

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

NAYS—31

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

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1225

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

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

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY
 MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Strike the preamble insert in lieu thereof the following:

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

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

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

Whereas loans and other support from France, Germany, Russia, and other nations

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

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

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

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

Three, "From intelligence sources, we know, for instance, that thousands of Iraqi security personnel are at work hiding documents and materials from the U.N. inspectors, sanitizing inspec-

tions sites, and monitoring the inspectors themselves."

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

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

□ 1231

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for a further period of debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

At this point then, I will begin the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

What did we deploy in the 1990s? Let us see, Mr. Chairman. We subsidized troops from other countries and Kosovo and Bosnia and Macedonia. We paid for OSCE inspectors. We built hundreds of schools. Mr. Chairman, during the 1990s, under President Clinton, this Congress built hundreds of schools. In fact, we did more than build hundreds of schools. We trained police forces. We trained and equipped local police forces. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we

used taxpayer money to send fire trucks to Sarajevo. We paid for fire equipment. We rebuilt countries. In fact, in addition, we started small business loans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague I was the one who took 11 Members of Congress, including five from his side, to Vienna, and the reason was, we did not disagree with the actions against Milosevic. We felt we had not put enough pressure on Russia, and in going to Vienna, and my colleague can

ask the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the gentleman can ask the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), we wrote the plan that became the basis of the G-8 agreement to end the war. If we had brought Russia in earlier, we could have avoided much of that.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I also have serious concerns about our policy going forward.

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

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

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

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

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

Since 9/11, I have called for a wartime budget that would fully fund the war on terror as well as reconstruction and stabilization in Iraq within a balanced budget framework. Americans are prepared to make hard and responsible choices. Every previous war has been paid for by the generation that fought it,

and not by saddling our children and grandchildren with mountains of debt.

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 7¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 48 minutes remaining.

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

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

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

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

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

I am worried that greed may trump patriotism in Iraq. The President has

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we are not exporting to Iraq the kind of democracy which would allow a minute and a half only for a Representative of more than 650,000 people to speak. We need more time to excuse how we are going to spend \$87 billion. We have

enough money for our troops to last until next spring. What is the hurry?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We went to war on bad intelligence without our allies. We were either de-

liberately misled, misled by ineptness, or we have had a massive intelligence failure. We did the right thing, but we did it for the wrong reasons.

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

Many of us have served in combat and away from our families. I was critical of President Clinton, 216 deployments, and our kids were tired. Our equipment was getting worn out. And it was time to get our kids home to be with their families. But now it is also approaching the same thing under President Bush in the amount of time that our people are gone. The only way to get them home is to stabilize Iraq and Afghanistan and that is what the President's goal is. I have been with the President. I have seen him get teary when he talks about the losses that we have of our men and women overseas and the principles that he is guided upon that my mother and dad,

who were Democrats, talked about the reach for freedom and outreach to the rest of the world. I believe those words, not just from my mother and father, but fought for them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BEWITCHED, BOTHERED, BILLY-GOATED
(By Maureen Dowd)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Guardian, October 13, 2003]

WAR WITHOUT END: A CATALOGUE OF
KILLINGS IN IRAQ

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

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

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

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

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

May 29, US soldier killed travelling on supply route.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On the article by Ms. Dowd, a Member from my State is quoted as saying, "The story of what we've done in the postwar period is remarkable. It is a better and more important story than losing a couple of soldiers every day."

The article from The Guardian is five pages of the names of people who continue to die in this foolish process. The premise was wrong of this war. The tactics were wrong in this war. The urgency was wrong in this war. The reasons given on the floor of this House for doing it were not correct. And now the President says, throw some more good money after bad. The answer from my district is "no," and it ought to be from the entire Congress, until we have some changes in this whole plan and we have some explanation for what he did with the last amount.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This vote will be one of the most important that I ever cast. It certainly is going to be among the most controver-

sial. But if America is to truly lead by example, adhere to its principles and to assume the responsibility that comes with national greatness and national interests in every corner of the world, then we must make this contribution now for their sake, for ours, and for the sake of future generations.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the supplemental, and I voted for the Defense appropriations and the Defense authorization. My support for the troops is well-documented, and I have shown that I support them. But I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that this administration misinformed the American people and misinformed this Congress for the reasons to go to Iraq. Weapons of mass destruction, the nuclear plan, the chemicals, the biological, we have yet to see any of that. Yet, he continues to tell us a story that is not true. This administration miscalculated what we would do in Iraq. He said that we would be seen as liberators and, in fact, to date, Mr. Chairman, they see us as invaders. I believe that this administration and the policy it has towards Iraq and its construction is misguided. The plan right now, if there is a plan, is not working. The ghosts of Vietnam are around this Congress and this city. For those that talk about the loans, I just want to remind them that we forced the Arabian states, we forced Russia, France and England to give loans to the regime when they were in a battle with Iran.

□ 1315

It was because of our encouragement that this debt is carried by Iraq today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. And certainly I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) as this most important investment in Iraq worked its way through the full Committee on Appropriations. Our committee scrubbed this bill down and reduced it, streamlined it, built in much more accountability; and I think collectively Republicans and Democrats came together to do an important work to bring this bill to the floor, and I certainly rise in support of making this necessary investment.

I also want to say over the last 3 weeks it has been an interesting experience for me because I began to ask questions and look at ways to propose an amendment to make a portion of

this investment, this reconstruction investment, a loan as opposed to a grant. That is a long story that I will not try to go back through except to say that when I met last week face to face with the President of the United States about whether this investment in Iraq should be a loan or a grant and he explained to me that negotiations were under way, I have to say that today at the United Nations with the resolution that our country achieved, what he told us last week is coming true, and that is support is building among other nations for making this necessary investment and for liberating on a permanent basis an Arab country.

And Iraq is a true test for freedom and opportunity for our allies and this great Nation, and I just want to come to the floor today to say, while I had differences of opinion about how to go about it, we need to come together as a Nation, as a people, and as a Congress on the fact that we must succeed in Iraq. At this point we have no choice but to go forward and finish what we have started. We cannot afford to fail; and the world must see us in a bold, successful move at this point in the history of the world to open up freedom in the Arab world, and what better place to do it than where tyranny and oppression were rampant.

Years ago I was a Member of this body and came to the floor with concerns about President Clinton's efforts in Eastern Europe, but I have also said in recent weeks that I was wrong and that that investment that our country made in resources and danger and peril for our troops to remove a genocidal murderer named Slobodan Milosevic was a very successful and necessary effort to promote freedom and better secure our country and so is this mission in Iraq, and we must not flinch.

We must invest the full amount. While I would love to see a portion of this made into a loan and I made my case and presented that argument; at the end of the day, those leaders in the executive branch in negotiations with the G-7 nations, our allies, others in the region from the Saudis to the Kuwaitis to the Qatars, they are talking about ways to write down this so-called debt; I call it bankruptcy debt. That debt that Saddam Hussein built up should not be payable, and I believe that the pressure is mounting for Germany and France and Russia and others to write that debt down dramatically. Ambassador Bremer told me that that is the goal, to have that debt written down or written off. And I do not want the U.S. taxpayer to invest a dime that might go to those other countries; and we built in conditions in this bill that would not allow that to happen.

But at the end of the day the bottom line, after we weigh in and have this debate and make our case and stand our ground and carry out our constitutional responsibility, is we need to do this. Whether one supported it from

the start or not, here is where we are today, and we have got to finish what we started and make the necessary investments. We cannot afford not to, and freedom comes with a huge price. For some brave Americans it is the loss of life, it is their limbs, it is going into harm's way on our behalf. For taxpayers, it is investments. We thank everyone for these investments; but the cost of freedom is high, very high today, but we cannot afford not to do it or invest it. We must finish what we started, and we must preserve our country with some preemptive action on the other end of the world. And I see it that way. I see Saddam Hussein as a threat, and terrorism is looking for a place to take root; and we cannot let it take root. We took decisive action, and now we have got to win the peace. And it is expensive, but we do not have any choice but to do this. And I hope everybody comes together to make this necessary investment.

We are all Americans, and we are at the waterfront. Democrats and Republicans, we are all patriots and we are standing with our country. Make one's case. At end of the day, support this necessary investment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I represent San Diego, California, a place from which thousands and thousands of our troops have been sent to the war in Iraq. My constituents' families are personally involved in this effort every day, and I say to them that those who are going to vote against this blank check for the President are thinking about their brave sons and daughters. It is we who are thinking about their safety.

This administration, with \$79 billion that we gave them, cannot equip our troops with the body armor they need to survive. We have killed dozens of soldiers. We have maimed dozens of them because they did not have that body armor. What kind of an administration would do that and then say they support the troops? We have no accountability for what they did before. We have no accountability for this \$87 billion that they are asking us to give them now. This is not what a legislative branch's duty is. A legislative branch is to exert co-equal control, co-equal influence with the executive branch; and the only way we can do that is through the purse strings.

The gentleman before me said we have to keep going with what we are doing. Even if it is wrong, even if we have thrown in so much money, even if we have no plan to get out, let us keep going. I heard those arguments with Vietnam, and we were in a quagmire then. We are in an "Iraqmire" now. And we need to turn those troops' responsibilities over to an international body. We need to make sure that our troops come home alive. We are going

to have the accountability that this body deserves only if we vote "no" on this matter. And I say to my friends, to my families in San Diego, it is time to turn this matter over to the United Nations. It is time that we internationalize this force. It is time that we bring our troops home; and we can spend that \$87 billion on education, on health, on our veterans here at home. Vote "no" on the supplemental.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I announce to the gentleman who just spoke that the United Nations has now voted unanimously to agree to the resolution offered by the United States of America on the issue of Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this \$87 billion is a little bit steep for my wallet, and it is a little bit steep for probably the wallets of most Americans. So I will be voting against it.

But I understand this is called a supplemental. It is interesting that it is a supplemental because we have not passed a budget; so I have to suggest maybe we ought to call this a preemptive budget rather than a supplemental. But it is the largest, and to have it before the regular budget is pretty astounding that we are going to spend this type of money.

