

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

a democracy that owes it to its people to be honest with them, honest about the tough choices we must make. But we are not living up to that bargain, and it is a darn shame, because those kids deserve better.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Highland Village, Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, in the last week in August of this year I was privileged to go with several of my colleagues to the country of Iraq. One of the things that sticks with me from that trip was the quote from General James Conway of the First Marine Expeditionary Force. He described to us what is going on in Iraq today as a "vivid success story."

The American soldiers who fought in Iraq did so with skill, determination and bravery in the face of grave dangers. Their conquest of Iraq was rapid, overwhelming, and the victory was obtained with relatively limited civilian casualties or damage to Iraq's infrastructure.

All Americans can be proud of the performance of our Armed Forces in Iraq, and we can unite in honoring of the memory of those courageous soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice to protect their fellow Americans.

Having overthrown Saddam's regime, we must now secure the peace. It is absolutely critical to the United States' national security that we help Iraq become a stable, free nation that does not support terrorism or pose a danger to its neighbors. A secure and free Iraq is in our country's national security interests, as it is in the world's security interests.

The road ahead is difficult, and every lost American life is a tragedy, but our troops' incredible sacrifices are helping to secure a safer future for our children, our grandchildren and, indeed, the children of the world.

It is also important to understand that the coalition forces in Iraq are making significant progress. Coalition forces have conducted over 190 raids in the past several months, capturing over 1,000 terrorists and enemy fighters. They have secured or destroyed over 8,000 tons of ammunition since major combat operations ended.

A new Iraqi police force and army are being trained and equipped right now. Additionally, Iraqis are gathering behind the new Governing Council that will have significant authority and will begin the process of drafting a new constitution for the Iraqi people.

Finally, the coalition is making significant progress in rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure, its public health services and its economy.

This much is certain: American troops will stay in Iraq as long as it takes to get the job done, and not a day longer.

On September 7, President Bush announced in a televised address to the Nation that he would submit to Congress a request for \$87 billion to cover

the ongoing military, intelligence and rebuilding operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere. \$67 billion is allocated for military purposes and \$20 billion is allocated for reconstruction.

This request will provide resources to the Iraqi and Afghan people so they will be able to rebuild their own nations which have suffered through decades of oppression and mismanagement, and, with that, a return to secure states. These funds would also restore basic services, such as electricity and water. Without those basic services, that can be an extremely radicalizing issue. They will build new schools, roads and medical clinics. Supporting reconstruction is essential to the stability of Afghanistan and Iraq and, therefore, to our own security.

I believe it is clear that we must support the Iraq supplemental. Congress has been diligent in its oversight efforts in analyzing the supplemental request. Both Houses of Congress have broken down, line-by-line, this request, and they have debated the importance of each item. Having completed this process, we must now determine how best to use those funds.

I would be most in favor of providing this assistance by means of loans. However, I recognize there are technical difficulties in administering funds in the way of a loan at this time and, therefore, as Congress exercises its oversight authority on the supplemental, we are obligated to provide assistance by means of a grant.

We should continue to stress that other countries be called upon for debt forgiveness and we must, we must, ensure that no taxpayer money, no American taxpayer money, will ever go to repay Iraq's foreign debt.

To that end, President Bush addressed the United Nations General Assembly on September 23 on the topics of terrorism, the future of Iraq and Afghanistan, and acting to meet the humanitarian crises throughout the world.

He stated that America is working with our friends and allies on a new U.N. Security Council resolution that would expand the U.N.'s role in Iraq to assist the development of a constitution, in the training of civil servants and the conducting of free and fair elections.

The resolution invites the Governing Council to submit its program and timetable for assuming additional responsibility in the months ahead, until Iraq is through the process of writing a constitution and holding elections. It also examines a role for the United Nations Secretary General and the special representative that is broader than their current roles.

The President believes that the aid should be global, and I completely agree. Leading the way, the United States should support the \$20 billion Iraq supplemental and look forward to many nations participating in the reconstruction efforts of Iraq in the future. The end result will be a new and

prosperous democracy in Iraq and, ultimately, a safer world for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE).

□ 2100

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the \$87 billion supplemental appropriation in its current form. It is with deep regret that I do so. I cannot vote for the request because it does not give the troops and the American people what they need.

We want a bill that more fully supports our troops and their families. Accordingly, I support the Obey substitute. We want a bill that honestly assesses what the military costs will be and protects the quality of life for all of the men and women who are serving so valiantly.

For example, the administration's request contains only \$15 million for water purification equipment. This will leave approximately 80 percent of the troops in Iraq without clean water. Our men and women deserve better. The Obey substitute addresses that issue.

We want a detailed accounting of the money that has been spent so far before handing out new money.

I look at this the way I treat my teenage sons. If I give them \$20 on Monday and then on Tuesday they come to me and ask me for \$30, I want to know what happened to the money I gave them on Monday.

We want a bill that will enable us to share the burdens and responsibilities of reconstruction with other nations and the people of Iraq and eliminate the back-scratching, good-old-boy, business-as-usual approach that this administration loves to use.

It has become clearer and clearer every day that the administration has no postwar plan for Iraq.

There is no exit strategy, only furloughs. America's men and women want to know when our husbands and wives and sons and daughters and partners and loved ones will come home.

We do need to finish what we started, but we cannot operate in the dark forever.

We want a bill that meets the obligation of shared sacrifice, one that puts equity and fairness in the equation. The men and women who wear the uniforms of the United States Armed Forces and their families are making sacrifices. Their level of sacrifice goes far beyond this administration's level of planning.

We want a bill that tells us how we are going to pay for the cost of freedom, and this bill does not.

As a Member of Congress, I have a constitutional obligation and responsibility to require that those conditions be met and that the administration be held accountable. Until the American people are presented with a bill that meets the requirements of accountability, transparency, and fiscal responsibility, I will vote "no" on the \$87 billion supplemental request.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Phoenix, Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), my friend and colleague.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this supplemental and in opposition to any effort to turn it into a loan.

On January 20, 1961, President John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address said these words: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty. This much we pledge, and more."

I would urge my colleagues that John F. Kennedy's words were true and right then, and they are true and right today; and they should guide this debate. When he spoke those words, we were engaged in a struggle with worldwide communism. Today, make no mistake about it: we are engaged in every bit as serious a struggle with those who would seek to destroy us: worldwide terrorism. And we must step up to the plate and finish this job.

Now, I know there is a debate of some whether we should have begun this war or not. But whether one supported the war from the outset or opposed it, and however one feels about those issues today, we have an obligation to finish what we have started. National defense is indeed the first obligation of our government; and as has been said on the floor here tonight, failure is simply not an option. It is critically important that we establish a stable, free, and democrat Iraq; and we cannot do that without this supplemental.

Now, some would divide it. Some would say, well, I will support the military side of these funds, but I will not support the funds for reconstruction. As also was said here earlier tonight, not only is that a dangerous distinction; it is a distinction which could cripple us.

I was in Iraq in August of this year. I spent 3 days in three different cities in that country; and I heard firsthand from our troops on the ground and their commanders that the reconstruction of Iraq, that the money to help the people of Iraq is critically important to our mission there and that without it, we cannot succeed. But, more importantly, our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), a Democrat, said it more eloquently in a debate we had here on the floor earlier this year when he said that he was in Vietnam when there was an effort by the locals to kill our troops, and he said, the best ally we can have in any war of that type are the locals, the people there. And he said, it is absolutely essential for our troops in Iraq today to have the support of the Iraqi people. So that when an improvised explosive device is planted by our enemies there, the terrorists who seek to kill us and to oppose us there get help from the local public.

Now, some also would say we should make this a loan, and I strongly oppose that idea. The reality is to make this a loan would send the exact wrong message. America must prove today that we are a strong and stable ally and that having committed to the people of Iraq to get rid of Saddam Hussein, we will remain until there is a strong and stable nation there. To make this into a loan now would prove what the world has said, and that is that we went there solely for our own purposes.

But there is a more important reason not to make it a loan. We will go to a donors conference in Spain in just a few days. If the United States is not willing to grant its funds without requesting repayment, no nation in the world will grant their funds, and we will burden the Iraqi economy and it will fail.

We have learned this history in the past. At the end of World War I, we failed to rebuild Europe and we paid the price for it. At the end of World War II, we agreed to rebuild Europe, and we had a long and stable ally. At the end of the struggle in Afghanistan to throw the Soviets out, we abandoned the people of Afghanistan. This lesson repeats itself through history.

I urge my colleagues, we owe it to the Iraqi people, we owe it to our friends in the Muslim world, we owe it to our grandchildren and their grandchildren to oppose terrorism in this world by proving that we are a strong and stable ally, that we are not there for just our interests. We are there to help the people of Iraq and the people of the Middle East, and we will not leave and we will not fall short of our commitment until a stable and strong government has been established in Iraq with a free and democratic people. And then the world will understand that America keeps its word.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental and to strongly oppose any amendment to make it a loan.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but respond to some of the previous speaker's comments. The previous speaker quoted accurately President Kennedy who said that we would "pay any price and bear any burden in the defense of freedom." That is a wonderful phrase. But my question is, what do you mean by "we," "we" will bear any burden?

