for this bill, and wholeheartedly sup-
port this legislation. And I ask my col-
leagues to vote in favor of it today.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in
strong support of H. Con. Res. 81, a resolu-
tion which condemns the crackdown on poli-
tical dissidents orchestrated by the regime
of Fidel Castro two years ago. Through this
remarkable violation of human rights, the
Cuban government arrested more than 75
journalists, labor union organizers, civic lead-
ers, librarians, and human rights activists, and
took them as political prisoners. On this occa-
sion, it is important that we keep in mind the
struggle in which our brothers and sisters in
Cuba continued to be engaged—that is, the
struggle for freedom and true democracy.

One of the many dissidents arrested in
March 2003 was Mr. Jose Daniel Ferrer Gar-
cia, a pro-democracy activist in Cuba who has
been jailed for his outspoken leadership in the
Cuban democracy movement. Mr. Garcia is the
regional coordinator for the Christian Liber-
ation Movement in Santiago Province. Through
his position, he has mobilized many Cuban youth for democratic
change, and has focused on accomplishing
the movement’s chief objective: to unite citi-
zens that are willing to defend and promote human
rights, to achieve changes in the Cuban society through peaceful means.
Because of the efforts of determined individuals
such as Mr. Garcia, the struggle for democ-
Ry in Cuba continues, and we should keep
this in mind when considering any potential
change in United States policy towards Cas-
tro’s regime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all of my colleagues
in the House of Representatives join me in
supporting H. Con. Res. 81, and continue to
voice their solidarity with Mr. Garcia and all
other pro-democracy activists in Cuba as they
continue their push for true freedom.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, A todos mis
hermanos y hermanas quienes sufren en las
cárceles de Castro bajo su régimen, a sus
familias y amistades aquí en los Estados
Unidos y en Cuba, les digo que el pueblo
americano está con ustedes. Y, aquí en el
Congreso de los Estados Unidos, vamos a de-
fender su libertad y ganar la lucha contra la
brutalidad y la opresión.
Por eso, junto con mis otras colegas en el
Congreso, escribí esta resolución que condena la ola represiva contra los disidentes
que hizo la régimen Castro hace dos años y
que declara que la gente cubana debe tener los derechos humanos y la libertad—la libertad de expresión y de asociación—y el
derecho de tener elecciones libres.
To all my friends here today who don’t speak Spanish, don’t worry, I won’t spend the
rest of my time speaking in Spanish. But I did
want to speak directly to the Cuban people to let them know that we stand
with them in their fight for freedom and human
rights.

We are debating this resolution today under
the shadow of the 2nd anniversary of the
Cuban crackdown on dissidents in Cuba. We often
think of an anniversary as a moment to cele-
brate—but clearly we have nothing to cele-
brate today. Instead, we use this anniversary to
mark a tragedy in the lives of the Cuban
people and to the lives of all those who sup-
port democracy and human rights in the hemi-
sphere.

The whole world was horrified as more than
75 journalists, human rights activists, and op-
position political figures were arrested, given
summary trials, and then sentenced to prison
terms of up to 28 years. Many of the pris-
oners, along with other prisoners of con-
science, spent over a year in solitary confine-
ment. Some have been deprived of adequate
medical treatment and reports from Cuba de-
tailed beatings and torture.

I am not fooled by the recent release of a
number of dissidents, by this attempt to trick
the international community. I am not fooled
because I know that when they released those
dissidents, who should never have been in jail
in the first place, more new dis-
sidents, I am not fooled because I know that
they only released these dissidents on “pa-
tole,” meaning that they could be arrested
again at any time.

Hundreds of political prisoners remain in
Castro’s jails today. Clearly, the Castro regime
has no respect for the Universal Declaration of
Human Rights, which states in Article 4 that,
“no one shall be subjected to torture or to
cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or pun-
ishment.” And the world has recognized these
injustices. The Department of State calls this
wave, “the most despicable act of political re-
pression in the Americas in a decade.”

Castro’s human rights record has been con-
demned by Amnesty International, Freedom
House, and other human rights groups.

In a statement, Amnesty International said
that these “prisoners of conscience” should be
immediately released and called on the Cuban regime to,
“comply with the principles laid out in
international rights standards for the treat-
ment of prisoners.”

Freedom House included Cuba in its report
Most Repressive Societies, 2004.” And the
House of Representatives has condemned Castro’s human rights record as well, in mul-
tiple resolutions. This year, on the two-year
anniversary, we are here to pass a resolution
that condemns Castro’s brutal crackdown and
demands that the Cuban regime immediately
release all political prisoners, legalize all poli-
tical parties, labor unions, and the press, and,
hold free and fair elections.

Today, it is a time for all of us to come to-
together, from both sides of the aisle, to stand
together for a universal cause: human rights.
Today, in voting for this resolution, we will
celebrate the strength and perseverance of the
Cuban people.