But I want to take this minute I have to quote from a book, "A World Transformed," and this was written about 5 years ago talking about Iraq. And I think this is a very serious quote and something worth listening to:

"Trying to eliminate Saddam Hussein . . . would have incurred incalculable human and political costs. Apprehending him was probably impossible . . . We would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq . . . There was no available 'exit strategy' we could see, violating another of our principles. Furthermore, we had been self-consciously trying to set a pattern for handling aggression in the post-Cold War world. Going in and occupying Iraq, thus unilaterally exceeding the United Nations' mandate, would have destroyed the precedent of international response to aggression that we hoped to establish. Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land."

That was written 5 years ago, very perceptive. It was written by President Bush, Sr. So I think we are here now in a very hostile land with a very difficult situation.

I was a strong opponent of the war for two reasons: one, I sincerely believed our national security was not threatened, and I also was convinced that it had no relationship to 9-11; and I think those two concerns have been

proven to be correct. Many who had voted against the war now suggest that they might vote for this appropriation because they feel it is necessary to vote to support the troops. I think that is a red herring argument because if we take a poll, and there have been some recent polls of the troops in Iraq, we find out that probably all of them would love to come home next week. So I do not see how a vote against this appropriation can be construed. As a matter of fact, that is challenging the motivation of those of us who will oppose the legislation, that we do not support the troops. So I am in support of voting against this appropriation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that all of us know is one and one equals two, and I think a very good question for all of us to ask is why are the two parts of this supplemental one part? Why are the military and the reconstruction parts of this bill together?

Let me give the Members the answer, which is not very complicated: one and one plus two, is that if they were separate, the supplemental part dealing with reconstruction would fail. Every Member knows that. Why would it fail? Because my Republican colleagues would vote against it and it would fail. So they have leveraged to put the two things together and said if we vote against the bill, we are against the troops. That is not why this bill is in one bill. The reason it is in one bill is because if the two things were separate, the reconstruction effort would fail.

Let me tell the Members why it would fail. Because it is crazy. Because it is crazy. Because it is indefensible from policy grounds to have American taxpayers, literally American taxpayers, pay for the reconstruction of a country, 27 million people, that has trillions, trillions of dollars in oil reserves, the second largest oil reserves in the world. At the same time, this country, Iraq, is part of OPEC today, will be part of OPEC when the middle class, lower class people in America take their hard-earned tax dollars and their hard-earned wages taxed by the monopoly power of OPEC, which is exactly what Iraq is going to do, some of that monopoly tax, hundreds of billions of dollars of taxes that we are paying as Americans, see some of that money going to terrorists. Some of that money is going to terrorists; and the terrorists, in fact, are trying to kill us. Vote down the whole amendment, and let us send it back as separate bills.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I do rise in support of the emergency spending measure that we have before

us, and I do thank the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman for their great work on this.

I appreciate the scrutiny of the reconstruction request to fund the priority projects to continue the development of a stable and self-sufficient Iraq and to eliminate those which may not be necessary. The sooner we accomplish this, the sooner our brave troops can return home.

A few days ago, several of my colleagues and I returned from a trip to Iraq where we gained firsthand knowledge of the challenges we face and the responsibilities we have. While there, we met with many American servicemen and -women representing us in Iraq.

□ 1330

I felt their passion for the mission at hand and the pride they felt for making a difference in the lives of Iraqis. I met military men and women from Delaware who described building schools, developing access to water and electricity and talking with Iraqis who are discovering, for the first time, the opportunities that only come from being free.

This trip also exposed me to the pain of this conflict, the senseless loss of life. While we were there, three U.S. servicemen were attacked and killed. Our troops in Iraq face serious danger every second of every day, but they remain committed to establishing a stable Iraq so we are not forced to send a future generation to deal with another Saddam Hussein.

We can all agree that we want our troops home safe and as soon as possible. I believe the best way to do that is by sending them the funding necessary to hand Iraq over to a democratically-elected body that represents a thriving, multiethnic, self-sufficient nation.

To prevent future vulnerability to terrorist attacks, the international community must be united. I have a great deal of pride in the leadership the United States currently provides in our stand against terror, but I support an immediate increase of involvement by the United Nations on the ground in Iraq and feel their leadership has long been overdue. The resolution just passed by the Security Council was altered in good faith for Russia, France and U.N. Secretary Annan, to include a loose time line for Iraqi sovereignty.

A time line should be a goal, but real progress in Iraq depends on the drafting of an Iraqi constitution, free and fair elections and the establishment of an elected governing body. Access to water and electricity, police protection, judicial accountability, secured borders, an internationally recognized monetary system, viable economic structure and making sure Iraqis are getting paid for the work they are doing are all necessities for moving forward and continue to be priorities for the Americans in Iraq.

In response to amendments attempting to shift grants to loans, I share

their concern for our growing deficit. The fact is that we are the leaders of the governing body in Iraq. There is no government structure to guarantee repayment. Next week at the International Donors Conference in Spain, we will call upon France and Russia to forgive tens of billions of dollars in debt, request billions in aid and ask that other nations send their soldiers to join ours.

I believe that all of us would prefer that the United States focus our attention wholly on our domestic priorities, but we do not have that luxury. Our responsibility is to make our world safer for generations to come and finish the job we started.

I would encourage all of us to support the supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today we consider providing additional funding for military and reconstruction activities. I am frustrated that we are paying for this request through increased deficit spending, without even considering the options of international loans or other revenue sources that would spread the burden to those who can most afford it. Nonetheless, I believe that the United States, ultimately, has responsibility to follow through on our international commitments.

We must not forget the majority of this bill's funding goes toward ensuring the safety and success of our troops, and they should have all the resources they need to get the job done. Last week, I visited Walter Reed Medical Center and spoke with soldiers whose injuries might have been prevented if they had been driving the armored vehicles funded in this bill.

With regard to the reconstruction component, I am pleased that some of the more controversial requests have been deemed unworthy of emergency funding. The remaining items will improve the safety and self-sufficiency of the Iraqi people.

Unfortunately, in meeting our commitments, we will add \$87 billion to an already historic deficit, which translates into larger interest payments on the national debt and less funding for important domestic priorities.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents are fully aware of the impact on our budget. The costs of this package fall unfairly on the American taxpayers, and we must rectify this problem. I know that some of my colleagues share my reservations, and I look forward to the upcoming amendment process as an opportunity to address some of these concerns.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, my trip to Iraq last week convinced me of the need to sup-

port this bill, to provide to our troops with the tools and protection they need to do their job. In addition, I am convinced if we do not adopt this bill, Iraq will descend into chaos and ultimately violence.

However, while I support the bill, I want to take the opportunity to urge President Bush to abandon the unilateral approach we have taken over the last few months in Iraq and begin to share more of the burden with our allies. For months, Democrats and Republicans in Congress have been urging the President to do exactly that.

In my trip to Iraq, I was remarkably struck by the resistance in the office of the CPA, the authority running Iraq, to bring our allies in. The stakes are too high, the challenges are too great, for us to try to do this by ourselves. We need to bring in allies, particularly from some of the Muslim countries, to help our soldiers work on a side-by-side basis.

I understand we have had a coalition in Iraq. That includes our good friends, the Canadians. How many troops do the Canadians have in Iraq? One troop. We need to get beyond symbolism. We need people on the ground that speak Arabic, that are equipped to work side-by-side with our soldiers.

The CPA, the Coalition Provisional Authority, is overwhelmed. I talked to soldiers who told me they have been counting on the Iraqi people to help them deal with the threats they face every day. They cannot even communicate with them, so few of our soldiers speak Arabic, so few of the Iraqis speak English.

Many of our troops are involved in jobs they were not trained to do. We have troops that are being policemen, that are training police. We need to call upon allies like the Germans and the Italians to train our police.

We are not in Iraq to do business. We are in Iraq to help the Iraqi people take control of their country. We need to bring our allies in to help us succeed in this monumental task.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

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

Mr. Chairman, there is a glaring omission in this emergency bill. We have once again neglected to provide resources for our veterans. I sought to add an amendment of \$1.8 billion from the Iraqi Relief and Reconstruction Fund to the Veterans Health Administration.

Today, as we move forward, each day over 10 to 11 people come in that have been injured in Iraq, over 1,500 to this day. We need to make sure that we have additional resources for our veterans. That \$1.8 billion does not begin to even address additional programs. It is to make sure we keep existing services as it is.

This administration has chosen to come forward and disallow Priority 7

and Priority 8 veterans. Now, they have also come forward with a lot of fuzzy math when they came with a proposal for \$3 billion for veterans, when that \$3 billion consisted of \$1.8 billion from copayments of veterans alone, and an additional \$1.2 billion when there were copayments from prescription drug payments from themselves. The other was supposed to be efficiencies.

The money is not there. There is a need for us to concentrate and provide resources for our veterans.

Let me also add that the previous time that we dished money for Iraq, a little bit over \$79 billion that has gone out for the war on terrorism, there was \$2 billion in there for health care for Iraqis. Well, I am only asking for \$1.8 billion for our own veterans right here. As they come home, and as we have over 1,500 that have been identified as needing services, we need to be there for them. I ask that we take that into consideration.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor for me to be here today on the bipartisan effort to support the President on the supplemental. I was particularly pleased to hear a moment ago the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS). He and I are both graduates of Washington and Lee University, so we have a kinship there, and I am delighted to hear of his support for the supplemental.

Today is a significant day with the support that has been received on the international stage. We began this morning hearing that Japan is going to contribute \$1.5 billion, up to \$5 billion, for the reconstruction and redevelopment of Iraq. We also had today the unanimous vote of the U.N. Security Council to support the proposals that the United States put forward today to bring order to Iraq and protect the American people.

Additionally, I had the opportunity today to be present with the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), meeting for the first time in history with Speaker Ognyan Gerdjikov, the Speaker of the Bulgarian National Assembly. He, of course, indicated, as their government has done on the Security Council and by providing troops to Iraq, that Bulgaria is standing very strong with its ally, the United States.