I want to know who is bearing any burden in this society for this effort right now, except for the troops and their families. How much of a burden are the politicians in this Chamber bearing? They are not facing up to the tough choices that are necessary to finance this war. How much of a burden are we asking the most well-off and privileged people in this society to pay, when the majority party and the White House insist on guaranteeing that, despite the need to pay for the war, they will still, that top 1 percent of earners will still get on average a \$130,000 tax

cut, rather than the \$52,000 that they would get under the Obey amendment, those who make \$1 million a year I am talking about?

If we are going to quote John Kennedy, let us live up to the spirit of Kennedy's remarks and support shared sacrifice for everyone, not just those who are serving in the military.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Marietta, Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this emergency appropriation to pay for this ongoing war in Iraq.

The gentleman that spoke before me talked about taking exception to some of the comments that were made, and I want to do the same thing. As I sat here and listened and continue to listen to the debate, over and over again I hear this phrase, Mr. President, what is our exit strategy? Mr. President, what is our exit strategy? To me, exit strategy is nothing more than a euphemism for cut and run.

I do not think we need to remind the Florida Marlins last night that if they had an exit strategy at the end of the seventh inning, they would not have won that ball game. You do not pull your team off in the third quarter or the seventh or eighth inning of a ball game, no matter how far you are ahead. You are not thinking about an exit strategy; you are thinking about the determination and the will to win. That is really what we are talking about here in making this emergency appropriation to continue until victory is ours.

I am strongly in support of both parts of this bill. The \$66 billion for our troops, giving them the resources necessary to succeed in the war on terror and protect them from terrorist attacks, including, as an example, armored Humvees to better protect our forces, lifesaving body armor, equipment, weapons, ammunition, better housing for our troops, yes, and to continue the increased monthly rate of imminent danger pay and family separation allowances that this bill calls for. And then \$18.6 billion for the continued relief and reconstruction of Iraq. I do not think that this is any less important. As my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, said earlier in his remarks, this is an investment in democracy, security and law enforcement, justice, public safety, and a civil society, infrastructure, water resources, electrical generation, distribution infrastructure, roads and bridges, health care; and, yes, Mr. Chairman, it is important, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), mentioned at the outset of this discussion, this needs to be a grant and not a loan; and he gave us a good history lesson, as did the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

A loan with possible interest fees risks serious harm to America's image

in the Middle East and Iraq. Heavy debt repayments could become a destabilizing political issue in postwar Iraq and could easily be exploited by anti-American factions. It is likely that the Iraqi people will view the loan as a way for the profiteering American invaders to make money off of Iraq. A loan burden also would likely stifle any significant economic development in Iraq. With the added burden of interest payments to the United States, the Government of Iraq will be limited in its ability to invest in its new market-based economy.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot expect the Iraqi people to pick themselves up off of the ground if we have got a boot at the back of their neck. It is very important that this be a grant and not a loan. We cannot expect other countries that are debtor nations, some which are owed \$8 billion and \$10 billion from Iraq, and we can say that, well, that debt was with Saddam Hussein. Well, it was not Saddam Hussein who signed a personal note to secure that debt; it was the country of Iraq.

So I just want to say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that the people in the eleventh district of Georgia that I represent are very supportive of not only the ongoing military effort, and that will continue until we win the battle and then we will talk about an exit strategy, but they are also in favor of reconstructing the country of Iraq. I am fully supportive of this emergency appropriation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

□ 2115

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to talk about the brave men and women who are fighting in Iraq at this very moment, the hundreds who lost their lives and the thousands who have been wounded. Despite the fact that Congress appropriated \$310 million in April, nearly one-third of the troops in Iraq have not been issued vests that are strong enough to stop bullets from assault rifles, nor have they been issued hydration systems to protect them from the searing heat of the desert.

In fact, many families have resorted to sending protective bulletproof vests and Camelbak hydration systems to their sons and daughters stationed in Iraq. No family should be paying extra to keep their loved ones safe. The Federal Government has this responsibility. After all, who sent these young people to war in the first place? Certainly not their families.

In August of this year, Mr. Chairman, I stayed in Bethesda Naval Hospital where I visited with wounded men and women and their families who have never in their lives expected to be harmed the way they were and who

will never again experience the world in the same way as a result of this war.

We do not talk about the impact of this war. In fact, we do not talk about the impact of any war on the wounded and their loved ones. I met with individuals who had lost limbs, their sight, their hearing, parts of their beautiful faces, and we are not providing the best equipment available.

It is pretty simple: If we are willing to spend another \$65 billion to keep our troops in danger, then we must care enough to bring them home, bring them home safely, bring them home soon, and support them after the war.

Since I see no real commitment to doing this from the administration, and I see no real reason for being in Iraq in the first place, I will be voting no on the supplemental.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, would you give us the amount of time remaining on debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 1 hour 13½ minutes.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 1 hour and 39½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in very strong opposition to this \$87 billion installment payment on the war in Iraq. Like all of my colleagues, I support our troops. And I must remind my colleagues that I am the daughter of a career military officer, and, as such, I could do nothing less.

My heart and my prayers go out to our troops and their families. I want to see them safe at home. I want to see them reunited with their families as soon as possible. In the meantime, I want them to have the health benefits that they deserve, the bulletproof vests that they need, and the basic supplies that they have been denied.

I want to know that our wounded and that our veterans receive proper treatment and proper respect. But we do not protect our troops, and the Congress will not have done its job if we blindly sign this \$87 billion check. We have not had an accounting of how the last \$78 billion was spent. And we still do not have anything close to sufficient proof that the allegations raised by the administration that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States was real.

We do not have an exit strategy that leads the Iraqi people to control their own government, their own resources, and their own obligations that leads us out of this quagmire. We have none of this. We did not have to go down this path. We could have pursued containment and inspections, multilateralism and saved hundreds of American lives and potentially hundreds of billions of dollars.

We have urgent, unmet needs here at home. We have schools here that need

to be constructed and reconstructed, housing that needs to be built, and jobs that need to be created.

Mr. Chairman, 44 million Americans have no health insurance. We had choices before we went to this war, and we have choices now. We should not appropriate another cent without a clear vision of how and when the United Nations will assume real authority over the political and economic transition in Iraq and how and when American troops will come home.

As Dr. Martin Luther King said, even though this is not his birthday month we must remember what he said throughout the war, he said, "In the wasteland of war, the expenditure of resources knows no restraint."

Now, we owe it to our children and grandchildren not to mortgage their future. I will vote no on this bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise also in strong support of our men and women who currently serve us with their uniforms that they so proudly wear in Iraq and Afghanistan, but I also have serious concerns about the President's supplemental request.

The administration's \$87 billion request fails to outline what I believe is a concrete plan for our soldiers' and our country's involvement in Iraq. We currently have, as you know, over 40,000 troops in Iraq who lack protective body plates and about 46 percent of the spare parts the Army needs, but this bill has no plan to address these urgent needs. We also have about 37,000 noncitizen soldiers, many of whom come from our districts who serve in our military, including about 3,000 noncitizens who are serving right now in Iraq. These soldiers deserve to be granted citizenship since they are protecting and defending our country. But this bill has no outline or plan for expediting their citizenship.

This past weekend, Members, another one of my constituents, Private First Class Jose Casanova was killed in Iraq. He deserves a better plan. He deserves a guarantee that he is going to be taken care of and his family will be taken care of.

The Iraq supplemental outlines a \$21 billion reconstruction plan for Iraq, but we need reconstruction here at home. I say that because in the county that I represent, Los Angeles County, we are faced with over an \$800 million deficit that we will have to somehow pay for in the next 2 years. The deficit has caused the closures of 11 clinics, health clinics that will now deprive hundreds, if not thousands, hundreds of thousands of people without medical help and treatment in our districts. But this bill has no plan for reconstruction to restore those health clinics in our districts.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I rise today to say that I am strongly against

this appropriation and urge my colleagues to follow suit.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to one thing that was said by the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) when she said that there was no money in this bill that would protect our soldiers in Iraq. I am sure she just may not be aware, has not had time to examine the bill or the report carefully enough, but let me just remind my colleagues that, as contained in the report here, I am reading from the report, and this is the language that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the ranking member and the chairman of the defense subcommittees, who have three-fourths of the dollars put into this bill, and that is the language of their report, they say, "The committee recommends significant increases in this bill to purchase protective body armor, improve portable radio frequency jammers, spare parts, and other critical items."

Moreover, the committee directs the Department, and, in particular, the Army, to fully fund requirements identified under the Soldier Enhancement Program, the Centralized Funding and Fielding Activity, and other accounts designed to expeditiously field new equipment to soldiers.