Today, we will vote for the universal values
which we all share.

So I call on all of the Members of the House
of Representatives to join me in the fight for
human rights and democracy for the Cuban
people.

Now is the time for us to stand together
together against brutality, torture and dictatorship.

Now is the time for us to stand together for
freedom, for the right to free speech and free
association, and for human rights in general.
Now is the time for us to stand together as
we call on the Cuban regime to immediately
release these prisoners of conscience, who
were jailed for standing up for democracy
and human rights against a brutal dictatorship.

To my brothers and sisters who suffer in
Castro’s jails, to their families and friends both
here in the United States and Cuba, I say that
our Congressman—Mr. Boozman, to the
Cuban people. I say that Castro will not
succeed in his vain attempt to suppress the
spirit of the Cuban people. I look forward to
the day, which is coming soon, when we will
all celebrate a free and democratic Cuba. It is
the spirit of the Cuban people and their cour-
rage that will ultimately be Castro’s downfall.
So, I ask each of you to join me in voting
yes for this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker,
we have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we have no
additional requests for time, and I
yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker,
yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question
is on the motion offered by the gentleman
from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House
suspend the rules and agree to the con-
current resolution, H. Con. Res. 81.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the
opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those
present have voted in the affirm-
ative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I
demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to
clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair’s prior
announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be
postponed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker,
I ask unanimous consent that all Members
may have 5 legislative days within which to
revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous
material on H. Con. Res. 81.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gentle-
man from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speak-
er, I ask unanimous consent to take from
the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 1268)
making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year end-
ing September 30, 2005, to establish and
fully implement regulations for State
driver’s license and identification
document security standards, to prevent
terrorists from abusing the
asylum laws of the United States, to
unify terrorism-related grounds for
inadmissibility and removal, to ensure
expedient construction of the San
Diego border fence, and for other pur-
purposes, with Senate amendments thereto,
disagree to the Senate amendments,
and agree to the conference asked by the
Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN
of Wisconsin). Is there objection to the
request of the gentleman from California?
There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments, to the bill, H.R. 1293, be instructed to insist on the highest levels of funding within the scope of conference for Customs and Border Protection, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement and to agree to the Senate provision regarding including requests for future funding for military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq in the annual budget of the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct the conferees representing the House to accept the Senate increases in the Byrd and other amendments that would strengthen our customs and border protection; it would strengthen our immigration and customs enforcement and fund the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

Secondly, it instructs the conferees to agree with the Senate amendment, again, the Byrd amendment, which would require that all future administration requests for funding the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan be presented within the context of the regular budget rather than being funded as they have been so far through the supplemental process.

Let me address briefly both issues. With respect to the border protection issue, let me point out that many years ago the Rudman-Hart Commission had effectively warned this Congress that our borders were a sieve.

In the immediate days after this House was hit with the anthrax scare, shortly after 9/11, I went down to the White House with the then-chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and we proposed to the President a bipartisan list of supplemental additions to antiterrorist activities that we believe should be funded in order to strengthen homeland security. Included in those recommendations were added dollars for our ports, added dollars for our border protection. When we laid out what we were interested in doing, the President simply ended the conversation by saying to us, “I am sorry but my good friend here, Mitch Daniels,” who was then the Director of OMB, he said, “my good friend Mitt Daniels believe that the administration has requested more than enough money for Homeland Security. And so I want you to know if you include one dollar more than we have asked for in our budget submission, I will veto the bill.”

That is essentially what he said. Ever since that day, we have been straining in the Congress to overcome the White House’s reluctance to provide adequate resources for counterterrorism.

I would point out that the PATRIOT Act itself called for a tripling of inspectors and agents on the northern border alone, and yet no Bush administration budget has ever proposed to meet that goal. Only because of congressional insistence have we finally been able to meet that goal, and I would say it has been a long time in coming and it was long overdue.

On March 30 the administration announced that they were putting 500 agents in Arizona, but those agents were not new agents; 135 of them were simply transferred from other sources and the rest of them were simply new trainees to take the place of agents who were not leaving or leaving the service. That is why we believe that the added funding provided in the Byrd and other amendments in the Senate to add funds for securing our borders, that is why we believe that money is necessary.

With respect to the second provision, the reason this second provision is necessary is to make sure the administration practice of hiding the true cost of the war in Iraq. We have spent, to this point, about $280 billion on that war. CBO estimates that the 10-year cost of our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan will wind up being about $1.6 trillion, and yet all of that money has been spent through a supplemental process, rather than the process of having the President submit in his regular budget their estimated cost for those activities for the year.

When you cut through all of the bull gravy, there is only one reason why the White House has done that, because they are trying to obscure the full cost of those military operations.