I had the opportunity 3 weeks ago to visit with General David Petraeus and with General Ricardo Sanchez in Iraq. I saw the progress being made.

Another indication of progress was in the New York Times today, and that is that the currency of Iraq is being exchanged. It began yesterday. This is a 90-day proposal or project to turn in the currency which has the dictator's face on it, Saddam Hussein. Yesterday, on the very first day, nearly one-third of all the currency in Iraq was turned

in. This is an extraordinary indication of progress, support by the people of Iraq, for the changes that are needed to be made.

Just as after World War II, we helped reconstruct Germany so it would not be a breeding ground for communists, we can now have a reconstruction of Iraq so it is not a breeding ground for terrorism. We defeated communism. I believe in the war on terrorism, with our wonderful troops, with our President, that we can make progress today supporting the supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chairman, I say to the chairman, ranking member, men of good conscience, everyone is of good conscience, I believe, on this floor, but Iraq is too important to pull up our stakes now.

We saw in Somalia, with the withdrawal of the United States, it soon reverted to its precolonial past consisting of a mosaic of independent clans with different laws and rulers, each with its own militia.

We pulled out of Afghanistan in 1989, we pulled out of Iraq in 1991, and what happened? I imagine that somewhere right now, Mr. Chairman, former Presidential economic adviser, Larry Lindsey, is enjoying the resurgence of his reputation. After he predicted that we would have to spend \$100 billion to \$200 billion in Iraq, on September 15, 2002 he made that statement, he was dismissed from the White House.

If this latest supplemental is enacted, the United States will have spent close to \$157 billion on military operations. Excluding that one moment of candor from Mr. Lindsey, this is indeed a far cry from the talking points. And this is more than talking points, these are faces of American soldiers. Every other administration official presented to Congress these talking points, these scripts, these spins, and to the American people, before we even went to Iraq.

Iraq is important, Mr. Chairman. The attitude of the administration must change regardless of how this vote comes out today. It must be more transparent, it must be more open, and it must allow for debate, instead of moving to secrecy. Let us not forget Somalia in our vote today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not vote for the original war resolution. I thought it was ill-advised to delegate to the President authority that the Congress had, and I thought it was ill-advised for the President to proceed to war without world support and support from the U.N. in the absence of an imminent threat to the United States.

I had some reservations, because people were saying that there was an imminent threat. The President was say-

ing that. But I did not think we should rush into this war in the first place. I have seen nothing since then to change my mind about that.

I think we were ill-advised to proceed to this war in a hasty fashion without the support of the U.N., and I think our policies continue to be flawed to stay there and to pursue this war without world support.

The only reason that I have vexed about this vote is that our soldiers are there, and they are in harm's way. But I think to support this resolution would be to sanction the flawed policies of this administration. Consequently, my intention is to vote no on this proposed appropriation.

□ 1345

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform who has done considerable work on the need for accountability in contracting on this issue.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Bush administration has made it impossible for me and others to do what we would otherwise want to do. Under normal circumstances, I would support the President's request for \$87 billion in additional spending for Iraq and Afghanistan, but I cannot do that today. The Bush administration's Iraq policy has been grounded in secrecy, deceit, and politics. Some suspected that a year ago, I refused to believe it. But now, it is inescapable.

The intolerable reality is that they blatantly twisted intelligence information to fit preconceived policies. They lied to promote public relations, from the Jessica Lynch ordeal to the President's campaign landing on the USS *Abraham Lincoln* and on what the war would cost our country. And through all of it, they have refused to answer questions, provide honest information, and accept any oversight or accountability for their actions. It is an abysmal and, at times, inexcusable record.

I voted for the Iraq resolution last year. I relied on the President's representations about the imminent threat Iraq posed to the United States. And I relied on the statements that other senior administration officials, including the Vice President, made regarding Iraq's nuclear capability. I will not make that same mistake again. They have squandered their credibility and the normal deference we give to any administration, Democratic or Republican.

I say all of this knowing full well we must finish what we started in Iraq. I feel that as strongly as any member of the House. And as one who voted for the resolution, I feel a responsibility to make sure we honor the sacrifice so many have already made by achieving a democratic and safe Iraq. And I feel a special obligation to our troops to make sure they have everything they need to be as safe and effective as possible. But before I agree to the President's request, I want to be confident

that those running the war are doing their job and that the reconstruction effort is effective, not wasteful, spending.

Some say the easy political vote is to support the President's request and defend it by saying we are supporting the troops. But if we really want to support the troops, we will first make sure that the people running the war know what they are doing. No American soldier should die because of mistakes up the line.

This administration must put aside its stubbornness and make the world community a serious and active part of this process. Then we could vote for the President's request in good conscience.

Mr. Chairman, the Bush administration has made a series of terrible mistakes in formulating its Iraq policy. But even in the face of those mistakes, the administration insists on going it alone. No help from other countries. No oversight by the Congress. No accountability to the American people. That will never change if we give them an automatic "yes" vote on today's bill. Instead, voting "yes" will encourage them to continue the policies that do not work and tactics that deserve condemnation. Our troops deserve better than that. We should oppose the President's request until this administration demonstrates that it puts our troops before politics and honesty before pride.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), a ranking member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I returned from Iraq last night, and every American can be very proud of the work that our men and women in uniform are doing there for our country. The sacrifice they are making and the danger they face demand that we provide them with the best in equipment, supplies, and quality of life that we possibly can as they continue the effort to bring stability to Iraq.

I commend our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for the efforts he has made to move more of the \$87 billion to protect our troops. Irrespective of one's views about the wisdom of preemptive action against Saddam Hussein and concerns about the intelligence analysis upon which that action was based, we are now confronted as a Nation with a challenge and a responsibility where failure is not an option. The future of Iraq and the success there will depend upon the willingness that we have to stay the course. This will require sacrifice on the part of the American people, and I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for calling upon the top 1 percent of Americans measured by income to share in the sacrifice being made by our troops in Iraq.

The future stability of the region demands stability in Iraq. I found the

Iraqi people to be capable, intelligent, and determined to provide a better way of life for their people. And in the eyes of Iraqi teachers, in the eyes of the Iraqi policemen and firefighters that we are training, and in the eyes of members of the Iraqi governing council, I found hope. We have assumed a stake in the success of their future, and we must not fail; and I hope that we will be joined by others in the world community in assisting us in achieving success in Iraq.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me this time and for his willingness to engage in this colloquy regarding an issue of tremendous importance. I am concerned, as are many of our colleagues, about the out-of-pocket costs to U.S. soldiers participating in the Rest and Recuperation program for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

As my colleague from Florida knows, soldiers granted leave through the R&R program are flown by the Department of Defense to Baltimore, Washington International Airport for a 2-week leave from arduous duties on the front lines of freedom. The Pentagon restarted the R&R program, which had been dormant since Vietnam, to boost morale of soldiers who are being deployed for over a year. Once soldiers arrive at BWI, it is up to them to pay for the rest of their travel costs to see their families. Often, airlines have provided discounted rates, but some soldiers have reported paying in excess of \$1,000. Now, we should not be causing an additional burden on soldiers or their families during this comparatively short stay in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate adopted an amendment during floor consideration offered by Mr. COLEMAN of Minnesota to alleviate this burden on our Armed Forces. Several Members of this House, including myself, have introduced legislation to correct this issue. I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he would consider supporting the Senate provision in the conference committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the gentleman from Arizona that I understand the importance of this issue. At a time when we are spending nearly \$90 billion to support the mission of our Nation and our troops, we should be willing to ease the strain on our soldiers and their families.

The gentleman from Arizona is a cosponsor of a bill, H.R. 2998, that I introduced to help ease the financial burden on returning troops and, in this case, troops who are charged a subsistence

fee for their stay in military hospitals. So I am supportive of the gentleman's goal.

I would also like to mention that the Department of Defense has plans to expand the R&R program to include airports beyond BWI, which should help some. Airports in Los Angeles, Atlanta, and Dallas-Fort Worth should become part of the program before the end of the year.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I agree that it is an issue of great importance, and I can give the gentleman assurance that the Senate provision will be given every consideration by this chairman.

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

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

Today we are debating the administration's request for an \$87 billion bailout occasioned by its failed planning, or rather, its failure to plan, its lack of planning for postwar Iraq. We are asked to pass this \$87 billion bailout despite the fact that the Bush administration has not yet articulated a coherent or workable underlying strategy to accomplish our mission and to bring our troops home safely and soon. It is either unwilling or incapable of doing so.

The only way this Congress can ensure for the American people that such a strategy exists and that it has a reasonable chance of success is by using its power of the purse. We are dealing with an administration that has already had over \$400 billion in its Department of Defense budget, and it has already received one supplemental appropriation of \$63 billion. Yet it fails to explain how and why our forces had tens of thousands of men and women unprotected with the proper Kevlar breast plates, Humvees without proper armor, and rancid water for 80 percent of the troops, or how those conditions continued, even after they knew in June that people were dying and being injured.

In addition, the administration, in its zeal to get all of the money now so it will not have to come back in 2004's election year to report to the American people, insinuates that a vote against this bailout is a vote against our troops and a vote to cut and run. Nothing could be further from the truth. The administration's own figures show that this is just another dissembling of the facts. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the Pentagon can stay in Iraq another 6 months without an additional penny in funds. But we have been prevented from seeking accountability from this administration as it asserts a need for emergency funds.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has a moral and practical responsibility to modify and condition these funds, and it is time to reject this rubber stamp

blank check and insist on an alternative that the Democrats want to put forward, but the majority and the administration have prohibited it from seeing the light of day.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who can speak in this Chamber, even though, unfortunately, she is not allowed to vote.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. The President himself woke up the American people with his September 7, \$87 billion sticker-shock speech. People have already voted. Choose the poll: 59 percent in one, 66 percent in another. The vote is "no."