The committee directs the Department to use funds approved in this measure to increase the availability of modern hydration systems to soldiers in the Iraq theater.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is simply not accurate to say that there is not money in this legislation which would enhance the protection and the quality of life of our soldiers who are serving us so well in Iraq. There is money in there, there is a significant amount of money in there. And the defense subcommittee has shown that it is very aware of the problems that have existed there and have addressed it with the legislation that we have before us this evening.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join many of my colleagues, patriots all, who are refusing to be rubber stamps for President Bush's failed policy in Iraq, who say "no" to an \$87 billion blank check for an ongoing war and occupation with no end in sight and no plan to get there.

I support our troops, and I am proud of their professionalism, dedication, skill and sacrifice. But because Americans awaken nearly every day to hear the name of another dead soldier, because I have met with our brave patriot soldiers who are now recovering from devastating wounds at Walter Reed, and because more than a billion is being borrowed every week to fi-

nance this war of choice, I feel an obligation to demand accountability before another cent is authorized at this time.

I, for one, will not be an enabler to an administration that clearly cannot be trusted with our treasure, our lives, and those of the Iraqi people.

The most galling part of this debate is that the Bush administration and Republican leaders are blackmailing Members of Congress to vote for this blank check with the threat of being accused of not supporting our troops. Yet it is they who are guilty of tragically disregarding troop safety and comfort and betraying our veterans.

I, personally, have talked to mothers and relatives who are sending their soldiers huge packages every week that include items like sunscreen and insect repellent, shampoo, and sanitary napkins because the administration did not make plans to provide these items. Worse, over 40,000 of our soldiers were sent to war without modern body armor, without quality boots, without jammers that block the signals between bombs and detonators. Fully 46 percent of the spare parts needed by the Army are not available.

Now, some will say that is why we need more money, but General Myers said it is not lack of money that they do not have flak jackets. He says it is lack of capacity to manufacture these vests. I say it is lack of priorities. Newly released information today says that the money is not needed until May or June. I say vote no.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to speak when my colleague from Washington State asked a question about how we pay. Even I will follow up with this question. How did we pay for the Marshall Plan after World War II when we obviously were in debt in paying for the world effort? How did we come up with the dollars to enact the Marshall Plan? Well, we borrowed against future resources. And that is exactly what we will do today. And we will do that in the passage of this legislation.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) spoke earlier on this debate and he mentioned Santayana, those who failed to learn from history are doomed to repeat it. He recited World War I and the reparations moving us into World War II, and I think it is very credible debate.

And a part of the discussion to say if we continue to load down Iraq with massive foreign debts and debts to us, it is a credible debating position to say we may be doing World War I provisions in reconstruction this war, and not the successful application of the history defined by World War II.

And I would like to be on the side of doing the job right and bringing the needed money, not holding additional

debt over the Iraqi people, and allowing them transition to a vibrant, democratic institution and economy.

I wish every Member of the floor of the House had a chance to go to Iraq before this debate. I was one of the fortunate folks that was available to visit.

□ 2130

And I do think a lot of the opinions would be changed. I think you do see the applications of some success. I had questions like everybody else, and I wanted to talk to my colleagues and friends. I have classmates over there. I wanted to talk to the Iraqi people. I wanted to see the economy. I wanted to see if there was a vibrant middle class trying to emerge, if there was entrepreneurial spirit starting to develop, and you can see that on the sides of the street. You can see individual vendors selling gasoline. You can see small shops developing. They have traffic jams. One of the biggest problems in Baghdad now is traffic, and a traffic problem says things are moving in the right direction.

But there are great challenges. I am not going to be a person that says the media is doing wrong by highlighting the sacrifices that our men and women are making every day. Because as a veteran, as someone who has, again, classmates serving over there, the world needs to know and our citizens need to know when our friends and our neighbors and our constituents are paying the ultimate price for freedom; and they are doing it every day, and we need to continue to tell that story. But there is more to the story.

Let us tell that story, but let us also tell the additional aspects of the story and what is occurring in there and in the great opportunities we have.

The field commanders who briefed us, the major military aspects of the campaign are over. Battalions are not maneuvering, divisions are not maneuvering. We do not have tanks rolling. What we do have are security breaches and terrorist attacks. So how do you win against that? How do you affect the change? How do you continue to win the hearts and the minds of the Iraqi people? The Iraqi people are asking for a minimum standard of living and basic security issues addressed. And when you are comparing what we have in the United States versus what the Iraqi people have, you are comparing apples to oranges. And that is why I would encourage all of my colleagues to make a trip, visit our troops, check with the Iraqi people and talk to them personally because I think a lot of opinions would be changed.

The field commanders want to continue to move forward on the minimum standard of living issues and the basic infrastructure needs to continue to show the good faith that the United States is there, committed to help transform over 30 years of a totalitarian regime to a thriving democratic

institution with free market principles which has the opportunity of changing the whole face of the Middle East. And they are asking for it. Our field commanders say this is the best way that they can finish and win this war and is the quickest way we can get our troops home. And I think this debate is about delivering to the folks that are asking for that need.

Let me finish by relaying my discussions with four soldiers from Illinois who serve in the 101st Air Assault Division out of Fort Campbell, Kentucky. This is at a dinner in Mosul. I asked each one of them, I am going to be asked what to relate back to the floor of the House and what to relate back to citizens back in Illinois. If I am going to take back one thing from each one of you, what do you want me to tell? One sergeant, E-5, Hispanic American from Chicago, said, the Iraqi people are not getting the same care as us. I have made a friend who is an Iraqi driver. He has been injured. The care he is receiving does not equate to what an injured soldier would receive.

That spoke volumes to me. What that spoke to me was that this sergeant E-5 had made a friend and was concerned about the health and welfare of an Iraqi citizen.

The second, a female, African American, E-5, said, the family is important for us to maintain our strength in serving here in Iraq. So tell the families out there to stay supportive of the troops. So this is my ability to do that to the families and I think the larger family, and the larger family is here. And I think we need to do that here on the floor.

The third one who is a Reservist lieutenant colonel from southern Illinois said, America must be patient. We are a very impatient country. We want things done now. And he says, this is going to take time.

The last one, another lieutenant colonel, active duty, said, tell the people in America that we are willing to pay the price. We are willing to pay the price for freedom in Iraq.

So I will just end, those four comments spoke volumes to me. So as I close, Mr. Chairman, I think that sounds like good advice. I think we need to continue to care for the Iraqis. And I think we need to stress the importance of staying united especially on the issues that when we cross the ocean boundaries and we have soldiers deployed in harm's way, we have to stay united.

I think we need to be patient, but everybody wants to push this rapidly. We all want to go rapidly, but you do not want to go so rapidly that things fall down like a house of cards.

We have the best military in the world, and they are doing incredible work under tough conditions. And they are willing to pay the price for freedom in Iraq and for freedom in the United States of America. Let us support them. We can really do no less.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gen-

tlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to express my strong opposition to this \$87 billion appropriations request.

While all of us believe that we must provide enough money to ensure that our troops are safe, the Congressional Research Service has calculated that if the Army continues to use resources at the current pace, it can fund military personnel requirements in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere throughout the end of May 2004, even if we do not appropriate one more dime for Iraq. And operational and maintenance funding should last through March 2004. There is no justification for this \$87 billion supplemental appropriations bill, and I will not support it under any circumstances.

After months of misleading the American people, this administration cannot account for the \$79 billion that has already been provided by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this President has mismanaged this costly and unnecessary war. They cannot account for American taxpayers' money already spent, and this administration has been caught with misleading and untruthful actions, and they are now being revealed. And now the President has the audacity to be angry with the media because they report to us on the continuous killing and maiming of our soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, we need the truth about what is going on. Our soldiers are being picked off one by one. The President made this big flashy and costly announcement that the war was over. What a terrible miscalculation; 183 soldiers have been killed since that announcement, more than during the war.

We do not need to give this administration 87 billion more of the taxpayers' dollars. We do need an exit strategy. It seems so easy for some of my colleagues to get up and talk about we cannot afford to cut and run.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about risking the lives of America's young people in Iraq. And someone has got our soldiers signing form letters talking about how well things are going. That too has been revealed. Yes, we do need an exit strategy. And we also need a domestic agenda for America. We need to create jobs, repair our roads and highways, and build schools and health clinics. I do not begrudge the Iraqi children and families education and health care; but Mr. Rumsfeld, Mr. Wolfowitz, Mr. Powell, and Ms. Rice told the American people the Iraqi infrastructure could be rebuilt with Iraqi oil revenue. Well, we find that is not true.

I am tired of the lies and spinning by this administration. We must deny this administration the ability to borrow more money, create more debt, weaken our economy, and continue to cause the loss of lives of our precious young people.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Huntington Beach, California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3289. And what we are doing in Iraq is a noble endeavor. It is in our interest to stand tall and, yes, even to fight and to promote freedom throughout the world. It is especially important for us to promote freedom in those dictatorships that threaten our country or are run by tyrants who hate our country.

Our military has done a magnificent job, and we need to give them what they say they need to do their job and to come home safely. Thus, there should not be any debate on the \$66 billion that is being requested. They say they need it. Their lives are in danger. We must step forward. They have stepped forward for us.

