

how can they even claim that this war was justified?"

Mr. Chairman, this sounds like a lot of the things that are being said here today by some others talking tonight, but this was really a 1945 article that Reuters wrote about Germany during the time of America's reconstruction of Germany. We all know that Germany was a success. It was a success because America's troops were there to bring stability and security because we invested through the Marshall Plan in reconstructing Germany. If we think about Germany in the 50 years before 1945 that helped contribute to starting two world wars that caused millions of deaths, in the 50 years since then they have been a great friend, a supporter, and have brought prosperity and peace to the region.

We are well ahead of Germany in our reconstruction of Iraq in so many important variables such as naming a cabinet, such as reforming the currency and so many other things. Reforming Iraq, having a democratic government there and an open economy can transform that region; and that will not only be a great benefit to that region but a great benefit to our security here at home. Let us continue America's proud tradition of reforming as we did in Germany and Japan and continue on in Iraq; and I am confident that when we look back in a decade or two from now, we will be proud of the work that we are authorizing here today. I encourage support of the amendment.

[From Reuters, Aug. 12, 1945]

ADMINISTRATION IN CRISIS OVER BURGEONING QUAGMIRE

WASHINGTON.—President Truman, just a few months into his young presidency, is coming under increasing fire from some Congressional Republicans for what appears to be a deteriorating security situation in occupied Germany, with some calling for his removal from office.

Over three months after a formal declaration of an end to hostilities, the occupation is bogged down. Fanatical elements of the former Nazi regime who, in their zeal to liberate their nation from the foreign occupiers, call themselves members of the Werewolf (werewolves) continue to commit almost-daily acts of sabotage against Germany's already-ravaged infrastructure, and attack American troops. They have been laying road mines, poisoning food and water supplies, and setting various traps, often lethal, for the occupying forces.

It's not difficult to find antagonism and anti-Americanism among the population—many complain of the deprivation and lack of security. There are thousands of homeless refugees, and humanitarian efforts seem confused and inadequate.

In the wake of the budding disaster, some have called for more international participation in peacekeeping.

A Red Cross official said that, "... the German people will be more comfortable if their conquerors weren't now their overlords. It makes it difficult to argue that this wasn't an imperialistic war when the occupying troops in the western sector are exclusively American, British and French."

The administration, of course, claims that, given the chaos of the recent war, such a situation is to be expected, and that things will

improve with time. As to the suggestion to internationalize the occupying forces, the administration had no official comment, but an unofficial one was a repetition of the quote from General McAuliffe, when asked to surrender in last winter's Battle of the Bulge—"Nuts."

In an attempt to minimize the situation, a White House spokesman pointed out that the casualties were extremely light, and militarily inconsequential, particularly when compared to the loss rates prior to VE Day. Also, the attacks seem to be dying down with each passing month. But this statement was leaped upon by some as heartless, trivializing the deaths and injuries of young American men.

Many critics back in Washington seem now to be prescient with their previous warnings of just such an outcome a little over a year ago.

One congressman said that "... It's time to ask whether the German people are better off now than they were a few months ago. Yes, a brutal dictator has been deposed, but at least the electricity and water supply were mostly working, and the trains running on time. After years of killing them and destroying their infrastructure with American bombs, it seems to me that the German people have suffered enough without the chaos that our occupation with its inadequate policing, is bringing."

It's not clear how much support the Werwolf has among the populace, who may be afraid to speak their true minds, given the fearfully overwhelming "Allied" presence in the country. But it is possible that, like the guerrilla forces themselves, the people have been inspired by Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels' pre-victory broadcasts, and those of Radio Werwolf.

"God has given up the protection of the people ... Satan has taken command." Goebbels broadcast last spring. "We Werwolves consider it our supreme duty to kill, to kill and to kill, employing every cunning and wile in the darkness of the night, crawling, groping through towns and villages, like wolves, noiselessly, mysteriously..."

While no new broadcasts of Goebbels' voice have been heard since early May, no one can be certain as to whether he is alive or dead, and continuing to help orchestrate the attacks and boost morale among the forces for German liberation. As long as his fate, and more importantly, that of the former leader Adolf Hitler himself, remains unresolved, the prospects for pacifying the brutally conquered country may be dim.