The reason is the President failed to seize the issue, the one issue that could have changed people's minds, that is paying for the war with a tax cut from the top 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans. Instead, he persists in making sacrifice a one-way street, sacrifice for the troops, while the rest of us remain untouched. The President has really touched the American people this time, though, with his \$87 billion request. Having almost wrecked the economy with a crippling deficit, this \$87 billion will prove our economic denouement.

First, the wreck of our relations with the very allies necessary for our own protection in the war against terrorism. Then, the wreck of the volunteer Army, particularly the loss of many of our weekend warriors from the National Guard and Reserve who never signed up for an indefinite duty in a preemptive war. Every amendment before this body must be paid for except this one.

Mr. Chairman, if we approve this request, the final wreck will be the appropriation power meant to check Presidential power. Our appropriation responsibility in time of war, never a tiger, will become a pussy cat that delivers to the cat in the White House, even without getting its proverbial cup of milk.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

I rise today to join every Member of this Chamber in supporting the American men and women serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the globe. We are indebted to their service, to their courage, to what they do to preserve the American Dream and freedom.

However, let us not confuse support for our troops with support for any half-baked plan, or lack of a plan, for securing our troops and rebuilding Iraq. Let us not fool ourselves into believing that our shared patriotism somehow absolves us, Members of Con-

gress, from the responsibility to stand up and criticize a flawed policy.

On September 7, President Bush addressed the Nation and called upon this body to pass \$87 billion in supplemental appropriations. Within minutes after the President's address and every day since, my constituents have been telling me that they are alarmed by this request. Some tell me that \$1,000 per family is a lot of money when they think the President is just throwing money at a problem without having a plan to fix it. Some tell me that we should be spending the money to address obligations here at home, like paying for the adequate health care for our veterans from previous wars, as well as the veterans from this war.

Others tell me that the President should not ask Congress for more money until he secures more international support, or that we should not have to bear the cost alone. Some tell me that when the government is borrowing money to give tax cuts to the wealthy, we should not be borrowing this \$87 billion from our children.

□ 1400

And like my constituents, I have all of these reservations and more.

I had hoped the President would send Congress a detailed, long-term plan for the reconstruction of Iraq. I had hoped the President would come with a plan for help from our allies. He has failed to do that.

I would support the Obey substitute if it were allowed, but without significant changes, I cannot support the President's request at this time.

I had hoped that by now the President would have secured the significant financial support of our allies. I had hoped that by now thousands of our men and women serving in Iraq would see international troops coming to relieve them so that some of them might return home.

Instead, the President has sent his request to Congress before developing a clear plan for reconstruction. He has sent his request before he has secured hardly any international financial support. And he has sent his request before he has convinced our allies to provide multinational forces to internationalize the troop presence in Iraq. In effect, he is asking the American people to subsidize his failed diplomacy and poor post-war planning.

Nevertheless, a Member of Congress should not vote no on this request out of spite. I believe that Congress can and should pass a supplemental bill that will adequately support our troops in Iraq. The President has committed us to helping to stabilize and rebuild Iraq and we must live up to that commitment. However, we cannot blindly approve whatever the President requests, especially when his request is not well thought-out and when it includes wasteful spending.

There are two parts to this \$87 billion request. About two-thirds is to support military operations and our troops, while the other third is for reconstruction. There are serious problems with both. First, the military portion gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to reprogram almost \$40 billion. In other words, the President is so unsure of what programs

need support that he has given the Secretary the power to change how \$40 billion worth of this bill will be spent. Forty billion dollars is a large petty cash fund. Why don't we just write the Secretary a personal check and send him on his way?

There are problems with the reconstruction portion of the bill, too. Imagine; the bill calls for \$900,000,000 to import oil to Iraq. We spend money we don't have so that we can import oil to the country with the world's second largest oil reserves. I am pleased that my colleague Rep. DAVID OBEY and the other members of the Appropriations Committee were able to eliminate some of the \$1.7 billion worth of the most wasteful portions of the President's request, including hundreds of millions of dollars to build luxury prisons in Iraq, hundreds of millions to buy state-of-the-art garbage trucks, and millions to send Iraqis to business school.

I am also pleased that they were able to guarantee that the Pentagon will have no flexibility when it comes to procuring bulletproof body armor and other critical need safety equipment for our troops. We must keep our troops safe. Unfortunately, these changes only scratch the surface of what is necessary to fix this request.

How can Americans be asked to spend a billion dollars to import oil into one of the largest oil producing countries in the world? Another amendment would make sure that this Administration is adopting competitive practices when awarding contracts to companies that are hired to help with Iraq's construction. Still, another would invest in making sure we have trained linguists who can speak the languages employed by terrorists.

I also would vote for the Obey substitute, if the Chair would allow a vote. It would help pay for the reconstruction of Iraq by eliminating the tax cut currently enjoyed by the top one percent of Americans. We cannot afford to go any deeper into debt that this Administration has taken us and we cannot saddle middle class Americans with a financial burden that they cannot afford and should not be asked to bear.

A year ago I stood here on the House floor and I voted against the resolution authorizing the President to launch a unilateral, preventive war against Iraq. At the time, I defended my vote, arguing that it was "at the least premature, and more likely contrary to our national interest," for Congress to authorize military action against Iraq. Today, our troops are in Iraq and we have made a commitment as a nation to make sure they complete their mission. But as I stand here again, I cannot help but ask whether voting for this \$87 billion request right now is at the least premature, and most likely, contrary to our national interest.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I just returned after leading a bipartisan trip to Iraq this last Friday. We had Members from all over the country, Republicans and Democrats, and we had Members on our trip that both had supported the war resolution last year, as well as those that opposed it.

I have to say all of us were very proud of every American we met from the USAID, workers at the schools, to the hospitals, and Ambassador Bremer,

the generals, the leaders of our troops, and every man and woman in our Armed Services. I wish I could have taken all of us here in this Chamber, as well as across the country, to see how proud we are of every person that we met with.

Whether you opposed the war resolution or not this last year, we are there now. We need this mission to succeed. I would have to say that nobody here would be against the money for our troops. Yes, we need armored Humvees. Yes, we need more body armor for our vehicles. I would hope that no one here would be opposed to the money to help those that are serving our great land. But we also need the money for reconstruction. It will expedite our troops' withdrawal to come home from that region of the world. It will help promote democracy by birthing democracy where it can flourish.

Now, there will be a dispute here that we will resolve, whether it should be a grant or a loan. We will decide that perhaps later today or tomorrow in the House, in the other body, or certainly in the conference between the House and the other body. But we need the money for reconstruction. Because without those security funds, without seeing those dollars come to help that land begin to prosper, our troops will be there a lot longer. And we will fail in our mission to achieve democracy in that important region of the world.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution that we are dealing with later on tonight and tomorrow. We need to encourage it in every way, freedom and democracy to flourish.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the supplemental and support the Obey amendment. This is a question of accountability. I continue to abide by the principles set forth by the Congressional Black Caucus last month to determine whether we, as Members of Congress, would support the President's request for more aid in Iraq.

I believe that the President should provide the Congress with the full details of the information relied upon by him to go to war. He has not done that. I asked that the President provide full details about how the efforts will be paid for, including full accounting of how and to what extent Iraqi resources could be used to reduce the U.S. costs. He has not done that.

He should provide us with full details about the future obligations of the United States and about how responsibility and authority for these obligations will be shared with the United Nations and other nations. He has not done that.

Congress should ask for a detailed accounting from the administration as to all funds expended to date, including details about all contractors for work in or related to Iraq.

Lastly, the President should set forth criteria he expects will be necessary to

meet before we bring our troops home. In other words, what is considered victory? He has not done that.

No more blank checks. People in my district want better schools. They want better health care. They care about the Iraqi people, but they ask are we spending our money effectively and efficiently. And what they have concluded is because this President will not tell us what has been done with the money we already spent, we question what will be done with this money.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, the commander of the Army's 101st Airborne Division in Iraq, Major General Petraeus, likes to remind Congressional visitors that money is ammunition in the battle to stabilize Iraq: money to reopen the cement factory outside Mosul, money to buy ice and food from local merchants, money to productively employ the now-idle hands of former Iraqi Army officers, money for 1,000 other local projects that capitalize on the boundless potential of the Iraqi people and arm them to defeat their most entrenched, insidious enemies, powerlessness and despair.

This bill provides the ammunition needed to wage and win the next critical battle in the war against terrorism and oppression in Iraq. Building on the administration's original request, the committee has met our first obligation, to arm and equip U.S. warfighters to prevail in this complex mission while fueling construction of a viable, sustainable civil society in Iraq.

During two trips to Iraq since April, I saw the strength and courage of our forces as they worked alongside Iraqis rebuilding schools by day and risking their lives patrolling those same streets by night. The dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces know their quickest route home goes through as many markets as minefields, and that their victory over tyranny will be secured as soon as Iraqis are running their own democratic nation.

We are stewards of Iraqi sovereignty. With the reconstruction, economic development, and public diplomacy funds in this bill, we make wise investments to preserve and grow the precious assets in our trust. But the deed of trust is not indefinite. The window of opportunity to build on an oasis of hope in that troubled region will close. This bill reflects our national commitment to meet history's challenge and set Iraq on an inevitable course toward democracy and economic vitality.

Fiscal pressures here at home cannot change the harsher fact that Iraq faces its new future encumbered with a crushing debt burden estimated to be as high as \$220 billion. Adding to that debt would be wrong morally and politically. Imposing debt without consent of the governed is the way despots and conquerors build monuments to

themselves and past glories. That was how Saddam Hussein built his palaces. Liberators leave behind memorials to generosity and investments in a better future. That is what this bill will buy. Our investment will be returned manyfold by a free and prosperous Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman and Members, Thomas Friedman, a columnist for the New York Times, back in February of this year indicated in a column, "You do not take the country to war on the wings of a lie." My friends, that is exactly what has happened. We were told that we have to attack Iraq because they have weapons of mass destruction. We have to attack Iraq because the United States was in imminent danger of attack by this country. And also we were told that Iraq and Saddam Hussein were involved in the terrorist attack of 9/11.