Our President is taking care of business. He has made the tough decisions to do what is necessary to secure our country and to make sure that we are safe in the years ahead. I wish that was the case in the past administration. I think many of the challenges we face today were left to us by jobs that should have been done in the past.

Saddam Hussein hated America for what it did to kick him out of Kuwait over 10 years ago. And when I just said the previous administrations, I hope you just do not think I mean Democrats, because George Bush's father, George Bush, Sr., did not do the job right and left us with Saddam Hussein in power.

So let us reflect that we did not do the job then, but let us just not place blame and say that means we should not be doing it today. No. The mistakes of the past should mean that we need to make sure we do what is right today so that America is safe in the future and that our children 10 years down the road will not have to face this same kind of problem because we cut and run, because we nit-picked our President at a time when he made the decision that should have been done 10 years ago.

Saddam Hussein was a man who hated us. He hated us. He was an enemy to the United States of America. He was a murderer to his own people. He pillaged and destroyed his own economy, and that economy should have been very prosperous; but instead he pillaged and stole from it. And now that country is very poor and needs our help.

America is safer. The people of Iraq are better off because of America's courage, our commitment, and, yes, our leadership.

I support this bill, \$66 billion in the supplemental that will help rebuild our military or bolster them at this pivotal moment. I will be voting for this bill, for the supplemental, H.R. 3289, even if my amendments are not made in order. But I have some serious problems with that part of the bill that provides \$18.6 billion in reconstruction for Iraq, and

it has taken the form, as the administration is giving us, as a grant, a gift, a giveaway to the people of Iraq.

Now, let me note Iraq is probably in essence one of the richest countries in the world. They have the third largest oil reserves now that we know. And, in fact, in the future we may find they are the most plentiful in oil of any country in the world. Why should we be borrowing money when we are in debt by \$400 billion a year, almost \$500 billion in deficit spending right now, why should we borrow and then give a grant to the Iraqis, which when they get back on their feet they will not have to repay, but our children will then have to repay? That is ridiculous. That is an absolute absurdity.

And I will present an amendment tomorrow that makes the reconstruction effort belong to the Iraqi Government, or the Iraqi people, of \$18.6 billion. And if I am ruled out of order, I will offer another amendment to cut that funding from the budget.

If that is ruled out of order, I will offer another amendment which will just cut from the budget \$18.6 billion in the reconstruction part of the bill. And believe me, if we vote for that, within a few days the administration will come back with a loan package because the Senate will probably vote for that anyway.

Let us keep faith with the American people in the long run. Let us make sure that everybody does their part, not just the American people having to bear this burden by themselves. And I would ask my Democratic colleagues as well as my Republican colleagues to please join me on the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2145

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, our Nation faces a tremendous challenge in Iraq and Afghanistan, with troops in the field and the threat looming of a reversion to tyranny or chaos. Because we cannot walk away from the need to sustain our troops and to stabilize these countries, I voted to report this bill from the Committee on Appropriations. But the Bush administration's Iraq policy has been marred by appalling failures of planning and execution and something close to a diplomatic meltdown with long-time allies. We must correct this course. The first step that this House must demand is an accounting of funds thus far expended, a more detailed justification for the present request, and an honest estimate of costs yet to come.

I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations improved the President's request in significant ways, pro-

viding critical new equipment for troops, including body armor and communications equipment, and eliminating funding for questionable and overpriced projects such as prison construction.

The committee adopted additional provisions offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that would require the administration to provide detailed justification to Congress on the use of appropriated funds in Iraq and Afghanistan; would require an analysis of the impact of military operations on our troops and overall military readiness; and would mandate open and competitive bidding for rebuilding contracts.

Despite these improvements, much still needs to be done. The administration must explain to Congress and American taxpayers how the \$87 billion, every penny of it borrowed, is to be paid for. It is neither fair nor fiscally prudent to leave in place, much less to extend, massive tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, cuts that have helped produce unprecedented annual deficits and that mock the very idea of shared sacrifice. We also need to secure greater international cooperation in the reconstruction effort in Iraq. These ideas were incorporated in amendments offered in committee and defeated along party lines, but we must and we will press them further during floor debate.

Success in Iraq and the means by which we achieve it are fundamental to the United States' overall foreign policy strategy. This effort affects our relations with nearly every nation around the world, and should, therefore, not be divorced from those charged with developing and maintaining these relationships, the Department of State. While the Department of Defense adeptly demonstrated its prowess in securing a military victory in Iraq, it is not designed for the art of nation-building nor is it sensitive to the requirements of diplomacy around the world.

For this reason I plan to introduce legislation along with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) to establish an Iraq Reconstruction Coordinator within the Department of State. It is now time to place experts in diplomacy and nation-building in charge of the reconstruction, and to allow the military to operate within its area of strength: security. This will help the United States build a true multinational coalition to support reconstruction, and bring our efforts in Iraq in line with other foreign policy objectives. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation, so that our Nation can move beyond the quagmire that confronts us.

Mr. Chairman, there is too much at stake to turn away from Iraq before the job is done. But there is also too much at stake to continue along the same self-defeating course. Congress must reassert itself as a coordinate branch of government, calling this administration to account and getting our policy in Iraq and the entire Middle East on a more positive and promising course.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from

Kennedyville, Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) who is from the Eastern Shore, and over there common sense is the rule of the day. So I am anxious to hear what he has to say.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me the time.

The gentleman from Arizona will remember about 12 years ago we traveled to southeast Asia, and one of the countries we visited was Cambodia, and we talked to a number of people in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, only a very short period of time after Pohl Pot and the Khmer Rouge had ravaged the country. And we were discussing the issues with these former members of the Khmer Rouge who were forced to be the members of Khmer Rouge, and they were stricken with utter fear. They asked us the question, where were you when we needed you. If my colleagues will remember their history, it was the Vietnamese who went in and relieved the burden of that suppression from the Cambodians.

Today, we are relieving the burden of fear and oppression for the Iraqis from a regime that has the psychology of serial killers.

I recently went to Iraq with the delegation of eight Members. Four Members on this delegation voted against the resolution to give the President the authority to use force, and they were going to vote against this \$87 billion package because they felt that we had not planned the war appropriately and did not plan for reconstruction and did not allow the State Department and other agencies in the Federal Government not associated with the military more access to the reconstruction in Iraq. Four of the eight Members were going to vote against this \$87 billion. They are now voting for the \$87 billion, the \$60-some billion for our troops and the \$20 billion to further reconstruct and bring democracy to the Iraqi people and here is why.

What we found out when we went to Iraq was that the planning to reconstruct Iraq was almost entirely done a year ago. In the last September-October time frame, this government looked at what was going to be needed, and they began putting that together. Right now, there are 11,000 construction projects underway.

To mention just a few, 1,600 schools were completely rebuilt and refurbished with the children with uniforms, with desks, with chalk boards, with books, materials ready for the school to be productive. The power plants are being rebuilt so there is now more electricity in Iraq than there was before the war; 150,000 tons of wheat have been harvested in Iraq as a result of the irrigation projects that were put in place last spring as a result of the Agriculture Department being involved in this productivity.

What we have seen was a total integration of the military, the State Department, the Agency for International Development, the private sector, a

whole range of organizations that are in Iraq today bringing prosperity, bringing support and security for our troops, making Iraq an example for the rest of the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close with this comment, and there are a lot more positive stories that can be told. The situation in Iraq and the United States and the rest of the world, we are facing a fork in the road. If we take the wrong turn, we will allow Iraq, and subsequently the rest of the Middle East, to decay into radical religious oblivion and suppression. If we take the right turn, there will be a new renaissance of science, technology and human expression never before seen in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the full supplemental.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

I rise in favor of the Obey substitute and in opposition to the President's \$87 billion appropriation request for Iraq. I am not in opposition because it has been proposed by the Commander in Chief. I am not in opposition because I do not think that we should not help rebuild Iraq. We tore it down; therefore, we should help to build it back.

I am not in opposition because some major companies are going to make a lot of money. Bechtel and Halliburton should be able to make money. Some people call it profiteering, but since it was supposedly for Iraq, then local Iraqi businesses and contractors should also be able to make money. Small businesses, minority-owned businesses, women-owned businesses and others should be able to provide services and make some of the money.

I am, however, opposed because all of the spending that will result from this \$86.9 billion appropriation will be added to the public debt, the debt that would not be necessary if we were operating with rational tax and trade policies.

I unequivocally support our troops, and I would love to vote for this supplemental to help rebuild Iraq, but I also would love to vote for health care for the millions who are uninsured. I would love to vote for affordable housing for millions who live in squalor. I would love to vote for the thousands and millions of poor children who need Head Start and cannot get it. I would love to vote for the thousands of young men and women in central city communities all over America who cannot find jobs and stand on the corners hollering crack and blow, pills and thrills and end up in prison for practically all of their lives.

