four Democrats railing for political purposes against the White House and the administration. I know that many of our colleagues on the other side share our concerns. And I found extraordinarily interesting an article that was penned by someone whom we all respect, Senator RICHARD LUGAR of Indiana, who chairs the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

And if I might, just for a moment, read his words:

The combat phase of our war in Iraq ended with a speedy, decisive victory and minimal loss of life. That impressive success is now at risk. Clearly, the administration's planning for the post-conflict phase in Iraq was inadequate. I am concerned that the Bush administration and Congress have yet to face up to the true size of the task that lies ahead or prepared the American people for it. The administration should state clearly that we are engaged in nation building. We are constructing the future in Iraq, and it is a complicated and uncertain business. The days when Americans could win battles and come home quickly for a parade are over. And when some in the Pentagon talk about quick exit strategies or say dismissively that they don't do nation building, they are wrong.

This comes from a Republican, highly regarded and well respected. It is important that we are doing this here tonight so the American people know that, so they hear the truth.

Mr. EMANUEL. The fact is among us four we had different opinions and votes on whether we should or should not go to war, whether there was a case for a war.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I voted against the resolution. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL) voted to support it, as did the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL); and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) voted against it.

Mr. EMANUEL. But we are united in our view that an administration should not mislead the America people; that a person who gave the President the wrong information needs to be held accountable because all of our reputations are on the line when the President of the United States is talking to the world with our judgment and justification. Second, that as we plan for this occupation, that if we had done the hard work of building allies on the

front end, we would have allies on the back end. And that the only faces in the occupation are American and British and others, but dominantly American, and, therefore, Americans bearing this burden alone, which it should not, in both financial and human costs.

□ 2230

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Speaker, if I can follow up on the comments of the gentleman, I certainly agree with him that we need to internationalize the postconflict situation in Iraq. We are bringing on ourselves the frustrations of those people. We do not have anyone sharing the burden other than the British. We do not have anyone else sharing responsibility or blame for things that are going wrong.

We need to bring in NATO to help with peacekeeping. We need to bring in the United Nations to help with reconstruction. And, obviously, the United States would be the major partner in both of those operations. We still would be very deeply involved, but we would have international allies and international institutions to help with resources and to help with credibility and to help with responsibility for the work that needs to be done.

We need to turn over to the Iraqis as quickly as possible two things: One, their oil; and, secondly, their government. We need to make sure that the Iraqi oil industry is transparent, corruption-free, and the proceeds from which are used to rebuild Iraq. And we have to turn over to the Iraqis their own government. We are moving way too slowly to do that.

Paul Bremer, the viceroy occupier, I am not sure what his title is, has postponed repeatedly the formation of an Iraqi interim government. He is now calling it an advisory committee that he will appoint to advise him. I do not think that is the way to give the Iraqis the stake in their future government that they expect and deserve.

Mr. EMANUEL. If I can add one thing to this debate before I need to go. I remember during the Reagan administration there was an open public discussion between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, which continued in years past, about the fact that we could not get into a military operation without an exit strategy. And I think it would behoove all of us in this institution, regardless of party or regardless of position, if we could define what the exit strategy is. What is the test? What is the standard?

When we have 70 deaths in 69 days, and some people, I think Senator LUGAR noted that we have to level with the American people we are here maybe 5, 10 years, that does not sound very convincing for an exit strategy and a standard that says here is when we know we are done. We cannot just say to the American people that we will know when we are done when we are done. We cannot have an open-ended checkbook and an open-ended sense of lives that are to be lost.

Again, I remind my colleagues that these are the days that are supposed to be flowers and kisses and hugs. A year from now we are supposed to be experiencing what we are experiencing today. Not today.

Mr. HOFFEL. Before the gentleman leaves, let me ask him if he has been able to figure out what strategy the President was pursuing last week when he suggested, in the face of the guerilla attacks and ambushes and assassinations of American soldiers, that our opponents should "bring 'em on?" Could any of the gentlemen joining me on the floor today tell me what they think the President's strategy was with that comment?

Mr. EMANUEL. As a former staff person who worked for a President, I believe that every staff person in that White House who was sitting on the side cringed when they heard that, because you cannot but think that there was a President whose rhetoric got ahead of where the policy is and what they were saying.

Nobody would ever suggest that our men and women in uniform, who are doing all of us proud, should be the focus of further attacks, this notion of "bring 'em on." We have lost 70 Americans in 69 days. There are other Americans we have lost in this whole battle, but 70 Americans who are fathers, who are mothers, who are brothers, sisters, who are Boy Scout coaches, leaders in their community, YMCA leaders. And the notion that somebody would sit here in the comfort of our great country in our capital and say "Bring 'em on" to our soldiers I think misses what they are facing every day. And I think it was a very, very unfortunate choice of words.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman would yield a moment further in that regard and in that context, I do think that the response to the gentleman's question is that the President, and my point to my colleague is, I wonder if he could corroborate or whether he would agree that the President, at least in my estimation, has said that this is wide open; that this does not have an end; that the calculations will be made on essentially an ad hoc basis; and that there is nothing that he can foresee at this moment that would lead us to the kind of exit strategy conclusions that the gentleman has raised.