Now, I would simply remind the House that President Roosevelt included the cost of funding World War II in his 1943 budget request. President Johnson included the cost of paying for the war in Vietnam in his 1966 budget request. President Clinton, at the insistence of this Congress, provided in the regular budget for the costs for financing our Bosnia operations and the enforcement of the no-fly zone edict in the 1997 budget.

People think that the President this year has submitted a budget which contains a deficit of $390 billion. In fact, that budget deficit does not include $1 of the more than $80 billion that this House voted to add to pay for the war in Iraq just a couple of months ago.

So I would say this provision simply is in pursuit of truth in budgeting, and I see no public policy reason why either of these provisions should be resisted. I ask for a ‘yes’ vote when the vote occurs.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mr. Speaker, could I inquire, after her 5 minutes, how much time do I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will have 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) will have 29 minutes remaining.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished ranking member for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the gentleman from Wisconsin’s (Mr. OBEY) motion to instruct conferees on the emergency supplemental.

This motion declares that all future funding requests for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan should be included in the President’s budget, not in emergency supplemental spending bills. This provision enjoyed wide bipartisan support and was included in the Senate bill. The House needs now to follow this track to fiscal responsibility.

While I support using emergency funds to pay for real emergencies, continued reliance on emergency spending for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan is fiscally irresponsible. Congress should stop bailing out the Pentagon for its inability to pay for the costs in Iraq.

On top of over $400 billion in defense appropriations every year, Congress has provided $268.7 billion in emergency supplemental funding for the war in Iraq and the war on terror. The nonemergency supplemental will bring total war-related supplemental spending to $350 billion.

The gentleman from Wisconsin’s (Mr. OBEY) motion would not prevent this emergency supplemental from going through, but it would make sure that the administration and the Pentagon, like millions of Americans, budget according to their means. We can afford
to fight and win the war on terror, but the public should not be misled into believing that these costs are an emergency or unexpected or that there is not an imperative for the Pentagon to look at its existing budget and deal with the war inside that budget.

For example, we know that the war in Afghanistan and Iraq operations cost roughly $6 billion a month. Those costs have been somewhat fixed for well over a year. It is perfectly capable and necessary for the Pentagon to look inside its own operations, find savings and find a way to put this in the budget.

These costs can be planned for and consigned to Congress in my regular order, instead of saddling our children with billions of dollars of debt and cutting vital domestic programs.

Last February, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend and colleague and chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, sent a strong letter to the Committee on the Appropriations Committee on Armed Services, sent a colleague and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and instructed the Pentagon to look inside its own operations, find savings and find a way to put this in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the Obey motion.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

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

I rise in support of the Obey motion to instruct. ICE simply needs more money. I urge the sergeant at arms to allude to that. For some reason, their budget has been in shambles ever since the Department of Homeland Security was created. Their bookkeeping has been in shambles more so than their budget, and I am not sure if it is their fault or the fault of the central Department, but it is somebody’s fault.

It is all screwed up.

It is not because Congress has not provided the money they asked for. Last year, we provided slightly more than $9 billion, and so the problem is in hiring freezes and training freezes and one problem after the other. Now they want to take money away from lots of other good programs to make up for their budget shortfall. We simply need to get ICE’s funding straightened out, period.

The other thing this supplemental does is add border agents. Whatever one’s views are on all the controversies relating to immigration and other issues, one thing is evident, and that is, we need to strengthen our law enforcement on our borders, whether it is the northern border or the southern border.

Since coming to Congress I have heard a lot about how we need to crack down on illegal immigration in this country, but seen very little action when it comes to providing adequate funding for the programs that we know work in dealing with the problem.

Most recently, with the passage of the Intelligence Reform bill, Congress promised to provide funding to hire thousands of new Border Patrol agents and create thousands of beds for immigration detention and removal activities. Unfortunately, however, the President's proposed FY2006 budget falls woefully short of meeting these needs.

During House consideration of the Supplemental Appropriations bill, I offered an amendment to add $772 million to hire an additional 1,000 Border Patrol agents, provide 8,000 beds for immigration and detention removal operations, and install radiation portal monitors at Ports of Entry. That amendment, which would have provided essential border security funding, was ruled out of order on procedural grounds. Unless we insist on the highest possible levels of funding for border security in this conference, Congress will once again fail to keep its commitment on this vital issue.

Meanwhile, every day foreign nationals from over 100 countries who are here in the United States illegally are being apprehended and turned back out onto our streets because we lack the space to detain them. At the same time, we hear of known terrorists who are training recruits to infiltrate our country in order to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, the time has long since come to make good on our border security promises—or continue to risk safety of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support Mr. Obey’s motion to instruct.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Obey motion to instruct conferences on H.R. 1268, Wartime supplemental, to insist on the highest possible funding for more border patrol agents and to insist on the Senate provision calling for requests for future funding for military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq to be included in the annual budget of the President.