Although Grand-Admiral Donitz made a radio announcement of Hitler's brave death in battle to the beleaguered German people on the evening of May 1, some doubt the veracity of that statement, and there has been no evidence to support it, or any body identified as the former Fuehrer's. Rumors of his whereabouts continue to abound, including reported sightings as far away as South America, and many still believe that he is hiding with the "Edelweiss" organization, with thousands of Wehrmacht troops, in a mountain stronghold near the Swiss border.

Many have criticized flawed intelligence for our failure to find him, causing some, in the runup to next year's congressional elections, to call for an investigation.

A staffer of one prominent Senator said, "For months, starting last fall, we were told by this administration that Hitler would make a last stand in a 'National Redoubt' in Bavaria. General Bradley diverted troops to the south and let the Russians take Berlin on the basis of this knowledge. But now we find out that there was no such place, and that Hitler was in Berlin all along. And now we're told that we can't even be sure of where he is, or whether he's alive or dead."

For many, marching in the streets with signs of "No Blood For Soviet Socialism," and "It's All About The Coal," this merely confirmed that the administration had other agendas than its stated one, and that the war was unjustified and unjustifiable.

General Bradley's staff has protested that this is an unfair criticism—that the strategic decision made by General Eisenhower was driven by many factors, of which Hitler's whereabouts was a minor one, but this hasn't silenced the critics, some of whom have bravely called for President Truman's impeachment, despite the fact that most of these decisions were made even before he became president in April.

But some have taken the criticism further, and say that failure to get Hitler means a failed war itself.

"Sure, it's nice to have released all those people from the concentration camps, but we were told we were going to war against Hitler, even though he'd done nothing to us," argued one concerned anti-war Senator. "Now they say that we have 'Victory in Europe,' but it seems to me that if they can't produce the man we supposedly went to war against, it's a pretty hollow victory. Without this man that they told us was such a great threat to America, how can even they claim that this war was justified?"

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under further debate the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, had come to no resolution thereon.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-320) on the resolution (H. Res. 396) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

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

for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004.

□ 2035

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 further debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, with Mr. SHIMKUS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, 3 hours and 27½ minutes remained in debate. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 1 hour and 36 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 1 hour and 51½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow we will vote on spending \$86.9 billion of America's taxpayers' hard-earned money on our on-going military operations and reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan. This massive request for supplemental funds brings home, to the pocketbooks of every American taxpayer, the cost of this administration's foreign policy. This administration has gotten us into a situation in Iraq that is both dangerous to our troops and critically important to our worldwide leadership. This situation is now so serious that it is less important that we arrived at this point by serious miscalculations, perhaps manipulations and half truths, than to understand that for us in this country "failure is not an option."

As Commander in Chief, the President committed our soldiers to this war, and now we must provide them with all the resources and support that they need. Our soldiers represent the best that this country has to offer, and their sacrifices should never be taken lightly or taken for granted. But the administration is also asking us to support reconstructing Iraq to the tune of \$18.6 billion, and this is only the beginning of what could be as much as \$70 billion in investments.

Mr. Chairman, if it is our responsibility to provide these services to rebuild Iraq, why are we along the southwestern border constantly told that there is not enough money to develop these services here at home? What about the responsibility to our own citizens? This bill includes \$4.3 billion to expand access to safe drinking water and improve sanitation while hundreds of thousands of our own people along our Nation's border do not have these services themselves.

This bill also includes \$793 million for health care programs and upgrades to

hospitals and clinics while cities like El Paso are in desperate need of these same services. And this bill includes \$5.7 billion to rebuild Iraq's electrical power infrastructure while hundreds of thousands of our own citizens here at home do not have electricity. If we can find the funds to support these projects in Iraq, the American people demand that we find the funds for their needs here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this supplemental request, but only, only because the safety of our brave men and women in uniform depends on it.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

I want to say I certainly appreciate the concern of our friends across the aisle about spending on this bill and spending on all bills. I think it is a great day when Democrats are worried about fiscal responsibility. Having said that, I have one of my good Blue Dog friends there who is always concerned about it, but I am glad now we have some other people who are.

I wanted to point out one of the arguments that we are hearing is we should be spending that money domestically. And this chart shows what our budget calls for in Medicare spending under the Republican budget, which is traditionally passed without a single Democrat vote.

Medicare takes care of our elderly population. Essentially everybody over the age of 65 is on Medicare; and under a Republican budget, as we can see, from the year 2004 on, it is going up. And yet this is happening without a single Democrat vote of support. Education, which again is one of those bills that is important to another population, the young population in our society, and again under Republican leadership and a Republican budget, it has gone up every year 12 percent. So when people are saying do not vote for this, that we ought to be spending it domestically, we are doing that.