So, Mr. Chairman, I support our soldiers, but I cannot vote a \$27 billion blank check to rebuild Iraq and nothing to rebuild the south and west sides of Chicago, Maywood, Ford Heights and other disadvantaged communities all over America. We need a more balanced approach to priority spending.

I support the Obey substitute and oppose the President's request.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

I rise today to voice my concern over the President's \$87 billion supplemental request and the failure to plan for postconflict peacekeeping and reconstruction in Iraq. In short, the administration has failed the American people here at home and the brave men and women who are serving overseas.

In the months leading up to the war, we were repeatedly told that this war would be swift; that the loss of American life would be minimal; and that the costs of the war would not impose a burden on the American taxpayer because Iraq had sufficient reserve to finance its own reconstruction. Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz said, There is a lot of money to pay for this that that does not have to come from U.S. taxpayers. We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon.

Now, we are faced with the chilling reality that the opposite is true. Over 320 Americans lives have been lost, and guerrilla war has escalated because the administration failed to admit the scope of the challenge we have on our hands, and of course, costs are skyrocketing.

If we approve this supplemental, the United States cost of war to date will reach \$141 billion. Some say it could reach \$237 billion, some \$418 billion, but the most glaring truth is that we cannot afford to lose and that our window to win the peace is quickly shutting.

We not only have a moral obligation to help rebuild Iraq, but it is in our best national interest to facilitate the transition to a stable democratic and economically self-sufficient Iraq. We should have had a plan in place 6 months ago. We should have had a clear exit strategy. We should have had coalition partners lined up and ready to go. We should have prepared our troops for the tasks we are now asking them to face, and now we have to make up for lost time.

Our first priority should be to get our troops the resources they need to complete their missions swiftly, transfer power to Iraqis and return home.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, 2 months ago, I had an occasion to give a commencement speech in the rural part of my District. And after the speech, a woman walked up to me; she had tears in her eyes, and I assumed that she was crying about the graduation of her child that day, but she walked up to me and she looked at me

and she said, Mr. DAVIS, I have a husband who serves in the Army National Guard. He has been in Iraq for 2 months now, has been in the Middle East for about a year, and every morning I get up and I turn my television on CNN, and I see that another American life has been lost, and for a span of a few seconds my heart jumps up into my throat, and I wonder until I see the name.

When I spoke to that lady, Mr. Chairman, I could not talk with her about the geopolitics of our commitment in Iraq. I could not talk with her about whether or not it was right or wrong for us to engage this conflict because I do not think that she terribly cared. She, like so many other Americans, though, was searching for a solution to this conflict.

I would like to be able to say to her that if her family and her husband are asked to sacrifice, that the sacrifice is not just limited to the middle ranks of this country. I would like to be able to say, as the ranking member of this committee said earlier, that if some are asked to pay any price or bear any burden that that will include some of the wealthiest Americans whose taxes have been cut in the last several months.

I will vote against this supplemental as it currently stands for a very simple reason. It is unfair to ask families like that of the woman that I encountered in Perry County, Alabama, to sacrifice, when we cannot even ask families who are earning over \$300,000 to forego a tax cut that most of them never really sought.

This is a time when we have to decide the direction of our foreign policy, but our foreign policy has to be consistent with our values. Our values, and it ought to be the values of the Bush administration as well, do not dictate that we ask sacrifice of only some people. They dictate that we ask sacrifice of those who can most afford to pay it, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution unless the administration can provide a means to pay for it.

□ 2200

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I do want to associate myself with the remarks, the very eloquent remarks of the gentleman that preceded me, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS). I think he caught something when he spoke about our values.

But let me speak just for a minute about an issue that was raised by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER). We are told this must be grants, not loans. But as others have indicated, just a few months ago it was Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul

Wolfowitz who was telling us, telling the American people, that Iraq could finance its own reconstruction. I guess my question is: What happened? What has happened to change that particular dynamic?

I look forward to supporting the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from California, tomorrow. I would again want to congratulate the gentleman from California for indicating that this is not a partisan issue. It is not about Clinton, and it is not about Bush One and President Reagan; but when the gentleman served in the White House, this government supported Saddam Hussein and we provided billions of dollars worth of loan guarantees to Saddam Hussein. Now we are talking about grants, about gifts; and we are asked not to question these numbers. But our own appointed Iraqi governing council tells us that they can do it much cheaper.

Just recently, there was a report in *The Washington Post* that said clearly and unequivocally, by a prominent member of that committee, and that sentiment is shared by those 25 members, that we can do it for 10 times less. For every billion dollars you spend, they say we will spend \$100 million. We cannot in good conscience support this request.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, we have already appropriated about \$65 billion for Iraq, and now the President is asking for \$87 billion more. The President wants to do this at a time when he is seeking to increase the copayment for veterans on their prescription drugs from \$7 to \$15 a prescription. The President wants \$87 billion for Iraq when he wants to impose a \$250 annual enrollment fee so that veterans can participate in veterans health care. They are excluding priority 8 veterans and saying you cannot even enroll in VA health care now because we do not have enough money. Yet he wants \$87 billion more for Iraq. The President has threatened to veto a bill if we get rid of the disabled veterans tax, but he wants \$87 billion for Iraq.

This administration has given gold-plated, unbid contracts to the President's and the Vice President's friends at Halliburton, and now he wants \$87 billion more. The President wants to build schools in Iraq, but he will not ask his wealthy contributors to reduce their tax cuts so that we can pay for those schools. No, the President wants to build schools in Iraq, and he wants to give the bill to America's children to pay for those schools.

We are being told we must support this in order to support our troops. But the truth is we sent young Americans into battle, and some of them have lost their lives and been seriously injured without having protective vests. I got a letter from a young West Point graduate in Baghdad saying, "Congress-

man, my men are wondering why they have the cheap vests. Shame. Shame."

Mr. Chairman, I resent the fact that the President and the leadership in this House are using our troops as leverage. They are using our troops as hostages in order to extract \$87 billion out of this Congress for Iraq. I support our troops. We all support our troops. That is not the issue. The issue is whether or not we are going to support the misguided policies of this administration. I will vote "no" on this unwise request.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I want to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND). I say that it is time to support our troops. We can best support our troops by bringing them home, by having the U.N. become involved. Bring the U.N. in and get the U.S. out. Support our troops; bring them home.

If we support \$87 billion on the next installment of our involvement in Iraq, what we are doing is supporting the continuation of the presence of American troops in Iraq. Make no mistake about it, this is only the second of many installments. There have been projections that the American presence there could cost now at least \$245 billion. There are other projections that say it could be many hundreds of billions of dollars more.

I presented for the consideration of Members of this House a plan that would get the U.N. in and the U.S. out, and the features of this plan are as follows:

Number one, we go to the U.N. with a resolution that would permit the United Nations to handle all of the oil assets of Iraq, without any privatization, to handle that on behalf of the Iraqi people; number two, to handle all the contracts in Iraq without any sweetheart deals on behalf of certain select contractors; number three, to have the U.N. handle the cause of new governance in Iraq. It is time for the United States to rejoin the world community. In doing that, we can rotate U.N. troops in and U.S. troops out.

It is time for us to rejoin the world community in the cause of stabilizing Iraq. You know and I know that the longer our troops are there, the more of them will not come back alive. The longer our troops are there, the deepening of the American involvement in Iraq will continue. This is the time for us to take a stand. Vote "no" on the \$87 billion. Vote to bring our troops home. Vote to get the U.N. in and the U.S. out. Vote "no" on the \$87 billion.

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

Before moving for the committee to rise, I would like to take just a few moments. Mr. Chairman, I think this has been an instructive and helpful debate here tonight. But as I have listened to

many of the speakers, I am reminded of my own visit to Iraq just about 8 weeks ago. In several different places, security officers who were accompanying us, troops that were out there in the field that we talked to at the mess hall, people that we talked to in different places, over and over again the message I heard from those soldiers was the same; and they said, please go back and tell the American people that it is not what is being reported.

They are also seeing CNN over there. It is not what is being reported on the news; it is much better than what they hear on the news; there are councils that are being elected; there are businesses that are being opened; there are people who are beginning to see livelihoods come back; people have the opportunity to speak out on the streets and speak out against the United States and speak out against the Coalition and speak out against their own governing council. That is something they never had the opportunity to do for all those years under Saddam Hussein.

So the message that I heard from our soldiers was please go back and tell them that this is a war worth fighting.

The question has been raised here tonight as to how it is going to be paid for. We have heard that over and over again. It is a legitimate question. But I would suggest to my colleagues that this is going to be paid for in the same way that we paid for World War I, the same way we paid for World War II, and for Korea and for Vietnam and for the first Gulf War, and for all the other conflicts that we have been involved with all these years. The money is borrowed. It is with the full faith and credit of the American people who believe in liberty, who believe in democracy, who believe in freedom for themselves and for peoples around the world that we undertake this burden of debt in order that others around the world may be free.