My friends, all those rationales have been proved wrong. We have not found any weapons of mass destruction. We know that there is no way in God's green earth that Saddam had any missile or any other armament that could come near to attacking this country. And over and over again we have been told, including by the CIA, that Saddam and Iraq was not involved in 9/11. So why are we there? Why did we attack this country?

My colleagues, I did not vote for the War Powers Resolution, and I am not going to vote today for this supplemental bill which will, in effect, continue the war and the killing of our troops. Now, we are told that if we do not pass this bill, our troops will not get the bullets they need and the food and supplies. That is all wrong, and it is not true.

The President signed the Department of Defense appropriation bill, and so funding is available until May or June of next year. So what we are left with is supplying reconstruction dollars to Iraq to build the things that we blew up in the first place.

But it is more than that. This bill also provides things like school buildings and books for Iraqi children. Now how nice. But why do not we do the same for our kids? It provides health care and medical facilities, free medical care for Iraqis, as we have 42 million Americans with no health care whatsoever.

My friends, those who support this bill should at least have the intestinal fortitude to pay for it. For if it passes, which will happen later today, \$87 billion will be borrowed. We are broke. We do not have the money. And that \$87 billion will be put on the \$500 billion deficit that already exists. When are we going to stop the insanity around here?

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, during the lead-up to this war in Iraq, this body had great assurances from the President and his staff that in the aftermath, the United States would not be tagged with the bill. Here we are debating to commit \$87 billion to this war.

And this war has been described to us as fighting terrorists. Not a single terrorist has come from this area. And this really could not come at a worse time because we have no money. Our economy is the worst we have seen in 70 years. We have lost many, many jobs. Just in my area, 105,000 jobs have been lost in Dallas.

Protecting our troops in Iraq, or anywhere they are, is important and necessary. But I have been to Iraq, and they are not protected. I have been to Germany to look at those who have been injured, and here. Where is the money going? There is no accountability. No accountability for the first money that has been appropriated. Now, we are asking for more.

And we are financing this war in Iraq with deficit spending. We are borrowing money to pay for this war. We are not cutting spending, we are not raising taxes. If anything, we are going to see another tax break coming soon. We are endangering Social Security.

Vote against this spending. We do not need another blank check being handed to the President.

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

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Iraq supplemental legislation before this Congress and commend the careful deliberation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and all the members of the Committee on Appropriations for this outstanding legislative work in every respect, save one. On the issue of whether reconstruction costs in Iraq should take the form of a grant or a loan, I have considered the arguments of the administration and the opinions of my constituents with much deliberation and prayer. On this question, I have decided it is appropriate for me to stand firm in my belief that a portion of the reconstruction costs should eventually be repaid by the Iraqi people to the people of the United States.

□ 1415

Accordingly, today I will offer the Pence amendment which provides, Mr. Chairman, a middle ground between the challenges of extending a loan to a nation, Iraq, and the desire of the American people to see this oil-rich nation bear the cost at some point in the future of building a civil society.

It is not appropriate, as some will argue on this floor today and tonight, to make all of the reconstruction funding in the form of a loan. As the admin-

istration has argued, and as has the chairman, the possibility of extending a loan from the United States to a nation not yet formed is problematic. In recognition of this reality, the Pence amendment makes the first 50 percent of the funding available immediately as a grant, giving priority consideration emergency purposes of security, electricity, oil infrastructure, and the like. Once the administration informs the Congress that a democratically elected government in Iraq has been established, the balance of the funds would be made available under the Pence amendment in the form of loans from the United States Government under terms determined by the President.

Having addressed the logistical concerns raised by the administration and others, I believe it is appropriate that the Congress defer to the consent of the governed, especially in matters of foreign aid. Many Americans, even in my conservative district, overwhelmingly support some repayment of reconstruction costs. Most Americans know that Iraq is an oil-rich nation, possessing the second largest oil reserves on the planet, and will eventually be able to bear the burden of repaying some of the costs of rebuilding its own infrastructure.

At a time of mounting Federal deficits, making a portion of the reconstruction a loan also reassures the American people that there is a financial end-game strategy in Iraq.

Finally, Congress today in adopting the Pence amendment would set an important precedent as we partner with the Iraqi people in establishing the elements of a free and just society.

In the end, Mr. Chairman, I would state firmly that I will support the final version of the Iraq supplemental bill because I am anxious to support the leadership and the Congress and the President and, of course, our military and civilian personnel in Iraq. But nonetheless, I am offering the Pence amendment today with the first belief that the United States should provide for the liberty and security of Iraq, but improvements in civil society in Iraq should ultimately be borne by the Iraqi people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, once again I would attempt to notify any Members who are watching that if they are on the Democratic list for speaking on this matter, they need to get to the House floor pronto or they will lose their opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the Congressional Black Caucus for standing up for the troops and voting against this appalling supplemental bill.

Just yesterday I visited Walter Reed Medical Center and was very impressed

by our brave troops. They have done their part in fighting and risking their lives for our Nation. In addition, I talked to our men and women stationed in bases in the Caspian Sea last summer, and I was appalled to see that the female soldiers were not supplied with enough personal items and they were not even given access to showers nearby.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support our troops; and for that reason I would like to know why after Congress appropriated \$79 billion for Iraq just 6 months ago, we are going to vote for another \$87 billion appropriations. By the way, the largest supplemental that ever passed this House.

I was horrified to learn that tens of thousands of our troops were sent out to battle without proper armor and to this day they still need many necessary items, for example, enough drinking water, showers, tennis shoes, proper chemical attack suits, quality boots, and even simple toothpaste.

Once again, I want to know, where is the beef? Where is the first \$79 billion? Our troops are doing their job. It is the Members in this body that are not doing what we were elected to do.

I want to also point out to the media, you are not doing your job. You have given this administration a blank check. We have not seen one shred of evidence that links 9-11 to Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, our troops are doing their job. It is up to the Members of this body to do theirs.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak about my recent trip to Iraq and to answer some of the questions millions of Americans have been asking every day since the President first announced that he would seek another \$87 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan.

Just this Friday I returned from a 5-day trip with eight of my Republican and Democratic colleagues as part of a delegation. We toured the south, the north of Iraq, as well as Bagdad; and I was able to see firsthand the schools that have been rebuilt, the teachers we have retrained, and the hospitals, universities and newspapers that we have helped open. I saw Iraqi police in training; and most importantly, I talked to our young men and women, many of them still teenagers or just in their early twenties, who have continued to risk their lives to bring democracy and the comforts of life we enjoy here in the U.S. to Iraq.

I came back, like so many of my colleagues, believing that there is no question that this should be about us providing for and supporting our troops, and that we do need to assist in reconstructing Iraq and to ensure the safety of Americans here in the United

States and those working abroad in our embassies or even simply traveling abroad.

However, it is just as clear to me that we cannot really afford to stay in Iraq, nor can we leave at this time. We cannot stay because the basis upon which we invaded and now occupy that country, in my opinion, was false. Our preparations and understanding of what occupation would require were faulty. Yet, if we were to pull out now, our mistake could subject the region, the world, and especially our country and our people, to grave dangers of terrorism. Iraq under Saddam Hussein was not a haven for terrorists, but the porous borders of post-Saddam and even the failure of the administration to plan for such an eventuality may be making Iraq such a haven now.

The President has put us in a terrible fix. We cannot afford to stay, yet we cannot leave. Meanwhile, we cannot even afford the initial down payment on his flawed policy of preemption. The country cannot afford the \$87 billion the President is asking the Congress to appropriate. Indeed, experts say that Iraq this year could only absorb \$6 billion. So why is Mr. Bush demanding three times that amount?

America cannot afford the price tag that the President has put on this Iraqi misadventure unless he agrees to rescind the tax cuts to the top 1 percent of Americans, unless he understands that we have got to work in a multilateral situation and brings in a true form other nations to share in the cost of this. Because otherwise, the money that we will be spending will be money that we will be taking from the middle class and working class people of this great Nation and the poor who are already paying for this war, especially with their sons and their daughters.

Let us make it so this is a shared sacrifice by all Americans. Most of all, our men and women in uniform in Iraq need a change in policy.

Mr. Chairman, I vote against this measure. This is a perpetuation of a failed policy and misguided priorities. Even so, the President can turn this around once he makes a choice between troop strength and tax cuts to the wealthiest of Americans. The President can turn this around once he makes a choice between international cooperation and stuffing the pockets of partisan cronies. Mr. Chairman, we know this is just the first installment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, last fall we were told that Congress needed to authorize military force against Iraq in order to convince the U.N. to send the inspectors back into Iraq. But as soon as we did so, the Bush administration pulled the rug out from under the U.N. inspectors and decided it would use the authority Congress granted them to fight a unilateral war.

Now we are learning that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

Congress and the American people were deceived, misled, and manipulated with false and misleading intelligence and political spin from the Bush White House.

Now the Bush administration cannot find any weapons of mass destruction. It cannot find Saddam Hussein. It cannot find Osama bin Laden. It cannot find Taliban leader Mullah Omar, and it cannot even find out who within the White House staff leaked the name of that covert CIA operative.

What does the Bush administration now ask the Congress for? They ask us to trust them and to grant their request for another \$87 billion going into Iraq, a blank check with no clear vision of how we are going to extricate ourselves from this morass.

Now, I hear a lot of talk from the administration and its supporters about how we are crafting with this legislation a new Marshall Plan for Iraq. Well, let me tell you, when George Marshall was crafting a plan for Harry Truman to reconstruct Europe after the devastation of World War II, he was not setting up a sweetheart, no-bid contract system for companies associated with the old Pendergast Machine in Kansas City.

That is what we are seeing today with the contracts being given to Halliburton and other favored companies. We are providing broad transfer and reallocation authority to the executive branch that gives the Bush administration virtually unfettered discretion to spend the monies we appropriate in any way they wish. At the same time the President asks us to spend \$87 billion in Iraq, he is also going around the country giving speeches calling for additional tax cuts for the top 1 percent wealthiest people in the United States of America.