What happens if we do not spend this money? What happens if we do like Howard Dean says and pull out? He said that yesterday. Tomorrow he will say something else. I cannot remember who was for the war today, Wesley Clark or Howard Dean. It switches back and forth on a regular basis. But the reality is what happens if we do pull out and stop right now? Will there be safety and security in the Middle East? We have to ask ourselves a very serious question: Will there be safety and security not just in Iraq but in the Middle East? If we pull out, will there be safety and security in the United States of America? What kind of signal does that send to the terrorist networks across the globe?

This is where the money goes. It supports our troops. I have the honor of

representing the Third Infantry Division. We have had nearly 18,000 constituents from the first district of Georgia who have been in Iraq. They need the support. This bill gives them that additional support. Last week I had the opportunity to go to Walter Reed and say thanks to a number of our troops, brave men who were wounded who are now in hospital beds who will be going through physical therapy and suffering from wounds perhaps the rest of their lives. Every single one of them was very gung-ho on the mission, very proud that he had served, and had no regrets. Obviously, everybody regrets getting hurt, but no regrets making the decision to go that they did. This bill gives our troops \$60 billion in support. They need it.

In addition, this bill supports the people of Iraq. It gives us an opportunity to have another democracy in the Middle East that we can work with along with Turkey, along with Israel. Another democracy in the Middle East. Can my colleagues think of that being in the grasp of the hands of this Congress and this government at this time and this generation, and how would our future generations look at us if we turned our backs and cut and run at this point? Mr. Chairman, we have got to finish the job. We cannot abandon them.

If we do not do this important construction, what will happen? We have got an example already. Some of this money goes to Afghanistan. Let us think about what happened in Afghanistan. The United States pulled out in 1989. We closed down our embassy, and I went with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) to Afghanistan about 3 years ago, and one of the things we heard over and over again in Afghanistan is, We are glad you are here, but are you here to stay? Because we have had this invasion from the Russians, we have had this internal civil war, we have had the groups like the Taliban and al Qaeda come in here and corrupt our government. Will America commit to Afghanistan for the long term? And the answer is yes. We also have to commit to Iraq for the long term.

Think about this: we are spending \$200 million on health care in Iraq. Saddam Hussein only spent \$13 million. That is support. Think about this: there are 150 newspapers that are already up and operating in Iraq, extremely important for an emerging democracy.

Think about this: electricity in 70 to 80 percent of the towns, water in 70 to 80 percent of the towns, and police forces and governing local municipalities springing up all over the place. These are positive developments, and we cannot abandon that right now. This construction money, a little over \$18 billion, though, is not enough. We need to do it in a grant form. Why do we need to do that as opposed to a loan? Number one, there is not a lending authority to give the money to;

but, number two, it is going to take not 18 to \$20 billion to rebuild Iraq. It is going to take about \$150 billion. We do not want to foot that bill. We believe the United States of America, being a leader in the world as a benevolent Nation, needs to step forward and set an example for all our friends who are in the U.N. or who are in NATO or wherever they may be to step forward and pull out their checkbooks.

□ 2045

Because this is not an Iraq problem. This is not a United States problem. This is not a Western problem. This is a global problem, because we have learned if you turn your back, like we did in Afghanistan, sit back and wait, another 9/11-type sneak attack will happen. But if we stay committed, we will have a great nation that we will have played a part in, and, for future generations, we can all look back proudly.

Vote yes for the supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very emotional issue. I come to the well with mixed emotions, simply because we are asked to do two things here: We are asked to stand up and support our troops, and, at the same time, we are asked to stand up and support our taxpayers.

I want to answer the first question quite frankly and straightforward, that I will vote for this supplemental based on the needs of our soldiers who are not into this political debate, but simply need equipment and support to do the job that our country sent them to do.

This bill provides \$65 billion out of the \$87 billion and provides needed funding for our troops. Part of this money is designed to go and purchase body armor to protect our soldiers. Part of this money is going to support continued payment of per diem for travel for family members.

I have just come from my district, and I realize the hardships being placed upon family members. There is an increase in the monthly rate of imminent danger pay in this budget from \$150 to \$225, and also for family separation.