Mr. EMANUEL. Well, my worry is not only do we not know the standard for our exit, and that before you get into any military engagement, you should know what your exit strategy is; that because we have 168,000 troops based now in all of Iraq, with no ability of any ally to come and replace our troops at a serious level, that our forces are stretched thin when it comes to the war on terrorism because of their occupation and being tied down in the deserts of Iraq.

Now, I think we are there, and we have to help turn this country around, but clearly now our troops are being targeted from guerilla warfare and

from terrorists. Our ability to do what we need to do around the world, both in Afghanistan and other corners of the world, our resources are being stretched thin and spread thin when it comes to the war on terrorism.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman mentioned Afghanistan, and I know he has another appointment, but let us review for a moment where we are in terms of Afghanistan.

How long have we been in Afghanistan? We are talking years already. And yet what progress have we made in Afghanistan? The American people should be aware of the fact that it is a mess. The President of Afghanistan, President Karzai, whom we supported from the beginning, is unable to travel throughout Afghanistan. He is just about able to leave the central district of the capital city of Kabul. We did not conclude our work there before we took on another military intervention of a much different magnitude, much larger size, when we went into Iraq.

As has been stated by all three of my colleagues tonight, America's word is at risk here. If we just go back again to the quality of the intelligence, I do not want to leave the impression with those who are watching this conversation that we are having tonight that this is, again, exclusively restricted to Democrats. These are concerns that are shared across the aisle. This is simply too important. Decisions were made regarding whether to wage war based on this intelligence, and, clearly, that is, in our democracy, a question of the most serious consequence, to wage war.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. May I follow up in that context?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Certainly.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Today, as I am sure my colleagues will acknowledge, and not everyone who is observing us and listening tonight may be aware, we passed a defense appropriations bill from this House. If anything should reflect the concern of the administration with regard to the issues of resolving the consequences of our attack in Iraq, it should be contained in here.

I have, for my colleagues' information, Mr. Speaker, referring to the House Action Reports, a Congressional Quarterly publication, a fact sheet edition published today on defense appropriations. In it, section 3 addresses military personnel. It includes things like a military pay raise and a civilian Defense Department pay raise. Active Duty personnel are listed at 1,388,100 in fiscal year 2004, equal to the President's request of 1,600 less than the current level. On Reserves, the bill sets a ceiling on Reserve personnel for a total of 863,300 in the next fiscal year, equal to the administration's request of 1,258 less than the 2003 level.

Now, think about it. We now have 150,000 plus people committed in Iraq under the circumstances and conditions that have been discussed here tonight, personnel deployed throughout

the world, not just in Afghanistan, but the Philippines, Yemen, and dozens of places, now possibly in Liberia, again under circumstances that are not clear as to where we are going, what we are doing, and who we are doing it with.

The President says, "Bring 'em on," but here is the congressional responsibility and obligation as manifested in the appropriations which follow on our authorizing personnel. And what we are saying is, is that the same deployments that have been taking place up until now, which have put such an enormous strain on the Guard and Reserves are going to continue. We are not adding a single person. We are not facing with any respect whatsoever the realities of what these deployments and the obligations attendant upon them will require of us.

That is why we are here in the evening during these Special Orders trying to reach out to the American public to explain that we are not quiescent on this. We are not merely observers. We are trying to participate in a respectful and responsible way as Members of Congress. But we have to rouse the attention of the American people to let them know that we are failing those men and women in the armed services if we think for a moment that we are providing adequate support and foundation for what we expect of them.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would say to my colleague that that is only half the story. When those men and women come home, when they are discharged from Active Duty, and when they assume the title of veteran, what are we doing to them then? What are we doing to them then? Well, what we are doing to them is, in some respects, discriminating against them. We are creating new categories of veterans who no longer will have access to veterans health care. That is unconscionable.

We send them to war, and when they come home, we reduce their benefits and, in fact, eliminate some of these heroes and heroines from having access to health care provided by the Veterans Administration. That is shameful.

Patriotism is more than just simply raising the flag. The flag represents respect, respect especially for men and women who serve this country in the military, and we are disrespecting and dishonoring them. That is wrong.

Mr. HOEFFEL. If the gentleman will yield on that point, is he aware that the Bush tax cuts in 2004 will reduce revenues about \$60 billion, and that for \$1 billion we could fully fund our obligations to all of the veterans, including category 7 and category 8 veterans, so that they all would get the health care that we promised all veterans?

We are \$1 billion short. Now, \$1 billion is a lot of money.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But when it comes to Iraq, we are going to be sending hundreds of billions of dollars, as the gentleman from Illinois indicated, to build schools, to provide health care, and to provide deepwater ports, but we cannot take care of our own veterans.