So if you are wealthy in this country, you get tax cuts and fat government contracts. But if you are an ordinary working American, you get Social Security and Medicare trust funds raided, the 50 percent who are in nursing homes, the elderly dependent upon Medicaid, payments for their nursing home care, they are cut; and meanwhile it is all raided for the reconstruction of Iraq, while at the same time tax cuts of the same amounts are being given to the wealthiest 1 percent in our country.

So the Republicans are busy at work coming up with new schemes to increase your Medicare co-pays, means test your benefits, increase payments for seniors with home health care visits. All of it is wrong, just plain wrong. It is a blank check. It gives the President and Secretary Rumsfeld too much authority. And it fails to do what is needed to build international support for peacekeeping and reconstruction in Iraq or craft an appropriate exit strategy to get our troops back home. And that can only happen if we have multilateral support for this effort, if we have a real vision for what is going on.

As long as this administration believes that it is going to bring Jeffer-

sonian democracy at the point of a gun to an occupied country, then we are operating with one of the most naive political schemes ever put together in the history of this world. And it is time for us to be ensuring that the Congress makes this administration accountable, rather than handing over a blank check with no accountability with at least 60 to 70 percent of this money capable of being reprogrammed by the administration at its own whim without Congress voting upon it again, all of it a mistake of historic proportions.

This is where Congress must check in. It did so after World War II. Today it is just providing a blank check.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3289, which provides supplemental appropriations to our national defense and the reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I would like to commend President Bush for his strong leadership during the war on terrorism. Under his leadership, our homeland has been free from terrorist acts since the attacks of September 11, 2001.

For the past 2 years we, as Americans, have come together in an effort to protect ourselves from all aspects of terrorism in both the United States and abroad. Patriotism has soared as Americans have supported the war on terrorism and our troops who are fighting it.

During these difficult times, we have managed to liberate millions of Afghans and Iraqis while improving their way of life and allowing them to experience the benefit of democratic rule. We must not stop at this critical juncture.

□ 1430

We must push forward in our efforts in these countries and pass this necessary funding measure.

The \$87 billion Supplemental Appropriations Act for 2004 provides the essential funding which is the step toward expanding democracy abroad and is an investment in America's safety. The \$19.8 billion provided for reconstruction in both Iraq and Afghanistan will be used to rehabilitate critical infrastructure so their citizens will have safe drinking water, roads, bridges, adequate sanitation, electricity in their homes and an increase in public safety overall. The \$64.7 billion provided for our national defense will give our troops the necessary equipment to continue the war on terrorism and protect our shores from anyone who seeks to do us harm.

This debate should focus on providing the necessary resources to complete this phase of the war on terrorism and providing adequate tools for our troops to complete their mission. Now, more than ever, we need to rally behind our troops, and providing adequate tools

for them to complete their mission is the best way to show our support. A vote in favor of this bill is a vote in support of our troops.

Finally, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work and dedication in the crafting of this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 23 $\frac{3}{4}$ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, because we are in search of absent speakers, I will yield myself 5 minutes until some of them arrive.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to address one issue that I have seen appear in the newspapers on almost a daily basis. There is somehow an impression on the part of a number of Members of this House and a number of members of the press that somehow we will endanger our ability to provide a responsible reconstruction package in Iraq if we scale back the reconstruction package now before us. I would like to suggest why that is not true, and to do so, I am simply going to read several paragraphs from the dissenting views that I filed with the committee in the report accompanying this bill, and here is what I wrote for that purpose.

"While the Committee wisely pared back some of the more outlandish projects proposed by the Coalition Provisional Authority, the bill the committee is sending to the House does little to alter the underlying approach to reconstruction envisaged by the CPA. That approach relies on huge contracts with large, multinational corporations to provide high tech and capital-intensive construction, training and services to Iraq requiring the importation of heavy equipment, highly-paid consultants and the payment of corporate overhead and profits.

"The consequence of this approach is that the American taxpayer will pay much more than he or she should; the amount of construction or reconstruction that can be performed within available funds will be significantly less than might otherwise be accomplished; the development of Iraqi businesses and institutions to deal with such problems will be negligible and the number of Iraqis who will be employed will be far fewer than could be productively used if less capital-intensive and lower-tech approaches were followed. In short, we will be paying more for smaller results and particularly smaller results with respect to employment and other economic changes necessary to bring about greater political stability."

Then I go on to cite one example. After U.S. engineers had told Major General Patraeus that it would cost \$15 million to bring a concrete factory up

to Western standards, the commander of the 101st Airborne Division gave the contract to local Iraqis who were able to get that cement plant running for just \$80,000.

It seems to me that the message that Congress ought to be sending the administration is that we need to focus more on low tech, indigenous strategies for development rather than simply getting in the old habit of going to the big multinationals like Halliburton and others and saying, okay, boys, what can you do for us with your high-paid consultants and high fees.

So that is why it seems to me that the responsible thing to do is to scale back this package until the administration revisits its approach. In the end, if they do that, we will provide better benefits to Iraq and better benefits to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, it has been over a year since the President began pressing to invade Iraq. At the time, many of us pressed the President to fully account for the cost of his planned war. Most Americans would agree that if the issue of Iraq was important enough to start a war over, it was important enough to pay for it.

For a year, Congress has asked for hard numbers on the cost of occupying and rebuilding Iraq, and for a year, the President gave us nothing but blandishments and pie-in-the-sky forecasts. At the time, experts, including the President's own chief economist, predicted the war and reconstruction would cost as much as \$200 billion, but the President and his aides actively downplayed those numbers, saying it would only cost around \$50 billion.

Well, guess what. Last month, the President finally admitted that he had lowballed the cost of the war when selling it to Congress a year earlier. The President is now asking for an additional \$87 billion to extricate our troops from what is beginning to look like a quagmire. This additional \$87 billion comes on top of \$78.5 billion Congress gave the President just 5 months ago, bringing the grand total so far to \$165 billion, and a recent analysis of House Committee on the Budget staffers showed that the entire costs for rebuilding Iraq could rise to as much as \$400 billion over the next 5 years. If the numbers we received last year were intentionally lowballed, it would almost seem as the President had decided to rebuild with pinstripe patronage.

The amount we are now being asked to provide almost looks as though it has been inflated to line the pockets of others. Just listen to some of the price tags in this bill: \$950 million for recruiting, training and equipping police forces in Iraq, including a police training center with international trainers. This seems to me to be a bit exorbitant. \$209 million for prison and detention facilities. Could we not save

money if the facilities were built by Iraqis?

A hundred million for a witness protection program? This amount is way too high. Do we really need to spend this money to ensure the lives of Iraqis who are assisting the U.S.? How many could there possibly be? Our own witness protection plan has nowhere near that amount. Are we going to put them up in Taj Mahals?

A hundred million dollars to investigate crimes against humanity? Again, this amount is absurd. We have plenty of evidence of Saddam's crimes against humanity. The parents, the families of loved ones missing have come forward to volunteer that information. It will not cost us \$100 million to find victims willing to come forward and document his crimes.

Then there is \$2.1 billion to rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure. This is on top of the \$948 million and counting already given to Halliburton and to Bechtel to refurbish Iraqi's oil fields.

Then there is \$697 million to improve the sewage system. This, when the administration is fighting to prevent Congress from passing a highway and transit bill? This is absurd.

Please, Mr. President, do not insult our intelligence.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the yielding time to me and my friend from Wisconsin for his leadership on this issue.

In April, almost every Member of the House, myself included, voted \$60 billion for our effort in Iraq. Unfortunately, since April that \$60 billion has simply not been used well. We failed to protect and supply our troops adequately. We hear stories. I met last week with 25 families of people who had loved ones in Iraq. We are not supplying them with safe drinking water. We are not supplying them with antibiotics. In some cases we are not supplying them with body armor, and we are told in committee that body armor will not be available for every one of our soldiers there until December. What was the administration thinking?

We appropriated \$60 billion. The administration has failed to submit any plan to the American people, to this Congress, to tell them how this is going to work, to tell all of us when there will be an exit strategy. This administration has failed to show any evidence that the United Nations is cooperating. We cannot get other governments, other countries to send money, to send troops, to send resources, and we failed in terms of accountability.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are spending about \$1 billion a week in Iraq. Three hundred million of that billion dollars is going to private contractors, and most of those private contracts are unbid contracts. So we are giving hundreds of millions of dollars to Halliburton and Bechtel and other friends of the President. Yet, we cannot protect

and we cannot fully and adequately supply our troops. We do not have enough body armor. We do not have enough safe drinking water for our troops. We cannot send our troops home on leave. We are making them pay for it. We are charging our troops for food when they are in the hospital in some cases. Yet, we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars that are going to private contractors, Halliburton, Bechtel and other friends of the President.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, Vice President CHENEY still is receiving \$13,000 every month from the Halliburton Corporation on the one hand, and we are giving them hundreds of millions of dollars in unbid contracts on the other. Vote no on the \$87 billion. Do not give President Bush a blank check to continue the incompetence and the corruption and the ineptness in Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding time to me and for his continued leadership on so many important issues.

Mr. Chairman, I will be offering an amendment later along with my colleague and very good friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT). It will discourage the ongoing violence against women in Afghanistan and the deplorable attacks on girls schools in that country.

The legislation before us appropriates more than \$230 million over the administration's request for Afghanistan, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY) for making this increase possible.

While the country has made progress in the last 2 years since the fall of the Taliban, warlords and reactionary Islamic forces continue to wage a campaign of hatred against their own women. According to recent press reports, more than 30 schools for Afghan girls were burned to the ground, depriving hundreds of girls of a chance to receive a basic education. This amendment designates \$60 million of the \$672 million in the supplemental bill to help women and girls.

□ 1445

It also provides \$5 million in support to the National Human Rights Commission in Afghanistan, which is doing critical work in bringing to light human rights abuses against women and men throughout the country. Without human rights, the Afghan Project and the efforts to create a constitution are seriously threatened. If we are to succeed in Afghanistan, these issues must be addressed and addressed now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distin-

guished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) to be offered later this afternoon.