Now, with that out of the way, it still remains a fundamental question that we must stand up for the taxpayer as well, and that is the convoluted position we are in. How do we stand up for our troops and support them in their needs for battle, to do the job that we sent them there to do? How can we not vote for these precious items that will protect their lives, including equipment to defuse ordinances away from land mines to save their lives? At the same time, we must speak up properly and effectively as good stewards of the taxpayers' money for the \$20 billion going for the reconstruction?

Many of us pleaded and worked hard to get this debate broken down along

two lines, because, yes, we must stand up for our troops. But we are Congressmen and women. We are elected to do one essential thing, more than any other, and that is make the decisions to determine how the taxpayers' money is spent.

I am here to tell you that this \$20 billion added on for the infrastructure rebuilding of Iraq is not good stewardship of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Concord, North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is not an either/or budget, this is a both/and; both supporting the troops, and supporting Americans at home.

Just one year ago this month, the House of Representatives found itself debating the authorization on the use of force against the regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq. At that time, Iraqi people were living under a tyrant, a brutal dictator who murdered, gassed and tortured his own people.

Saddam's reign of terror displaced some 700,000 people throughout Iraq, destroyed more than 2,000 Kurdish villages and killed thousands of Iraqis. This regime had more forced disappearance cases than any other country in the world. Iraqis were not free to practice their religion or express their political beliefs. Citizens lived in constant fear of a dictator whose image covered the Iraqi landscape. Saddam Hussein's regime was not a government of benevolence, it was a reign of unconscionable terror.

Today Iraq is a vastly different place. Children are attending school. Girls are taking karate classes. The Iraqi National Symphony has performed again after years of absence. Oil flow is back up to 72 percent of its prewar level. Markets are flourishing and a new Iraqi police force is being trained.

I would like to share a few thoughts about the hope currently present in the society written by Major Michael Fenzel of the 173rd Airborne Division.

"When you see soldiers on the street patrolling with the new Iraqi police officers, you know there is great hope. When you have seen the stark difference between the empty and frightened streets of early April and the bustling markets of today, you feel the hope. The well-publicized incidents of violence are spasms of resistance to a concept so compelling it cannot be denied, freedom. The attacks themselves are generated by a small bands of militants and hired guns at the behest of 'return party' chieftains and terrorist financiers. And when you have the chance to see the steely determination of American and coalition soldiers serving here through the heat of each day, you cannot help knowing that hope has already defeated tyranny."

We do, however, still have many challenges ahead of us. We continue to hear reports of American servicemen

giving their lives to help restore the peace in Iraq and the Middle East. Patience is required, but the cause is just, and even though the challenge is great, success is essential and achievable.

Today we are at a crossroads. We have the opportunity to continue our commitment to the Iraqi and Afghani people in restoring freedom, liberty, and dignity to their lives. We also have a responsibility to further support our men and women currently serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

While there remain many domestic matters that are a top priority, we must send a signal today that we are committed to helping build a safe, secure and democratic government in Iraq and Afghanistan. Stability in Iraq and Afghanistan is directly related to America's security at home and abroad. Failing to establish a safe and secure Iraq will allow the region to continue as an incubator and supplier for terrorists.

Winston Churchill said, "The price of greatness is responsibility." My friends, today we have the responsibility to do what is right, what is just, and what will help foster a safe and stable environment in the Middle East. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this Iraqi supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how I am going to vote on this. Two weeks ago, I visited Walter Reed Hospital, and I met young soldiers who had double amputations, severe burns and head injuries that will be with them for life. Sending those soldiers into the field without adequate body armor, without armored Humvees, was inexcusable, if not criminal. We must act to protect those soldiers right now.

But, I say to my friends, I have yet to hear the supporters of this supplemental say how they will pay for it. I will tell you right now, you can possibly get my vote if you will answer that question. I have only 2 minutes, less now, but I would yield at least 30 seconds to anyone who is supporting this bill if they will tell us how you want the American people to pay for it, when we are closing veterans hospitals, when we are \$600 billion in deficit every year, when our schools are falling apart, and we cannot rebuild our roads.

I yield 30 seconds to anyone who supports this bill to tell me how to pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, that is the problem. That is the problem. We want to make lots of promises, but we do not have leadership in the administration or in this body that will tell the American people the hard truth; what programs we have to cut, what taxes we have to raise, whether we will borrow from Social Security or whether we will pass the debt on to our children. That is the problem.

I am really sorry. We must support those troops. But they are fighting for