Mr. HOEFFEL. The gentleman is correct. We are appropriating \$29 billion next year for veterans health care. We need \$30 billion to meet all of our obligations, our moral obligations, and we are not measuring up, and it is wrong.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman would yield in turn, to follow up on my point in regard to our analysis, or rather not so much an analysis, I daresay, but our observation that these offhand remarks, these ad hoc remarks by the President, which take on the weight of policy, such as "Bring 'em on," this kind of childish assessment of what constitutes the ground operations in Iraq, are now followed by an observation of the President that Mr. Taylor, the President in Liberia, has to go.

Now, where he is going and how he is going and under what circumstances is not said. And the questions from the press, the press which is absent, which do not appear, at least as far as I can tell; now, whether or not people in the White House are so covetous of being in the White House that they do not dare ask the question that anybody with any journalistic bent worthy of the name would ask, just who is supposed to replace Mr. Taylor when he does go, wherever you think he should, provided you have got that far?

□ 2245

Mr. Speaker, the reason I raise this issue and the reason I raise it in the present context is if you think we had no planning in Iraq, I can tell you now and tell the American people and tell my colleagues we do not have a clue or an idea of what we will do in Liberia in terms of who will replace Mr. Taylor and who will prevail when he leaves.

Now, are we to send in not tens of thousands of, but perhaps hundreds of, American soldiers into a situation that we do not have the slightest idea, nor has there been any discussion in the Congress about what we are going to do, how, when or why we are going to do it, and what the circumstances will be upon the action taken.

Now, I for one admonish all of us to take into account where we are now in Iraq and remember that we face exactly the same circumstances in terms of lack of forward-planning policy with regard to Liberia, and the consequences could be just as severe. The numbers might be different, but the situation is the same. We have an administration now that thinks that military action in and of itself constitutes political policy. Furthermore, support for the troops is then defined as being support for whatever political agenda they have. Now, that is what we are facing this evening.

No one can say if only for the fact that we appear here on the floor tonight that due warning has not been given to the American public by Members serving in the Congress of the United States that we should have a full debate with respect to what we are going to do in Liberia, most particularly in the wake of what is taking

place in Iraq, and that before any action is taken in Liberia, the will of the Congress has to be determined.

I would hope that we take the most serious and sober view before we commit American troops in furtherance of a political agenda, and that political agenda is made manifest for the world to judge on the basis of action by American troops.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think we need to learn our lessons and learn them well and ask the questions that need to be asked and avoid the taunts and the arrogance that can get us into a lot of trouble when we fail to think things through.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that editorial opinion is focusing on the President's comments and on the post-conflict realities in Iraq. The Philadelphia Inquirer on Sunday in response to the President's comments about "bring it on" in their lead editorial title "Bring Reality On," said continued hubris in high places heightens risks for U.S. soldiers in Iraq. The Inquirer asks: "Mr. President, do you live in a playhouse or the White House? Childish taunts such as that are not the calibrated words demanded of the United States President at this turn of history's wheel." And the Philadelphia Inquirer goes on to make several points about the reality that is needed in our policy.

First, they say get real about the number of U.S. troops needed to establish and maintain order for months to come; get real about the full scope of reconstructing Iraq, its costs and duration; get real about cutting taxes. The incumbent is the only President, the Inquirer says, in the Nation's history to cut taxes in the middle of a hot war. They say get real about spurning the value of the United Nations; get real about the democratic aspirations you unwisely inflated among the long-oppressed, divided Iraqi population; and get real about admitting mistakes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, obviously we all make mistakes, but it is important to acknowledge the making of mistakes. I would submit that if Secretary Powell had information that was available to him a week after the President of the United States in his State of the Union message referenced the sale of uranium by an African country to Saddam Hussein, then it is almost inconceivable that the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, would not have had a conversation with the President suggesting or informing him that he did not find that information reliable in terms of his presentation to the United Nations; and yet for 6 months the White House, the President, has continued to insist on the reliability of the intelligence that he selected when he made his presentation to the American people.

The complaints are not coming just from this side of the aisle, but are coming from the intelligence community. Even the top U.S. Marine officer in

Iraq, General James Conway, said U.S. intelligence was simply wrong in leading the military to believe that the invading troops were likely to be attacked with chemical weapons. I respect the general for making that statement; and it is time that the administration, the President and those who, upon review, discovered that the premises and the facts that supported those premises were inaccurate or incorrect, it is time to acknowledge them and restore the confidence of the American people and the people of this world in the integrity of the United States and its leadership.

These are just some quotes from intelligence officials, individuals who have no particular partisan axe to grind, and these are reports from the New York Times, and I am quoting, "As an employee of the Defense Intelligence Agency, I know how this administration has lied to the public to get support for its attack on Iraq. Some others see a pattern not so much of lying as of self-delusion and of subjecting the intelligence agencies to these delusions."