I would note that the percentage of debt that we are incurring is a fraction of what we incurred in past wars. Yes, it is a lot of money. But can anybody doubt, can anybody doubt that this fight against terrorism is any less important than the struggle we fought against in World War I, or the struggle we had against Fascism and Nazism and against Japanese imperialism in World War II? Is it any less important than what we fought against in Korea in the 1950s? I would say, no, Mr. Chairman, it is not less important. This is just as important. This war on terrorism is a defining moment for the United States and for the American people, and we have no choice but that we must win.

And let me close with this thought, because many have said, yes, I support our troops in the field, but I really do not think we should be spending this money on the reconstruction. I asked that question very specifically of General Abizaid when he appeared before our subcommittee, the CentCom commander, and General Abizaid said,

"Make no mistake about it, you cannot separate what we are spending on reconstruction from what we spend on our military. Every dollar we spend on the reconstruction is just as important to the safety and the security of our troops in Iraq as the money that is spent on ammunition, that is spent on flak vests, that is spent on armor for our vehicles." It is just as important. We must win this war by winning the war of reconstruction, by winning the civilian part of this war.

Mr. Chairman, we will have more opportunity to discuss these matters again tomorrow as we go into general debate on the bill and then as we proceed with amendments, and I hope the debate will be an enlightening one and one that will help Members come to a good decision about what America should be doing in this region. There is no doubt in my mind what the right course of action for this body and for the United States is.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, 3 weeks ago, I had to opportunity to travel to Iraq with Chairman LEWIS and several of my fellow members of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

While in Iraq, I had the opportunity to not only talk to our men and women in uniform, but also members of the Iraqi Governing Council and local citizens about the situation they are facing. Quite frankly, things are much better than what I had heard on the evening news and read in the newspapers.

Most of the national media accounts of the situation in Iraq paint a picture of a country in rubble with unwelcome American troops being attacked and killed by the Iraqi people. After spending time there, I can attest that reality is quite different than what is being reported by many in the media. Republicans and Democrats who have been to Iraq have said the same. The Iraqi people appreciate the job we are doing, and enjoy the improvements in infrastructure and security the United States is providing.

Despite what the American people are constantly told, all of the hospitals in Iraq are open, the markets are open, and the electricity is on in most places. The roads and bridges in Baghdad are actually quite good, and, with a few exceptions, the only damaged structures are government buildings, Saddam's palaces and military sites.

There is no question about the need to improve and update the country's utility, agricultural and financial infrastructure. However, this need is not due to the U.S. military action against Iraq. It is because of 30 years of neglect under Saddam Hussein.

Saddam basically spent the Iraqi oil revenue on three things: (1) his military; (2) transportation infrastructure so he could travel on good roads; and (3) approximately 85 palaces throughout the country. All of this while his regime executed, according to estimates, as many as 1.5 million Iraqis.

For these and other reasons, the vast majority of Iraqi citizens are glad they have been liberated.

One of our generals told me a story about two Iraqi children telling some U.S. troops about a terrorist ambush site. The children showed our troops where some artillery shells had been strung together with a device that

could be detonated remotely. These kids helped the Americans because these same troops helped rebuild their playgrounds and their schools, got the electricity running again and were providing a way of life they had not know before. These children did not want to lose that, so they helped our soldiers, the ones who have helped provide this new life.

This visit convinced me that Congress should support President Bush's FY 2004 Supplemental request for the war on terrorism.

The first \$68.1 billion of this \$86.7 billion supplemental appropriations bill will go directly to our military to replace and refurbish equipment, provide additional armored vehicles and replenish supplies.

That leaves approximately \$18.6 billion—which I believe should be grants, not loans—to help rebuild Iraq. As we prepare to ask the other nations of the world to forgive Iraqi debt and contribute to the reconstruction cost, the United States must lead by example. We can either be seen as liberators and allies or conquerors and opportunists.

It is also important to keep in mind that as we help the Iraqi people, we are ensuring the safety of our young men and women in uniform and building a more secure future for our children and grandchildren at the same time.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, despite the most advanced technology and the best of intentions, our operations in Iraq, followed by widespread looting and sabotage, degraded that country's antiquated infrastructure and left the people fearful and helpless. The people of Guam know how hard it is to recover from liberation. Hagåtña, the capital of Guam was destroyed during World War II and has yet to fully recover. From this experience I can tell you that reconstruction is the hardest of tasks and every bit of assistance helps. If we do not follow through on our commitment to reconstruct Iraq we will have won the battle but lost the war. So I rise today in support of the Iraq Supplemental with sympathy for the people of Iraq whose liberation has left their country in chaos.

I believe a people suffering under a tyrant can be restored by democracy. I believe a Soviet style economy can be revived with a healthy dose of American capitalism. I believe that a nation that has been isolated from the international community can, in partnership with the United States, step up and regain its rightful place in the world. The Iraq supplemental before us today will work to further these aims. Iraq is a test of our beliefs, just as it is a test of the ideology of those arrayed against us.

At the same time our service men and women are not the world's policemen. They have accomplished their combat mission and should be relieved by an international peace/keeping force and Iraqis. Our Army has traditionally steered clear of law enforcement duties, which are better left to those with the special training and suitable equipment. We did not seek that role for them in Somalia, Haiti or Kosovo, nor should we seek it now.

It is an example of the best of the American people when we help another. Yet it is only human nature to express concern that similar attention is not being paid to needs here at home. Each of us in this Chamber can list the unmet needs of our constituents such as concurrent receipt for veterans or healthcare for our seniors. The debate on the Iraq supple-

mental should not be a proxy for our failure to address these issues. Rather, we should commit ourselves to fixing these issues in the coming days. The Fiscal Year 2004 appropriations bills are not yet passed and we have time to make amends. We should come together in the same bipartisan manner that we have gathered to consider this Iraq supplemental and work to meet the needs of our Nation.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express—in no uncertain terms—that I will not support President Bush's \$87 billion request. I will not grant him another blank check. President Bush has lost my trust and that of the majority of my constituents. He has lost the trust of many of our allies and he has damaged America's credibility in the eyes of the world.

Mr. Chairman, this President has taken us to war on false pretenses—unilaterally—and with unnecessary impulse and haste. He has exaggerated claims of the imminent threat posed by the former Iraqi regime. He has fabricated an Al Qaeda-Iraq link. He has ignored American intelligence reports that Saddam Hussein did not have a massive arsenal of WMD. He has failed to make America safer or lessen the terrorist threat. He has misled Congress about the cost of this war, and he has neglected to provide us with a detailed accounting of expenditures in Iraq.

The President's \$87 billion request is an irresponsible diversion of funds that should be allocated for education, veterans, prescription drugs, homeland security and healthcare. It is unconscionable that the burden of this expenditure will fall on the backs of those who can least afford it. The President has talked about sacrifice and responsibility, and I challenge him to be responsible and sacrifice a portion of his ill-conceived tax cut to pay for continued operations in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, this Administration has demonstrated staggering negligence in failing to plan for post war Iraq, which has directly contributed to the continued loss of American lives and growing cost of operations on the ground. As an elected official I cannot—and will not—entrust President Bush with an additional \$87 billion.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concern regarding the \$87 billion supplemental appropriation that President Bush requested on September 7, 2003. I want to make clear that I will support the 130,000 thousand United States troops currently stationed in Iraq and that I am committed to exiting Iraq in an appropriate manner. As a Korean War veteran, I always will insist that our servicemen and women have whatever they need to protect themselves and execute their missions. I will vote for the sums they need once President Bush accounts for what has already been spent. However, we must prevent wasted or padded expenditures and war profiteering and ensure that our troops get critical equipment and support, which the administration has failed to provide them.

The \$87 billion requested for military operations and reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan is troubling on many fronts. It is troubling that \$20 billion of that \$87 billion would be spent on Iraq's reconstruction when billions are needed domestically at home. It is troubling that on March 27, 2003 Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz told a House defense subcommittee that "We are dealing with

a country that can finance its own reconstruction.” Furthermore, Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in a Senate Appropriations Committee hearing on the same day said, “I don’t believe that the United States has the responsibility for reconstruction, in a sense * * * funds can come from various sources I mentioned—frozen assets, oil revenues and a variety of other things, including Oil for Food, which has a very substantial number of billions of dollars in it.” If Iraq can pay for its own reconstruction, why is the administration returning to Congress with a \$20 billion request for reconstruction in Iraq?

I am concerned that the money the administration has requested may only be the tip of the iceberg in regards to total monies that the United States will spend in Iraq. On December 31, 2002, the New York Times reported, “The Administration’s top budget official estimated today that the cost of the war with Iraq could be in the range of 50 to 60 billion dollars.” Lest we forget, last year Congress appropriated \$79 billion for the war effort in Iraq, almost \$10–20 billion more than the administration initially estimated.

Based on these concerns I am only prepared to vote “yes” for the \$87 billion request if the following conditions are met:

(1) The President specifies to Congress how the money will be spent and how its prudent distribution will be assured.