The conditions for women and young girls in Afghanistan are still worsening. Further assistance to the Afghan women and girls for education, protection of human rights is crucial, it is necessary, and it is the right thing to do. So I support the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 11¼ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the rule. I know that most Americans want to see us do everything possible to support our troops in the field and in harm's way, but there is \$20 billion in this request that is full of fat and pork and is intended to construct, not reconstruct, infrastructure in Iraq.

I asked for an amendment yesterday that was not made in order to make this in the form of a loan. We have this notion in Tennessee that people who receive the proceeds of the loan ought to be the ones borrowing the money. I take the position, Mr. Chairman, that Americans have paid with the blood of young American soldiers. And the people who are going to benefit from this \$20 billion largess are going to be the Iraqis, not Americans.

Let me say one further thing about this matter. Somebody has to borrow this money. Do my colleagues not think it ought to be the people who benefit from the proceeds of the loan? We are borrowing \$20 billion, some of which comes from China. We had a \$400 billion deficit this year. That is \$16 billion in additional mandatory spending next year and every year thereafter on interest.

This leadership in Washington, D.C. is spending more money than has ever been spent before in the history of the country. They are not spending it today, they are spending it tomorrow, and it is called interest and it is going to wreck our economy and wreck this country's future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think at least for now, with the blood of American soldiers being spilled, the least we can expect is that the people who get the proceeds of the borrowing ought to borrow it, not the American taxpayer.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for allowing for a very serious debate.

I thank all of our service men and women and their families who really are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice. Tragically, this means sometimes their lives, but certainly the sacrifices of their families.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to visit on a number of occasions our wounded in our hospitals here in Washington, D.C. I have never seen such a group of valiant and strong-hearted, wonderful individuals who are still committed to this Nation. That is why I believe this debate is one of the most important, historic debates and occasions we will have ever in our congressional careers.

Mr. Chairman, I have determined that I am going to stand up on behalf of these troops that I had a chance to talk to over the weekend in Doha, Qatar; these troops who have said that there is no exit strategy; that they, in fact, do not know when they are going to return home. Mr. Chairman, the equipment that they have is riddled with inadequacies, so that if they are in a Humvee, it does not meet the test of avoiding explosion and great injury.

This is the largest supplemental in the history of this Nation, so I ask the leaders of this Congress, let us delay this vote, let us vote only for the finite amount of money that will provide for our troops. Let us hold off on this \$20 billion or \$30 billion or \$36 billion.

Look at what Secretary Rumsfeld has said. He told us in the fall of 2002 not to worry about the cost, that Iraq is a very different situation from Afghanistan because they have oil. But now they are coming to us and asking for \$20 billion, and we do not have any accountability for the \$79 billion that we gave just 6 months ago. And our troops are in need. What about the Reserves and the National Guard that told me that they have problems in getting paid? And that is why I have an amendment.

We do not need to go to the donor conference in Madrid with a check. What we need to go with is a collaborative spirit, where we can sit down with France and Germany and Russia and our allies and develop a resolution that talks about troops and money.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to stand on behalf of these troops. Until they get paid, until there is an exit strategy, until there are mental health benefits for those that are returning, they will not get a vote out of me. Because we need to stand on behalf of the American people, and we need to find the right solution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I just heard somebody mention Halliburton. This \$87 billion is not about loans or grants; it is not about Halliburton or Bechtel. This is about a war that we are committed to. We voted for this war. Whether individuals voted for it or not, the Congress committed ourselves to this war.

This is about a commitment to our troops thousands of miles away and a mission that we have had trouble getting them trained for, that they are not used to, about the lack of MOSes, people in specialties that are not in the jobs they should be in. This is about finishing a war as quickly as possible and allowing our men and women of the Armed Forces to come home victorious; to, indeed, march into the sunlight. This is about keeping our troops safe and not coming home in body bags so that they can again be with their mothers, fathers, wives, husbands, and children. In order to do that, they not only need the money for the military side, they need the reconstruction money.

The administration sometimes refers to this significant effort of our troops in Iraq as a low-intensity conflict. This minimizes the effort of our 150,000 troops still in the theater and around Iraq. This is not a low-intensity conflict when you cannot tell the activated Reserves and Guards, who have been active duty for 2 out of 6 years, what time they are coming home. This is not a low-intensity conflict when we are wearing out our equipment, when we have a third of our Bradleys that are deadlined because of lack of tracks or when we have people short of body armor. This is not a low-intensity conflict when I find a 67-year-old Reservist calling the office because the Army called him and said we would like you to volunteer to come back because your specialty is short, and if you do not volunteer, we are liable to call you back.

I called the Army, and it turns out they said, no, we are not going to call anybody back involuntary. But it shows the shortages. We have a shortage of MOSes. Those are the specialties, important military specialties. We have 6,300 that are not in the jobs that they should be in. We have the number of people there, but we do not have the trained personnel because the shortages are starting to come up in the replacement area.

Now, I have been to the hospitals, and I have talked to the troops in Iraq. They are not complaining about incidentals. They are complaining about what would save their lives, things that are essential to their lives. They complain about the lack of potable water. They complain about equipment that will save them, if they run

over a land mine; equipment that will stop bombs from detonating in their path; equipment that will save them from shrapnel and fragments that penetrate the body armor or penetrate their bodies.

I saw a poll in "Stars and Stripes," and the general said, well, these polls, we always have people complain. The military always complains. But these are not the same kind of complaints I have heard in the past. These are serious complaints. These are complaints which are life-saving, essential to their life. This is about giving the resources needed to stabilize and secure Iraq as quickly as possible to bring our troops home as whole human beings to live out their lives in the sunlight.

Every time I go to the hospitals, every time I talk to them, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has been there, his wife has been there, and many of my colleagues have been there to the hospitals, and they appreciate us coming, and they talk about how the body armor saved their lives. The inserts in the body armor were the key. When our subcommittee, and most of us have been on that subcommittee 15 to 20 years, for most of us our entire career, and everything we do is to try to protect the troops, try to make sure they have what they need, and when bureaucrats stop the money from getting out to them, that is almost criminal.

Let me say this. The reconstruction money is just as important as the money that we are putting in for the combat. We have to win what I call the "X factor." The X factor is winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. We have seen polls that show they are in favor of us. We have sent people over there, and they say they are all happy with us. Well, let me tell you this. If they were happy with us, if they were for us, they would not allow people to fire RPGs, which are missile-guided weapons, at our Humvees and then disappear into the crowd. We have a lot of work to do.

I urge the people to vote for this entire supplemental. It is absolutely essential to the troops' security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I just want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement.

History has an uncanny way of reminding us of our motivation. General Marshall outlined a program to help war-torn Europe without knowing that 30 years later the United States would face a similar crossroad. 400,000 Americans were killed in World War II, paying the ultimate price for mistakes made after World War I. And following the second European war, the continent ran out of food and suffered from runaway inflation and turned to communism.

Learning the lessons of World War I and its failed peace, the U.S. Congress backed the Marshall Plan. The plan went far beyond feeding the hungry to laying the foundation for the postwar recovery. This plan, the Marshall Plan, was very expensive. In today's dollars it cost \$105 billion. And as we face a similar crossroad, we have the benefit of history.

We know that President Truman's decision to back the Marshall Plan helped to prevent World War III. A third generation of Americans did not return to the killing fields of Europe. Today, we face a similar challenge of rebuilding Iraq and preventing a third Middle Eastern war.

This week, the House debates the Iraq supplemental. In considering \$19 billion to rebuild Iraq, we face the same question that President Truman faced. Truman asked: How much should we pay to help avoid World War III? And the American people of 1947 answered: \$105 billion, as approved by Congress and the Marshall Plan.

□ 1500

Today, we see the unfinished work of Desert Storm and we ask, how much should Congress pay to help avoid a third war in Iraq?

Let us look at the costs of these wars to bring things into perspective. We know that in current dollars, World War II cost \$4.7 trillion and remains the most expensive conflict in U.S. history. So far, the war on terror costing \$193 billion, including this Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental, is more costly than Desert Storm at \$82 billion but less costly than other major conflicts, including Korea at \$400 billion and Vietnam at \$600 billion. We know the Marshall Plan's cost of \$105 billion is roughly five times the \$19 billion cost for Iraq proposed here.

Cost is also relative to income. Today's U.S. economy is larger than it was in 1947. The Marshall Plan imposed a heavy financial burden on the American people, 5 percent of our national income. This plan is a much lighter burden; .02 percent of America's income finances this plan. In such terms, the Marshall Plan was over 200 times more expensive than this Iraqi plan.

Under this plan, the reconstruction of Iraq has already begun. Chairman LEWIS and I returned from Baghdad where we saw the main power plant returning to prewar capacity. We saw firsthand a budding democracy taking root on the front pages of no less than 120 new newspapers founded since May 1 in Iraq. Under Saddam, only half of schoolchildren attended class. Last week, 90 percent of schoolkids attended class, many with some of the 1.5 million book bags provided by the U.S. They also returned to class with 5 million new textbooks, but these textbooks were absent the pictures of Saddam and the rhetoric of hate that undermined the future of this region.

We need to work with our allies, and as oil begins to flow, a well-educated

people will return to work, but like their predecessors in Europe, our troops need to finish this mission, earning a ticket home with no future Middle Eastern war forcing a return to the killing fields of Iraq. The stakes are high. I think we should finish the job so that there is no third war in Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of our troops in Iraq. Thousands of young men and women, my neighbors and yours, remain in harm's way. They are suffering casualties daily and fatalities every week. We must do all we can to provide for their protection. We are indebted to our troops for their service and sacrifice. The men and women of the Armed Forces make all Americans proud. My vote for this bill is for one reason only, to give our troops the resources they need to carry out their mission. But my vote should not be interpreted as supporting this administration's postwar policy in Iraq or the lack of one.