Another quote, "The American people were manipulated," bluntly declares one person from the Defendant Intelligence Agency who says that he was privy to all of the intelligence on Iraq. "These people are coming forward because they are fiercely proud." He is referring to intelligence analyses at the Defense Intelligence Agency, and those that are watching should be aware that there are many intelligence agencies, but this is the consensus of their opinion, that they are fiercely proud of the deepest ethic in the intelligence world, that such work should be nonpolitical and are disgusted at efforts to turn them into propaganda.

This is from an individual who retired in September after 25 years in the State Department. His name is Greg Thielmann, and he spent the last 4 years of his public service in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, and these are his quotes: "The al Qaeda connection and nuclear weapons issues were the only two ways that you could link Iraq to an imminent security threat to the United States, and the administration was grossly distorting the intelligence on both things."

The outrage among the intelligence professionals is so widespread that they have formed a group, an association, called the Veteran Intelligent Professionals for Sanity, and they wrote to President Bush this past month to protest what they called, and again this is their language, "a policy and intelligence fiasco of monumental proportions."

I am quoting from their letter: "While there have been occasions in the past when intelligence has been deliberately wopped for political purposes, never before has such wopping been used in such a systematic way to mislead our elected representatives into voting to authorize launching a war."

A comment by Larry Johnson, one of those talking heads that we always see on those cable programs, he used to be a CIA analyst and worked at the State Department, referring to the low morale among the intelligence community: "I have never heard this level of alarm before. It is a misuse and abuse of intelligence. The President was misled. He was ill-served by folks who are supposed to protect him on this. Whether this is witting or unwitting, I do not know."

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman is aware that there is a perfectly rational reason why the White House admitted this week that they made a mistake with the President's State of the Union speech in which he claimed Iraq was trying to buy uranium from Africa. The reason that the White House had to finally admit their error is they were basing this on British intelligence, and the British system has resulted in an open inquiry where British parliamentarians have investigated and continue to investigate the question of the accuracy of their intelligence prewar, and the uses of that intelligence by the Blair administration.

They have concluded that while Prime Minister Blair did not himself mislead the public, that this information regarding the purchase of uranium in Africa was simply wrong and was based on forged documents.

This White House could no longer maintain the fiction that there was any basis in anybody's intelligence reports that Saddam Hussein was trying to buy uranium in Africa, and they simply had to because of a more open system in England where their Parliament has been more aggressive than this Congress. They had to face reality.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am sure that C-SPAN viewers have witnessed those hearings. Sources and methods were protected. No State secrets were given out. It was a respectful discourse; and it informed the British people, a people, by the way, who sent men and women into combat with the United States. But I do not believe that is the only reason, and I am directing this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) because while they admitted it today, ironically Sunday there appeared an article in the New York Times written by the individual, a former ambassador who, on behalf of the CIA, went to Nigeria to investigate this assertion that, according to some newspapers, came via the Italian intelligence service, and what he has to say in his words, one might draw the inference prompted this response today by the White House. Some might claim it to be an effort at damage control. But his name is Joseph Wilson, and the article is entitled "What I Didn't Find In Africa."

He starts it by saying, "Did the Bush administration manipulate intelligence about Saddam Hussein's weapons programs to justify an invasion of Iraq? Based on my experience with the administration in the months leading up

to the war, I have little choice but to conclude that some of the intelligence related to Iraq's nuclear weapons program was twisted to exaggerate the Iraqi threat."

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read the whole article, but it is extraordinarily informative. Maybe we can do it here in the United States as well as they can do it in the United Kingdom.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure our colleagues as well as those who may be observing and listening to us that we do not intend to make this a 1- or 2- or 3-time deal.

□ 2300

This is not two or three Members of Congress off on some individual crusade. We are not here simply to recount those things with which we have a disagreement. What we feel very strongly about is what I believe is the views of the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States and most certainly those who have talked to me about that Members of Congress have not stepped up to the plate with regard to the discussion of these issues in illuminating what is at stake for this country, and that right now some of these corporation-controlled media networks and the organs of the executive government are controlling the message that is out there, and only free men and women, freely elected with the faith and trust of the electorate, the people have put us into these positions of trust here in the people's House.

It is up to us with that kind of an obligation placed upon us by the people to speak out and to speak up, to speak forthrightly, to speak with as much knowledge as we can bring to bear, to exercise such judgment as we are able to bring to bear, and to keep the people of this country informed, and to let them know that we will not be silenced in this, that we are going to be back night after night after night, and that if we cannot get these issues discussed during the regular business of the day, then rest assured we will be here in the Special Orders that are given to us here in the people's House to make certain that the hammer of truth is going to come down on the anvil of inquiry that is required of a free people in a democratic society.

We are going to return here again. We invite our colleagues to engage in this colloquy. We invite our colleagues to come forward and express their views. We invite our colleagues to come forth and make inquiry of one another so that we can be better informed ourselves, so that we do not have a circumstance that comes to fruition again in this Nation such as we experienced in Vietnam.