The President is asking for \$87 billion to stabilize Iraq, a second installment for Iraq’s reconstruction that has no geographical, time, or force limitations. It has cost the lives of American men and women that were bravely performing their military duties in Iraq. The President and his advisors have not been reliable or trustworthy in handling their gravest responsibility: sending American soldiers in harm’s way. As Members of Congress we must stand up to the President on behalf of the American people. Even if Congress is unfairly labeled “non-patriotic” or “non-supportive” of our troops, we must require the President to clearly outline how he plans to spend American tax dollars in Iraq. It is not reasonable for the President to present us with a request that includes: \$33,000 each for pickup trucks required for the effort; \$360,000 for 600 radios and telephones; \$800 million to train 1,500 Iraqi police officers at \$530,000 per police officer; and \$100 million to place five Iraqi families in a witness protection program at \$200,000 per person.

It is important that the American public be aware that \$87 billion equates to \$300 for every man, woman and child in the United States. When we are spending monies of this magnitude, we must have the courage to challenge policies until they are clear in purpose and direction.

(2) The President provides sure-fire strategy for exiting Iraq.

I, along with many others, believe that for the President to go to war in Iraq without international support and without an exit strategy was a fatal flaw. Given those tragic failures thus far, I am in “shock and awe” that the President has failed to fully explain how he plans to secure Iraq, achieve Iraqi self governance and share the burden of rebuilding the industries and society of Iraq. How can we be expected to endorse blank checks with no idea as to the overall plan for Iraq.

(3) The President exercises diplomatic leadership in convincing other nations to join us in the effort in Iraq.

Even now, with the benefit of hindsight, the President has not learned from his diplomatic failures. The United States refuses to relinquish appropriate levels of authority to the United Nations, and this refusal has significant diminished prospects for gaining international aid and support in Iraq. Two weeks ago, the United Nations greeted President Bush and his resolution coolly, finding that the resolution did not go far enough in the role it assigned to the U.N. and its timetable to transfer power to the Iraqi transitional government. Many international leaders, including United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, supported an accelerated timetable for the turnover of power to Iraqi leaders. However, the U.S. balked at their request. Secretary of State Colin Powell told the 25 Member U.S.-appointed Governing Council in what has been characterized as “very direct terms” that the U.S. intends to resist the request that a U.S. backed Security Council Resolution place Iraq’s political future in the hands of the U.N. Based on the President’s unpersuasive speech and the U.S.’s weak resolution, it is expected that when donor countries meet in Madrid later this month, financial support will not be forthcoming.

(4) That these funds will not divert the necessary resources from being used for priorities in the war on terrorism, such as homeland security in the U.S., the pursuit of Al Qaeda leaders and cells throughout the world.

Though Mr. Bush has depicted the war in Iraq as the “central front” in the war on terrorism, it is important to note that the Iraq supplemental request is more than double the President’s request for homeland security in fiscal year 2004. If these monies were utilized for the true war on terrorism, then: Port Security could be increased, the anti-missile system for commercial airliners could be put in place, and stricter security over unscreened air cargo could be implemented. Moreover, adequate training and equipment for emergency response personnel could be provided, and public health officials would have the resources to identify and treat people attacked by weapons of mass destruction. In my opinion, it is unacceptable for the U.S. to allocate billions to a war of choice in Iraq while we fail to allocate funds to secure America’s borders from a myriad of dangers.

Similarly, the primary objective in our war abroad against terrorism must remain the destruction of Al Qaeda and to capture its leadership. The war in Iraq has already diverted many key resources including, Special Forces, Intelligence personnel and specialized equipment from the search for bin Laden in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It was bin Laden and his Al Qaeda agents, not Saddam, who carried out the 9/11 disaster, despite discredited efforts by Vice President CHENEY and others to suggest the contrary. Iraq is not the heart of the war on terrorism, despite President Bush’s claims to the contrary. We must keep our priorities straight.

(5) The President and Congress commits to a willingness to allocate funds to desperately needed programs vital to U.S. citizens.

It should be known that the \$20 billion reconstruction includes \$9 million for a zip code system, \$20 million for a month long business course at \$10,000 per pupil and \$53 million for state of the art landfills. We should not forget that charity begins at home. How can we build Iraq, if we refuse to acknowledge the so-

cial ills in the U.S.? Within our borders, we are faced with a troubled economy, scores of hungry children, millions of uninsured, deteriorating infrastructures, and devastating homelessness. The American public should know that \$87 billion would:

1. Finance the educational needs of all 50 states.

2. Provide health care for the elderly and those without health insurance.

3. Provide incentives to Corporate America to generate jobs and bring unemployment levels back to where they were in December 2000.

In conclusion, I would like to vote for this legislation because I want to support our troops in Iraq. I want to believe that these funds would provide our citizens with better protection from terrorism. I want to believe that the Administration has a plan and not just a price tag to protect our soldiers and to return Iraq to its citizens. However, at present, I remain unconvinced and cannot vote for the President’s \$87 billion supplemental until the above concerns are resolved.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, one year ago, Congress considered whether to authorize the President to use the armed forces of the United States to attack Iraq. The President asked us to pass a resolution that gave him unprecedented war powers at a time when he had yet to make the case for war. I voted against the resolution.

Today the President asks us to pass an enormous spending bill to fund the ongoing war in Iraq and the continuing reconstruction of both Iraq and Afghanistan. Yet, everyday, American lives are lost while the President fails to garner broad international support and create a coherent exit strategy for a war that is less about self-defense and more about the President’s obsession with Iraq. All along, our economy continues to remain on the ropes.

Therefore, like my previous vote on authorizing the use of our armed forces in Iraq, I cannot support this supplemental bill to give the President a huge blank check to continue the occupation of Iraq and risk the lives of our troops. As Members of Congress, this is our opportunity to tell the President what our constituents are telling us—we won’t spend another penny in Iraq until our President gives the American people a plan on how he intends to win the war, minimize costs, and most importantly, bring home our troops as safely and as quickly as possible.

As we were debating whether or not to grant authority to the President to go to war in Iraq, I asked some serious questions that this Administration continues to have difficulty answering. Was the United States acting in self-defense against an imminent threat in Iraq? Did the United States have to pursue near unilateral action in Iraq without strong international support? And most importantly, what is our exit strategy?

The President and his Administration repeatedly told us Iraq posed an imminent threat of safety to America. But where are those nuclear weapons?

Before the war, the Administration also told us there was strong, credible evidence to link Saddam Hussein to September 11th. Yet, the President himself now admits there is no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved with September 11th.

We were told Iraq had thousands of weapons of mass destruction that could easily be

used against friends, our allies and the United States. But where are they?

Worse yet, we were never told about an exit strategy and still don't have one today.

Instead the President spent his time playing "Top Gun" by landing on an aircraft carrier to declare the major conflict in Iraq over. Yet, more courageous men and women have died in these last few months than before that dubious, made-for-political-campaign-commercial event.

And now the President comes to us asking for enormous amounts of money to continue what is supposedly no longer a major conflict.

Even if we agree to send money to Iraq, we shouldn't send it to contractors that are ripping off the American taxpayer. Why should the American taxpayer pay \$15 million to Halliburton to repair a power plant when the Iraqi people can do it, and did, for \$80,000?

More importantly, we've already appropriated over \$70 billion for the war in Iraq and related efforts, virtually every penny the President asked for to win this war and protect our troops. So why does the Army lack Kevlar protective plates for 40,000 of our troops in Iraq? Why do we continue to hear stories about parents sending their children better protective gear, basic supplies, and food and water at their own cost? Why does the Defense Department refuse to pay travel costs for soldiers returning from battle for a brief, two-week visit with loved ones? The President has given us no assurances that his new funding request will not be mismanaged and, instead be used in strong support of our troops.

There is no question that we need to allocate whatever funds are necessary to support our troops in the field.

But there is only one real opportunity for the Congress to have a say in the course of war or foreign affairs and that is when the President comes to us and asks us to appropriate the taxpayer's money for war.

That time is now and this Congress must insist that the President deliver his exit plan and detail how he plans to get equipment, food and water to our troops.

If this appropriation is defeated today, the President will be with us tomorrow delivering the exit plan that he should have provided to the American people one year ago.

As I said during the debate over the war with Iraq, we are at our best when we are first among allies standing tall for the free world. Let us be at our best when we deal with Iraq, but always dedicate ourselves first and foremost to the freedom and prosperity of our great United States.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, resolving the current instability in the region is in the long-term best interests of all Americans—failure in Iraq would lead to irreparable consequences.

This emergency spending bill raises a host of critical concerns that must be addressed.

More than 138,000 American troops are currently in Iraq and I believe that they absolutely must be adequately provided for and able to return home to their families as soon as possible.

Today, I am offering an amendment to this bill so that Congress receives a detailed description of purpose for all projects over \$1 million. My amendment also calls for a comprehensive survey of security and infrastructure needs, including progress reports on previous projects. Finally, my amendment asks

for necessary estimates on additional funding required and troop levels projections.