As a member representing a border community—and a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee—I am grateful for Mr. Obey’s leadership and his work to include the important provision on the wartime supplemental. As so many of our colleagues know, I have been lifting my voice to get the word around to members that our border security is profoundly lacking. Members can go to my web page for more information about the dangerous practices ongoing along the U.S. Mexico border.

Currently, the United States does not have room to hold the large number of illegal immigrants—called OTMs, Other than Mexicans—caught by border law enforcement. So we are releasing OTMs into the general population—in large numbers. Very few released OTMs return for a mandatory deportation, meaning there is a large number of OTMs at large in the U.S., immigrants who have passed through the hands of law enforcement.

Border law enforcement officers routinely call the detention centers, discover there is no more room to hold OTMs, so they are processed and released into the general population on their own recoginziezation.

The OTMs are given ‘specials of appear,” permission that allows them to travel freely in the United States through the time they are to return for deportation. Law enforcement officers then take the released OTMs to the local
wonder that private citizens are taking the law into their own hands to try to stem the tide of OTMs coming into our country. But private militias—operating without the color of law—are not the answer. We must secure our borders so private citizens do not feel the need to do so.

Our budget reflects the values and priorities of the American people. Consider what the 2005 budget did not include: The Homeland Security bill that became law in December, 2004, mandated 10,000 Border Patrol agents over 5 years, 20,000 annually. The President’s budget funded 210 BP agents, the senate added 1,050 agents. The House must stand up and add the full 2,000. Intelligence Reform mandated an increase of 8,000 beds in detention facilities annually for the next 5 years, still not nearly enough to hold all those coming in the U.S. . . . yet the President’s budget proposal provides for only about 1,900 new detention space beds—over 6,000 beds short of the congressional mandate passed in December, 2004. We can add all the Border Patrol agents we want, but without a place to hold these OTMs, the problem remains.

Grants to reimburse local law enforcement officers that also hold illegal immigrants for the federal government were slashed, adding to the problem. I was a law enforcement officer in my previous life. If we don’t have the border officers to stop the OTMs crossing the border . . . if we don’t have the room to hold the ones we catch . . . if we don’t put our money where our嘴巴 are—we are sending a dangerous signal to those who may wish to do us harm. Until we send a signal that those who cross our borders illegally . . . until we send a signal that when we catch you we will hold you until you are deported . . . until we honestly face the amount of money we will take to deal with these things, OTMs will continue to flock to the U.S.

We must send that signal today. Homeland security must be about the security of our people and our property, it cannot be budget driven as it is now.

Lastly, as a fiscal conservative and member of the Armed Services committee, I know it is ultimately the responsibility of Congress—not the Administration—to properly spend money on military operations. To that end, I thank our Ranking Democrat on appropriations for including in this motion a provision requiring future funding for our military operations to be included in the President’s budget. All the money we appropriate here is the people’s money and should be good stewards of it. To rush through special bills to fund the military when committees of jurisdiction have not had the opportunity to review the bills is an abdication of our responsibility.

I encourage the members to support this motion and the Supplemental appropriations bill to include funding for border security and to require further military funding requests move through our regular authorization process for the fullest scrutiny by the authorizing committees.

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

Mr. O’BRY, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O’BRY).

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

Mr. O’BRY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be post-poned.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today. Accordingly, (at 4 o’clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 5 o’clock and 37 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from Speaker’s table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MS. HERSETH

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conference.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Herseth of South Dakota moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 95 be instructed, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of the Senate’s budget funded 210 BP agents, the Senate added 1,050 agents. The House must stand up and add the full 2,000. Intelligence Reform mandated an increase of 8,000 beds in detention facilities annually for the next 5 years, still not nearly enough to hold all those coming in the U.S. . . . yet the President’s budget proposal provides for only about 1,900 new detention space beds—over 6,000 beds short of the congressional mandate passed in December, 2004. We can add all the Border Patrol agents we want, but without a place to hold these OTMs, the problem remains.

Grants to reimburse local law enforcement officers that also hold illegal immigrants for the federal government were slashed, adding to the problem. I was a law enforcement officer in my previous life. If we don’t have the border officers to stop the OTMs crossing the border . . . if we don’t have the room to hold the ones we catch . . . if we don’t put our money where our嘴巴 are—we are sending a dangerous signal to those who may wish to do us harm. Until we send a signal that those who cross our borders illegally . . . until we send a signal that when we catch you we will hold you until you are deported . . . until we honestly face the amount of money we will take to deal with these things, OTMs will continue to flock to the U.S.

We must send that signal today. Homeland security must be about the security of our people and our property, it cannot be budget driven as it is now.

Lastly, as a fiscal conservative and member of the Armed Services committee, I know it is ultimately the responsibility of Congress—not