If anything motivates me to be down here on this floor, I see parallels. I am not drawing analogies, but I see parallels, distinctly fearful parallels, to what took place in Vietnam in which we were urged to keep quiet, in which we were urged not to say anything for

fear it would be called dissent, as if there was already an understanding as to what the correct position should be when it comes to issue of life and death as we face now in Iraq and other places where American troops are deployed.

I believe it is an absolute necessity of democracy that we have the fullest and freest and the deepest and with the widest breadth of discussion that it is possible to have, and that is what we are going to be doing on this floor.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, we would be derogating our duty. And I applaud the eloquence and the obviously genuine commitment that the gentleman from Hawaii just respected. We would not be honoring our obligation, and additionally we would be failing those members in the military that have fought as well as they have, and we would be failing those individuals in the Intelligence Community that have expressed their views.

It brings to mind a story that again appeared in the newspapers shortly before we broke, I think it was the day that we broke, where someone stood up and testified before a House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. There was a number of intelligence officials within this closed hearing. Of course, it appears in the press, so I can speak about it. And this individual's name is Christian Westerman, and he happens to be a top State Department expert on chemical and biological weapons, and he told the committees that he had been pressed to tailor his analysis on Iraq and other matters specifically pertaining to Cuba to conform with the Bush administration's views. That is unacceptable. He is viewed within the Department, according to reports, as a careful and respected analyst of intelligence. He served in the Navy, and he was obviously not comfortable making that statement, but that kind of courage is important if we are going to ascertain the truth.

And whatever the truth is, the American people deserve the truth, and it is our responsibility to make every effort that we can to seek it. And I want to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I actually wrote those words down. "The hammer of truth will be brought down on the anvil of inquiry," and that is our job. It is our challenge here. It is not unpatriotic to ask questions. It is not unpatriotic to seek accountability. It is not unpatriotic to dissent. In fact, it is the highest form of patriotism to seek the truth, to ask questions, to try to get to the bottom of this in the name of the American people.

I know our time is short. Mr. Speaker, does either gentleman have any concluding remarks?

The gentleman from Hawaii I thank for being here.

The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if at some point in the future, and

we should discuss this with other Members of the House, but I for one would like to extend an invitation to some of our colleagues who serve in the Parliament, in the House of Commons, to come to the United States, or maybe some of us to go there to further this discussion, because I was so impressed with British democracy after viewing on C-SPAN those hearings that we have alluded to tonight. And there is real deep concern among the British, and it is clear that it is having an impact in Britain to a far more significant degree, unfortunately, than it appears to be having in this country. Maybe at some point in time, because I really believe it is necessary to have an independent commission depoliticize this issue, take it out of the realm of partisan politics.

Yes, there are congressional committees going on, but we know that there was an independent commission that was chaired by former Senator Rudman and former Senator Gary Hart that, unfortunately, they examined national security and just about predicted the events of September 11. It is so important to restore the confidence of the people in our national security, in our system. I think that happens to be the answer, but I would really welcome the input from the members of Parliament, from the House of Commons that sat in on those hearings to come and give us their observations.

I was particularly impressed with former Minister Robin Cook and a female former member by the name of Claire Short. I would think that if we invited them, they would come here, and hopefully the American media, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) have put up with, finally start to take a good look, because this is an issue that is not going to go away because it is about time that we reflected and began to see ourselves as others are viewing us if we are going to continue to claim a certain moral authority in this world.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would only add it would also be nice if we could be joined by our friends across the aisle in some of these discussions during these special orders. I thank my colleagues for being part of this discussion.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on the Special Orders matter related to Post-Conflict Iraq and the U.S.-U.N. involvement therein. I ask that our colleagues remember that two wars and over a decade of sanctions have crippled Iraq's infrastructure. With respect to the events that led to the need for Iraq rebuilding, I renew my concerns that there has been an apparent break down in U.S. intelligence as to the search for Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) that suggests that the current administration may have misled the public in order to garner support of the war in Iraq. Secondly, because the international community looks, in large part, to the United States as the nation with the best ability to aid in the job of rebuilding Iraq, it is important that our leadership respect its humanitarian needs, especially of the

right to self-determination and ensure that these needs take precedence over capitalistic prospect. Moreover, as will be evidenced by my introduction of a bill to authorize the formation of a women's peace commission, I strongly advocate the involvement of women in the peace and rebuilding process in leadership capacities. In fact, not only should the women's peace commission be composed of Members of Congress, American small, minority, and women-owned businesses should also be active in the rebuilding process.

As to the potential misleading of the public as to the U.S. motive for waging war on Iraq, I will offer a resolution calling for the establishment of an independent commission to study the performance of U.S. intelligence agencies in gathering and disseminating intelligence on WMD in Iraq, the current administration's knowledge of WMD in Iraq, and the accuracy of the information given to the public. During a Presidential address on March 17, 2003, President Bush stated, "Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised." Thereupon, the administration initiated Operation Iraqi Freedom on March 19, 2003. Although the public justification for this war was Saddam Hussein's alleged possession of WMD, we have seen nothing to date in the form of WMD in Iraq. This failure to locate any WMD in Iraq or any evidence that WMD have been destroyed or relocated strongly suggests the U.S. intelligence's inaccuracy or the inaccurate communication of this information to the public. At this point, thorough assessment of the performance of U.S. intelligence agencies with respect to the gathering of information as to WMD will be required to restore public confidence in the American Government before we are in a position to efficiently offer genuine aid in the rebuilding process of Iraq.