We cannot maintain our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan without a clear understanding of our longer term needs. We must know how many troops will be needed and how much this entire operation will cost, including contingency plans, and decide how our nation will pay for the entire cost of the operation.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, the Administration rushed into this war before they understood the consequences. Nearly half a year prior to seeking out a United Nations mandate and two months before Congress even considered the resolution authorizing force, the war plans were already set. In fact, a recent Washington Times article tells of a secret report to the Joint Chiefs indicating that post-war planning had been insufficient. The administration clearly did not consider the enormous costs and effort that would be involved after the Iraqi army was defeated. Congress already appropriated \$78 billion earlier this year. Now we are going to appropriate another \$87 billion and undoubtedly there will be more requests to come. The taxpayers will have to pay billions to repair what we destroyed in the first place.

There was not sufficient justification to start this war to begin with. To try to bolster their case for war, the administration had asserted that Iraq was an urgent threat to our national security and that we were at risk of an Iraqi surprise attack by weapons of mass destruction. But they offered no substantiation of these allegations, speaking only of hunches, probabilities, and suspicions. The administration also made dubious claims that there were ties between the 9/11 terrorists and Saddam. But in the months following the invasion, our intelligence community can still find no link between the Iraqi regime and the plot that led to those deadly terrorist attacks. No weapons of mass destruction have been found, despite intensive efforts and an attack on the U.S. was not imminent. President Bush could not prove his case for the war then, and he can't now!

The notion that we have a "coalition of the willing" is also something of a farce. Our major partner in this effort, Britain, has committed only \$908 million to the rebuilding efforts over the next two and a half years, and has 12,000 troops in Iraq, far less than the 130,000 we have on duty there. For Pakistan, Jordan, and other unnamed lesser members of this coalition, this bill gives them \$1.3 billion—including \$200 million in loan guarantees—to reward them for what amounts to little more than verbal support.

The appropriations committee showed some common sense by rejecting such dubious provisions as the President's requests for \$2 million for garbage trucks, \$153 million for "solid waste management programs," and \$9 million to institute a ZIP code system in Iraq. I still have questions about the bill's funding of \$10 million to fund 100 prison construction consultants at \$100,000 each, over \$150 million for "private sector development" like computer literacy and English classes, and money to establish museums and memorials. While pouring billions into Iraq, critical needs are going unmet here at home.

This measure would provide \$793 million to modernize and obtain equipment for Iraq's health care facilities. While the President plans to spend hundreds of millions to provide better medical care in Iraq, health care costs in Mil-

waukee have skyrocketed, forcing more and more families to go without treatment. Last year 41,000 people in Milwaukee County and over 450,000 in Wisconsin went without health insurance. Nationwide, 43.6 million Americans currently have no health insurance, an increase of over 2 million since last year. There is a health emergency right here in this country. We should be investing federal funds to help struggling families here receive quality, comprehensive healthcare.

This supplemental contains \$90 million for education in Iraq. While the President boosts spending to help Iraqi children learn, in Milwaukee less than three-fourths of eighth graders are proficient in the skills necessary to advance to the ninth grade and many teachers are forced to teach in overcrowded classrooms. The Administration has under-funded its own education policy by \$8 billion, leaving thousands of children in Milwaukee and throughout the nation left behind.

This bill would also provide \$950 million for recruiting, training, and equipping an Iraqi police force. An additional \$509 million would be used for "public safety facilities and services." While providing money to create Iraqi civil service jobs and pay their wages, here at home the Administration is trying to contract out thousands of good-paying federal government jobs.

With the total price tag of the supplemental at \$87 billion, its passage will directly increase the projected deficit this year to a new record-setting height of over \$500 billion. Instead of driving us further into debt, this bill should have been paid for. We could have delayed for one year the tax cut for the wealthiest one percent of Americans, which over ten years would raise the full cost of the proposal before us today. But the Republican leadership did not allow my colleague to offer his substitute proposition which would have paid for the package in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, I did not vote to start this war and I cannot vote to fix up a country we destroyed. We have pressing needs here at home that are going unmet as planeloads of U.S. currency are being shipped to Iraq, raising the federal deficit. The President recently signed into law the \$369 billion appropriation for the Department of Defense. Some of these funds should be used to provide for the cost of our troops in Iraq. The funds in this supplemental are apparently not so imperative since the Congressional Research Service indicates that the Army's available military personnel funding as well as operation and maintenance funding should last into the spring of next year.

The administration's policy in Iraq has been a failure. Defeat of this measure would spur the President to come up with a workable exit strategy, one that would put a stop to the almost daily killing of our American troops. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, without a doubt, this period in history will record that the United States was committed to spreading democracy and freedom throughout the world. Building and guiding new democracies is one of the most difficult, yet important tasks, that the United States—as a leader of the free world—can undertake. With this debate today on the Iraq supplemental spending package, we seek to recommit ourselves to providing for those in the midst of that most important mission, our armed and foreign services.

Deciding to wage war is not a decision that is made lightly or for political expediency. It involves the sweat and sacrifice of America's most courageous patriots, our armed forces. When someone joins the military and takes the yoke of freedom upon their shoulders, they deserve the maximum support we can muster. Mr. Chairman, that is why I have come to the well of this House, to make sure they are provided for.

I support President Bush and believe that we should pass this supplemental as soon as possible. There should be no doubt about United States intentions: We stand behind our troops and their mission to bring democracy and freedom to Iraq.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the President's supplemental request for operations in Iraq. Just over one year ago this body voted to authorize the use of military force to confront the grave and growing global threat posed by Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist regime. We convene one year later having achieved many successes toward that objective, but face new trials worthy of our continued sacrifice to protect the safety and security of the entire global community.

I realize public opinion among Americans is fiercely divided when it comes to Iraq. Criticism is not a bad thing for our country during a time of war as long as it's constructive and does not undermine our ability to defeat the enemy. As it stands, opponents of the war and detractors of President Bush are too easily fortified by a mainstream press quick to underscore bad news and seemingly ambivalent toward the many positive developments occurring each day in Iraq.

Several of my colleagues here in the 108th Congress have shared stories of the remarkable progress they have observed during recent trips to the Middle East. Electrical grids are being restored, public schools are open, the banking system is operating, thousands of reconstruction projects are underway and thousands more have already been completed. Most of all, the Iraqi people are free—and with the elimination of Saddam Hussein's rule—the world has taken a giant step in winning the war on terror.

87 Billion dollars is a massive sum. As a conservative, I'm a strong supporter of fiscal responsibility and accountability. But I believe this supplemental is a wise and necessary investment, critical to our continued efforts to secure peace and future prosperity for the Iraqi people.

The President's request covers two major expenses—troop support and reconstruction. \$67 billion alone will be directed to the operational costs of our military forces: providing for essential equipment and provisions necessary for the safety and strength of U.S. troops. What American could shrink back from that commitment?

The remaining 20 billion dollars will undoubtedly be the source of much debate here today. Some believe that American dollars designated for reconstruction should come in the form of a grant. Others argue it should be made as a loan, payable once Iraq rehabilitates its commerce and economy. We should all agree that the United States cannot withdraw from a crippled Iraq and expect a stable government and economy to take hold.

Reconstructing Iraq is a top priority for the Bush administration and should win the appro-

priate support of this Congress. By agreeing to this supplemental, the United States military will have the resources necessary to rebuild infrastructure and restore social order, creating a politically secure and economically sound Iraq. Accomplishing this goal is the most significant factor that will bring our troops home for good.

During his address to a joint session of Congress last July, British Prime Minister Tony Blair concluded with a prophetic statement we should all consider as questions and challenges arise in the aftermath of war in Iraq; "Destiny put us in this place in history, in this moment in time, and the task is ours to do. If our spirit is right and our courage strong, the world will be with us."

I ask my colleagues to join me in acting in support of our President, our armed forces, the good people of Iraq, and the united freedom of all by voting in favor of this supplemental.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, could I ask for an accounting of the time before I move that we rise so that we can be ready for tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 53 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 1 hour and 16 minutes remaining.

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 (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, 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.

□ 2215

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BOEHLERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER 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.)

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 Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida 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 Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO ALTAMONTE SPRINGS PATRIOTS BABE RUTH SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the Altamonte Springs Patriots for winning the Babe Ruth World Series Championship for Age 16 and Under. These twelve young women along with their coaches and parents should be extraordinarily proud.

The Patriots embody teamwork. They attend schools throughout Orange and Seminole counties in Central Florida including Lake Brantley, Lake Mary, Seminole, Orangewood Christian, Central Florida Christian Academy, and RBR Academy. Many have played together since age 10. At age 12, they competed in little league softball and made it to the Florida State Tournament.

On their journey to win the Babe Ruth World Series Championship, the Patriots won 19 of their final 20 games. The team raised \$6,000 to finance their World Series trip to Louisville. In the championship game, Anna-Maria Jordan pitched seven innings, allowing only two runs while Natalie Ruff led the offense with a fourth inning two-run single.

On behalf of the people of the 24th District of Florida, I would like to congratulate the following champions for their outstanding triumph: Lauren Bennett, Jennifer Garaffa, Nicole Hall, Arielle Jenkins, Anna-Maria Jordan,