As I cast a "yes" vote, I will supply the troops with the resources they need. My hope is that the President and the administration will finally supply a policy the Nation deserves. Because the absence of a policy has never measured up to the valor and patriotism of our troops. As we will do our part in Congress, now it is long overdue for the administration to do theirs, enunciating a policy. Our troops will get the Humvees and the Kevlar vests they need, but the policy is as important for their protection as the equipment.

Just over 2 years have passed since the September 11 attacks when the world reached out and expressed sympathy and solidarity with America and Americans. Because of our arrogance, we have turned the world's sympathy into antipathy. This administration lacks a policy that is coherent, that spells out a clear vision for Iraq's mission, invites support from our allies and provides an exit strategy that will bring our troops home and reunite American families. I supported the war. I still believe getting rid of Saddam Hussein was the right thing to do. But the administration has made a legitimate war illegitimate through its actions. While it sold the war on a set of claims that were never true, the administration never leveled with the American people.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. It is my understanding that after this leg, we will still have an hour of general debate remaining under the rule that was adopted; is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Committee will rise for some business in the House and then go to an hour of debate on the bill back in Committee.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the supplemental and support the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill. While I support the funds allotted for our courageous troops, I cannot support the bill in its current form.

The lack of information we have received from the Administration on operations in Iraq and future costs is embarrassing, especially as we hear daily about new casualties on the ground. We have seen no timeline estimating when elections will be held to allow the Iraqi people to choose their own government. We have heard no estimated date from this Administration for sending our troops home. We still have seen no estimate of the total cost of operations in Iraq.

While we must work toward quelling the attacks and stabilizing Iraq, passing this bill is not the answer. If Congress approves this request, the amount spent on Iraq will exceed \$150 billion. But we still don't know how the Administration spent the first \$70 billion the Congress approved for Iraq and Afghanistan, a funding request I supported. American taxpayers deserve some accountability. American taxpayers deserve to know how their hard-earned money is being spent, and they deserve to know how much will be spent in the future.

When someone puts a down payment on a house, that person does so knowing not just the amount of the first payment, but also the full cost of the mortgage. We need to know what the mortgage on Iraq is—we deserve that, and the President has a responsibility to tell us. It's that simple.

It is unfortunate that the Majority would not allow us to consider the funds for the troops separately from the reconstruction funds. I don't know of one colleague in this House that does not support the troops, and to say that a no vote on this bill is a vote against them is offensive.

This past August, I was able to visit troops in my district in New Mexico who had recently returned from Iraq. In fact, just this week, I met with veterans in my district, and the overwhelming majority do not support this effort. I also visited troops on active duty in Germany and closer to home in Bethesda Medical Center during the war. I heard their stories, all of them heroic, and expressed my gratitude for their service to our country. I voted in favor of the resolution to support the troops in this war, and I am proud of that vote.

What I am not proud of, however, is the process we have seen in considering this funding bill. I submitted an amendment to pay for this funding bill by modifying the President's irresponsible tax cut so that the rate of the top one percent of the taxpayers would change to 38.2 percent—still less than the

percentage before the tax cuts—for 2005 through 2010. Unfortunately I was not permitted to offer the amendment, so we will not have a vote. A similar provision was also included in Mr. OBEY's amendment which was also not allowed a vote on the floor.

The new cost of the war—\$150 million—if fifty percent more than Administration officials estimated a few months ago. This year the Federal Government has the largest deficit in its history—over \$400 billion—and this does not include this new request. Because of poor decisionmaking, poor planning, and plain old bad math, our grandchildren will be paying for this war.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. I hope that as this vote proceeds, Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that some of us who are struggling with this, please refrain in your press statements and releases from referring to anybody on this side of the aisle as being unpatriotic. I think there are legitimate questions about how this was brought to the floor, about the specificity associated with it, about the term of our stay there. I have been on the ground, as I know many of my colleagues on the other side have there in the region, so I would hope that we can all refrain from referring to anyone in this body, anyone in this Chamber, Democrat or Republican, as being unpatriotic.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I know that that 15 seconds has been bugging you all day. I am going to yield it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, once again, to briefly explain that when we have concluded this phase of the debate, then the Committee will rise, and we will officially then take up the bill. We will go through the regular process of calling up the bill under the rule.

Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this supplemental appropriation.

This is one of the most important votes we will cast this year. For the future of peace in the Middle East and the promise of a better future for the children of Iraq—this vote should be one vote you will remember for the rest of your life.

Without question, we will have concerns about the amount of money the reconstruction of Iraq will cost the American public. Eighty-six billion dollars . . . it's a lot of money.

Like you, I have received many letters from my constituents asking "why?" I have been

peppered during town hall meetings. "Why is it that Americans are always the ones who have to pay?"

Why? Because we are Americans.

Because, when ruthless dictators take innocent lives, when people—like Saddam Hussein—terrorize their own people, when evil people conduct unspeakably evil acts against their own—we must ask ourselves, "Who else will act?"

"Who else will?"

Time and again, America has given its blood, its strength and its money to promote and protect freedom overseas.

As the world's standard bearer for democracy and freedom we have inherited this duty. We are America—This is what we do.

Some will say that we cannot afford to support Iraq. I say we can't afford not to.

We are committed—like it or not—to the rebuilding efforts in Iraq. It is incumbent upon us to lay the foundation of a free economy for a country now free from oppression.

The Iraqi people are looking to us to uphold our responsibility for security and reconstruction. We must follow through on our commitments to the Iraqi people and the local population must understand that we have their true interests at heart.

We should never again come to the floor of this House and make speeches about mass graves, malnutrition, environmental devastation and WMD. Neither should we again detail to our constituents the horrors of state-sponsored rape, murder and torture in Iraq.

Can it happen again? You bet.

Saddam's minions want us to leave, they want Americans dead—because they will use the same forces of terror they are using today, to kill innocent Iraqis and American soldiers, as a path to power tomorrow.

If we abandon Iraq, we are back to square one. We dishonor the men and women who have given their lives for us and the Iraqi people during this necessary mission. Our Nation's fight for freedom in Iraq.

Our job will have been left undone and for what?

This Congress should be committed to assisting Iraq in becoming an independent, self-governing and economically viable nation. We must finish the work and honor the sacrifice of so many dedicated soldiers.

To abandon our efforts would be inhumane to the people of Iraq and dangerous to our national security.

The world has changed. Many of us—especially those of us on the Appropriations Committee—sensed a new insecurity after the 1998 embassy bombings in Tanzania and Kenya and the attack on the USS *Cole* in Yemen.

The United States did not act appropriately then.

The events in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania forced us into this new role because we must protect ourselves and the free world.

Why? Once again. Because who else will?

So here we are today, setting the course for a free Iraq.

We have all been sent to Washington by our constituents to make difficult and honest choices. You will make a choice today.

This package reflects a vision and a hope that America can be a catalyst for freedom and peace in the Middle East—freedom that generations of Iraqis have not yet experienced

and the kind of freedom we take for granted every day.

Be a catalyst for freedom and security. Vote in favor of this appropriations bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, under the balance of the debate time, I have a series of thoughts that I would like to present, but I am going to wait until we actually have the bill before us.

In the meantime, I just want to make this one closing thought before yielding to the majority leader. We have talked so often about what our constituents have told us, this week, last week, the week before. After Desert Storm, over a decade ago, one complaint was we went to war against Saddam Hussein, but we never finished the job. This finishes the job. I still hear that complaint today. We got rid of Saddam Hussein and most of his henchmen, and now we are finishing the job to get our troops back home. We cannot do that until we have established, as the United Nations agreed today to help expedite the establishment, a government in Iraq, to establish a form of constitution and to provide those things that a government would provide for their people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the very distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I really appreciate the gentleman bringing this to the floor and conducting what I think is one of the most important debates in the country and in our careers. It has been a good debate.

I hope Members of this House would pay attention to the statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). As I sat in this Chamber listening to the gentleman from Pennsylvania speak, I was looking at a gentleman that I have the utmost respect for but mostly because he knows what he is talking about. If the Members back in their offices did not see the gentleman from Pennsylvania's comments, I would hope that they would get the transcript and read it. Because when he says that the reconstruction money is as important as the money to go to the troops, he is absolutely right, and it is part of the war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, this debate, for all the time and energy that it has consumed, really comes down to one question: Are we at war with international terrorism or are we not? And with this vote, every Member of the House will tell the world how seriously they take the war on terror. Let us put an end to the sleight-of-hand rhetoric some of the war's opponents have used of late. To those who have feigned offense about their patriotism being questioned, this is not about your patriotism. It is about your judgment. While I am on it, let me just say that that old debating tactic of "I support the troops, but" is just not going to cut it this time. If you support the war and you support

the troops, you must vote for this bill. The war that we are fighting cannot be won without a safe and secure Iraq. It cannot be won without the reconstruction funding in this bill. It is just that simple.

Everyone in this building and everyone in this country has the right to oppose this war and oppose this war supplemental, but that opposition and the weak and indecisive foreign policy that it represents has consequences. A "no" vote on this bill is a "no" vote on the war on terror and will serve to undermine our coalition. If you oppose the war, feel free to vote "no." But at that moment, the American people will know for sure who is working to win the war on terror. This bill does not just fund the war, it funds the overall strategy of the war on terror. That means, Mr. Chairman, that the reconstruction money is defense spending; it is war spending; and it is homeland security spending. These priorities are one and the same, because they serve the same strategy and combat the same enemy. And that enemy, I would remind my colleagues, is not each other but the enemy is the terrorists.

This is life and death, Mr. Chairman, not politics. And if we are serious about winning this war, we must pass this bill. Since we took on this fight 2 years ago, two oppressed nations have been liberated. Terrorist networks around the world have been destroyed or forced into hiding. And the brotherhood of human freedom has been expanded by 50 million Iraqis and Afghans. This is all because the American people have once again decided, Mr. Chairman, in the face of an unthinkable evil to stand and fight.

I urge my colleagues to stand and fight with them today and vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of October 14, 2003, the Committee rises.

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

□ 1515

LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during