The United Nations (U.N.) has been in the nation-building/rebuilding business on a worldwide scale for over a decade: East Timor, Cambodia, Kosovo, Bosnia, Haiti, and to some extent El Salvador, Guatemala, and parts of Africa. Although the U.N. has experts and experience, it does not have sufficient resources in which to undertake the task of rebuilding Iraq. While, as I mentioned above, the international community looks to us for the lion's share of support resources, we must yield to the U.N. as a legitimizer of a new order in Iraq. Legitimacy through international alliances and high overt purpose is vital to an effective rebuilding process. The U.N. power is that bestowed upon it by its member-nations; however, it has great capacity to bestow legitimacy to this effort. In obtaining legitimacy through the U.N., we must not abuse the interest in self-determination of the Iraqi people. All ameliorative efforts should aim toward the goal of facilitating Iraqis in running their own trials without the involvement of U.N. international expertise. Furthermore, the United Nations will aid the effort to build internationally acceptable electoral machinery and run elections for the rebuilding nation. Experienced U.N. advisers could remain in government ministries, for years if necessary, without creating looking like an occupation.

As to the method of rebuilding Iraq, I have suggested the creation of a bipartisan, bicameral working group on Iraqi reconstruction. I proposed the convening of an immediate

working group to craft a comprehensive strategy for the reconstruction of Iraq. I am deeply troubled by the reports we are receiving from Iraq. The picture that was painted for us before the war—what we would find and how the Iraqi people would respond to being "liberated"—seems to be wholly inaccurate. It seems that our forces, as well as the American people, were unprepared for the challenges we are now facing. It is essential that we develop a truer vision for the future of Iraq, and a realistic plan for making that vision come to be. Doing so will demand all the expertise and experience that Congress has to offer.

To tap into those skills, we should form a working group, composed of a diverse array of qualified and committed Members of Congress. Conceptually, we must immediately dispense with partisanship and turf-wars and come together to form a plan that is right for our troops, right for the people of Iraq, and worthy of support and financing by the American people. We do not have the luxury of time to start this discussion in both the House and Senate, a dozen committees, and then assimilate ideas later. So, I propose that we convene a joint House-Senate bipartisan working group on Iraq.

Since tensions began to escalate in Iraq last year, I have consistently fought for resolving the crisis with four goals in mind: minimizing the loss of American lives; minimizing the impact on the Iraqi people; minimizing the costs to the American taxpayers; and ensuring that our work in Iraq leads to long-term peace and stability in Iraq and the Middle East. I believe that those of us against the war, as well as those who supported it, can all agree on those four principles. We owe it to our troops and to the people of Iraq to acknowledge the problems that exist, and to make the investments of time and money necessary to get the job done—so we can bring our troops home.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. FROST (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and July 9 on account of official business.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family emergency.

Mr. SANDLIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of traveling with a congressional delegation to Iraq.

Mr. GOSS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and July 9, 10, 14, and 15.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and July 9 and 10.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and July 9.

Mr. KOLBE, for 5 minutes, today and July 9.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 9, 2003, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3009. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions (Multiple Chemicals) [OPP-2003-0179; FRL-7311-5] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3010. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flufenacet (N-(4-fluorophenyl)-N-(1-methylethyl)-2-[[5-(trifluoromethyl)-1,3,4-thiadiazol-2-yl]oxy]acetamide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0181; FRL-7313-9] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3011. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0133; FRL-7306-8] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3012. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0088; FRL-7308-6] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3013. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1 Proteins and the Genetic Material Necessary for their Production in Corn; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2003-0154; FRL-7310-1] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3014. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diallyl Sulfides; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2003-0134; FRL-7303-6] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3015. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Famoxadone; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0130; FRL-7310-9] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3016. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0135; FRL-7313-7] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3017. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerance; Technical Correction [OPP-2003-0155; FRL-7316-5] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3018. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Tolerance Nomenclature Changes; Technical Amendment [OPP-2002-0043; FRL-7308-9] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3019. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Tolerance Nomenclature Changes; Technical Amendment [OPP-2002-0043; FRL-7316-9] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3020. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for emergency FY 2003 emergency supplemental appropriations; (H. Doc. No. 108—98); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3021. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Tommy R. Franks, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3022. A letter from the Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on the Utilization of Industrial Partnerships within the National Nuclear Security Administration, Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3023. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Federally Enforceable State Operating Permit Program; Allegheny County, Pennsylvania [PA 138-4098a; FRL-7511-7] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3024. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Credible Evidence [SIP NO. CO-001-0075a; FRL-7512-7] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3025. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah; SIP Renumbering [SIP NO. UT-001-0048, UT-001-0049, FRL-7501-5] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3026. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; 1-Hour Ozone Standard for San Diego, California [CA-282-0389; FRL-7515-4] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3027. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for California State Implementation Plan Revision [CA 086 SIP; FRL-7518-4] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3028. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interim Final Determination That the State of California Has Corrected Deficiencies and Stay and Deferral of Sanctions; San Joaquin Valley Ozone Non-attainment Area [CA286-0404B; FRL-7517-9] received June 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3029. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; State Implementation Plan Corrections [SIP NOS. CO-001-0052, CO-001-0032, CO9-3-5603; FRL-7503-4] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3030. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendments to the Control of Volatile Organic Compounds from Chemical Production and Polytetrafluoroethylene Installations [MD131-3091a; FRL-7503-7] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3031. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Regulation to Prevent and Control Air Pollution from the Emission of Sulfur Oxides [WV038/053-6026a; FRL-7500-2] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3032. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Regulation to Prevent and Control Particulate Matter Air Pollution from Manufacturing Processes and Associ-

ated Operations [WV050-6029a; FRL-7503-9] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3033. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Removal of Alternative Emission Reduction Limitations [PA158-4206a; FRL-7504-6] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3034. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Georgia Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [GA-200325; FRL-7500-9] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3035. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Approval of Revisions to Maintenance Plan for Northern Kentucky [KY 147-200329; FRL-7505-3] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3036. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee; Approval of Revisions to the Tennessee State Implementation Plan [TN-213-9952(a); FRL-7506-8] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3037. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA 267-0394a; FRL-7495-4] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3038. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [CA 264-0398; FRL-7505-5] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3039. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Utah; Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7505-1] received May 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3040. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Nitrogen Oxides Budget Trading Program [VA127-5064; FRL-7523-2] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3041. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Nebraska [NE 178-1178a; FRL-7523-1] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3042. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; State of Iowa [IA 186-1186(a); FRL-7523-4] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3043. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Regional Haze Rule to Correct Mobile Source Provisions in Optional Program for Nine Western States and Eligible Indian Tribes Within that Geographic Area [FRL-7522-7] received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3044. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that Iraq's declaration to the United Nations of December 7, 2002 has been transmitted to the House Select Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on International Relations.

3045. A letter from the Chairman, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for the period October 1, 2002 through March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3046. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 7E for Fiscal Years 2000 Through 2003 as of March 31, 2003," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3047. A letter from the Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2002 through March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3048. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's Report on Final Action as a result of Audits in respect to the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2002 through March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3049. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a correction letter on the approved retirement of General Tommy R. Franks, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3050. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3051. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the Month in Review: April 2003 Reports, Testimony, Correspondence, and Other Publications; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3052. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period ending March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3053. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 2002

Annual Report for the Office of Surface Mining (OSM), pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1211(f), 1267(g), and 1295; to the Committee on Resources.

3054. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on how the provisions of Section 428 of the Homeland Security Act, will affect procedures for the issuance of student visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3055. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report on the Feasibility of Accelerating the Integrated Deepwater System, pursuant to Public Law 107-296, section 888(i); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3056. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Water Quality Standards for Kansas [FRL-7522-5] (RIN: 2040-2A00) received July 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3057. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II and survivors of such veterans and extend health care benefits to certain Filipino veterans residing legally in the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3058. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the biennial report on the Montgomery GI Bill for Members of the Selected Reserve; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Select Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2122. A bill to enhance research, development, procurement, and use of biomedical countermeasures to respond to public health threats affecting national security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-147 Pt. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGULA: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2660. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 309. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 438) to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for teachers in mathematics, science, and special education (Rept. 108-189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committed on Rules. House Resolution 310. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2211) to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Rept. 108-190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 311. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2657) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-191). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 312. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2660) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-192). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 2660. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina:

H.R. 2661. A bill to name the Capitol Visitor Center after J. Strom Thurmond; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 2662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain limousines are not subject to the gas guzzler tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 2663. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Castle Nugent Farms located on St. Croix, Virgin Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 2664. A bill to provide for Medicare reimbursement for health care services provided to Medicare-eligible veterans in facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2665. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to protect the rights of employees to receive overtime compensation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 2666. A bill to authorize funds for fiscal year 2004 for research, development, test, and evaluation for a prototype multi-role, long-range sniper system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 2667. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the disclosure of certain information by persons conducting phone banks during campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 2668. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to direct the Great Lakes National Program Office of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop, implement, monitor, and report on a series of indicators of water quality and related environmental factors in the Great

Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2669. A bill to provide a model for school districts in the United States using and building on the experience of the District of Columbia in establishing fully accountable public alternatives to traditional public schools; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 2670. A bill to limit the reimbursement of travel expenses of the members and employees of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) (all by request):

H.J. Res. 63. A joint resolution to approve the "Compact of Free Association, as amended between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia," and the "Compact of Free Association, as amended between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands," and otherwise to amend Public Law 99-239, and to appropriate for the purposes of amended Public Law 99-239 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the urgency of providing support for the "Agreement on Ceasefire and Cessation of Hostilities Between the Government of the Republic of Liberia and Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy and the Movement for Democracy of Liberia", and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and encouraging prevention of stalking in the United States and supporting the goals and ideals of National Stalking Awareness Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H. Res. 308. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should actively pursue a unified approach to strengthen and promote the national policy on aquaculture; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MARKEY):

H. Res. 313. A resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the establishment of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps and

voicing the appreciation of the House of Representatives regarding the service of the members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. OTTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. BURNS.

H.R. 36: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 119: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 140: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 173: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 218: Mr. COX.

H.R. 284: Ms. HARMAN and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 290: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. HINCHY.

H.R. 303: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 369: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 384: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 461: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 466: Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 516: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 570: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 571: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COLE, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 676: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 687: Mr. WICKER and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 713: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 725: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 742: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 745: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 756: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 785: Mr. BURR, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 792: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 806: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 811: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 816: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 817: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 822: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 828: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 832: Mr. BELL and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 857: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 869: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 879: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 891: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 898: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 919: Mr. CARTER, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 934: Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 979: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 980: Mr. GORDON and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1075: Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 1078: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 1093: Mr. CAMP, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1137: Mr. PITTS and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 1157: Mr. DINGELL, Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1167: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1173: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1196: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1236: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1259: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 1266: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1268: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1288: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1295: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1301: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1310: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 1355: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1359: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1418: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1421: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1430: Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1435: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1464: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1472: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PENCE, Ms. HART, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 1473: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1482: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. HINCHY.

H.R. 1513: Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HALL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 1522: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1567: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1589: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1605: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1639: Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1657: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1659: Mr. LANTOS and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1652: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. OSE, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1671: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1710: Mr. GOODLATTE and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1748: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1807: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1839: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1863: Mr. BELL and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1865: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1873: Mr. MICHAUD and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1886: Mr. KIND and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1902: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1905: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1906: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1909: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1943: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1963: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1999: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 2011: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2020: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 2022: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 2028: Mr. CANNON and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2038: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2047: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 2052: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. JACKSON, of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 2075: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 2118: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 2193: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 2198: Ms. MAJETTE.
 H.R. 2205: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. COX, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. KIND, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FORD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2218: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2224: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 2232: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2250: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 2253: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H.R. 2262: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2272: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2291: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 2295: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 2300: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2318: Mr. RUSH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 2323: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 2347: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 2369: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 2377: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2379: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ROSS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 2418: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2426: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 2427: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 2437: Mr. HONDA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2440: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
 H.R. 2444: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 2445: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2446: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 2448: Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 2449: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 2455: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2462: Mr. TANNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 2464: Mr. OWENS and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2478: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 2482: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WU, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2491: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2497: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 2515: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 2517: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 2519: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 2532: Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 2538: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 2545: Mr. OWENS and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 2546: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2550: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2574: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 2578: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 2591: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 2631: Mr. GOODE and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 2632: Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 2637: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 2640: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 2655: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.J. Res. 11: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHAYS.
 H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HAYES, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BURNS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. STENHOLM.
 H.J. Res. 62: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. FROST, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. OTTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Con. Res. 130: Mr. FROST.
 H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. REYES and Mr. SKELTON.
 H. Con. Res. 215: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H. Con. Res. 217: Mr. PITTS and Mr. BELL.
 H. Con. Res. 229: Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 237: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. FLAKE.
 H. Res. 103: Mr. JANKLOW.
 H. Res. 238: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia,

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WYNN.

H. Res. 259: Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 280: Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 286: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 287: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 288: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 304: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1063: Mr. PALLONE.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2657

OFFERED BY: MR. MANZULLO

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to acquire manufactured articles, materials, or supplies unless section 2 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a) is applied to the contract for such acquisition by substituting—

(A) "Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives" for "head of the department or independent establishment"; and

(B) "at least 65 percent" for "substantially all"; or

(2) to enter into a contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work unless section 3 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10b) is applied to such contract by substituting—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) "at least 65 percent" for "substantially all"; and

(ii) "Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives" for "head of the department or independent establishment"; and

(B) in subsection (b), "Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives has made any contract containing the provision required by subsection (a) and" for "head of a department, bureau, agency, or independent establishment which has made any contract containing the provision required by subsection (a)".

H.R. 2660

OFFERED BY: MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ Section 2604(a)(1) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8623(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking "subparagraph (B)" and inserting "subparagraphs (B) and (C)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) Not more than 50 percent of amounts appropriated for carrying out this title for any fiscal year shall be provided for home heating purposes."

H.R. 2660

OFFERED BY: MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: In the matter relating to "ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES—LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE", after the second dollar amount, insert the

following: "(increased by \$200,000,000), to remain available until expended".

H.R. 2660

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON
AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . Federally recognized Indian tribes shall be eligible to the same extent as States are eligible for programs funded with amounts made available under this Act.