the office, I hope that, in our conduct, we can prove ourselves good and responsible stewards of this public trust.

It is my sincere hope that now that the correction has been filed and the slander abated, this will be the last time any Member has the unpleasant duty of rising in this House to defend his or her reputation and the traditions of this institution. I hope that this single aberration will be remembered as just that: a single aberration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. Speaker. I include for the RECORD an editorial published this morning in the daily newspaper in Norfolk, Virginia, the Virginian Pilot, on this issue.

(From the Virginia Pilot, May 3, 2005)

A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF

The mood in certain precincts of Congress has become so poisonous that people aren’t speaking the common language unless they’re accusing political opponents of unspeakable crimes.

The “Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act” would make it a federal offense to take a minor across a state line for an abortion without the consent of her parents, for a physicist to perform such abortions, and allows parents to sue anyone who does.

Democrats on the Judiciary Committee offered amendments that would have limited the law’s scope. U.S. Rep. Bobby Scott, for example, sought to insert this line: “The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by taxicab drivers, bus drivers or others in the business of professional transport.”

Pretty straightforward, right?

Should the U.S. government prosecute a bus driver because a girl in one of its buses is traveling to end a pregnancy? No matter your answer to that question, the congressmen’s wording is pretty clear, unless you’re a member of the Judiciary Committee’s staff, which managed Scott’s amendment into this:

“Mr. Scott offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution if they’re taxicab drivers, bus drivers or others in the business of professional transport.”

In other words, the staff of a committee on which Scott serves accused him of trying to protect sexual predators, arguably a crime in itself.

It is the kind of libel—repeated against two other Democratic members of the committee—that only nameless, faceless bureaucrats would dare make. But, significantly, it’s also the kind of power-made mischief that the Republican leadership felt deserved defense.

The Congress Tuesday evening spent an hour debating a resolution to require Republicans to change the descriptions, which are supposed to be, and ordinarily are, written in dry, neutral language.

That debate was itself illustrative of how deep the divisions in Congress have become. While the Democrats—including Scott and Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi—talked about how Republicans abused the truth to score political points, the majority changed the subject entirely and re-argued the merits of the abortion bill, which passed the week before.

“The issue is whether we can trust each other to deal with each other fairly,” said Wisconsin Democrat Rep. David Obey, who had voted for the abortion bill.

In the end, Tuesday’s debate was a ramorous parry and feint, lasted an eternity and came to absolutely nothing. The resolution to change the descriptions, of course, failed on a party-line vote.

Still, for 60 minutes, the rudeness that now rules the hall of the Capitol was on sharp display for all America to see.

“The rewrite says more about the person who wrote it, and those who defend it, than it does about the amendment itself,” Scott said Tuesday.

Scott’s right. What is says is nothing kind, and not to be forgotten.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, not seeing the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for filing the corrected report, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to accompany the bill, H.R. 1268, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1268, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF ACT, 2005

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 258, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly 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 expeditious removal of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

I am pleased to bring to the House for its consideration the conference report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror and Tsunami Relief.

The conference agreement includes a total of $82 billion. The vast majority of these funds are to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. For that reason, it is critical that we move this package quickly. It also provides needed assistance to the victims of the tsunami.

During our conference with the Senate, Chairman COCHRAN and I agreed that the final agreement should come in at or below the President’s request and relatively free of extraneous items. The conference report before you has met both of these very critical parameters. We did our very best to keep the package clean, and by and large, we were successful with that. We have funded our foreign policy priorities while still preserving congressional prerogatives where appropriate.

With that said, the conference report provides a total of $75.9 billion for defense-related expenditures, roughly $921 million over the President’s request. The additions over the request are for force protection, and increasing the survivability of troops in the field.

In addition to the defense-related spending, the conference report provides a reduction of $1.5 billion in foreign assistance from the President’s request. The conference agreement also includes $656 million for increased border security enforcement. This includes 500 additional border patrol agents and increased detention space.

We have also included $656 million for tsunami disaster relief. Finally, the bill includes much of the REAL ID Act of 2005, which was included in the House-passed version of the bill. The provisions on asylum, border infrastructure, and driver’s license standards are included. Each of these provisions will greatly enhance the security of our borders. All of these provisions reflect agreements negotiated by relevant authorizing committees. I especially want to thank Chairman SENSENICH, Chairman DAVIS and their staffs for getting this measure before the Congress in a timely fashion.

I urge my colleagues to support this much needed support for our troops.
## EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE,
THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF, 2005

### TITLE I - DEFENSE-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS

#### Military Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>11,750,942</td>
<td>11,779,642</td>
<td>12,067,208</td>
<td>12,067,108 +310,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Allowance for Housing, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>1,542,100</td>
<td>1,542,100</td>
<td>1,542,100</td>
<td>1,542,100 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>524,900</td>
<td>534,080</td>
<td>535,108</td>
<td>535,108 +10,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>1,246,126</td>
<td>1,251,726</td>
<td>1,358,053</td>
<td>1,358,053 +111,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>1,316,572</td>
<td>1,473,472</td>
<td>1,684,943</td>
<td>1,599,943 +283,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>39,627</td>
<td>40,327</td>
<td>39,627</td>
<td>39,627 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>9,411</td>
<td>11,111</td>
<td>9,411</td>
<td>9,411 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>4,015 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>429,200</td>
<td>430,300</td>
<td>291,100</td>
<td>291,100 -138,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Military personnel</strong></td>
<td>16,869,094</td>
<td>17,067,094</td>
<td>17,531,765</td>
<td>17,446,886 +577,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operation and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>17,201,004</td>
<td>17,366,004</td>
<td>17,601,004</td>
<td>16,914,004 -287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Afghan Security Forces (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(290,000) (290,000) (290,000) ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Iraq Security Forces (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(210,000) (210,000) (210,000) ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>66,300 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>3,423,501</td>
<td>3,030,801</td>
<td>3,430,801</td>
<td>3,030,574 -392,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>970,404</td>
<td>982,404</td>
<td>970,404</td>
<td>982,404 +12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>5,051,510</td>
<td>5,769,400</td>
<td>5,529,574</td>
<td>5,627,053 +25,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>3,521,327</td>
<td>3,061,300</td>
<td>3,308,392</td>
<td>3,042,265 -479,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>8,154</td>
<td>8,154</td>
<td>21,354</td>
<td>26,354 +18,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Reserve (emergency)</td>
<td>75,164</td>
<td>75,164</td>
<td>75,164</td>
<td>75,164 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Operation and maintenance</strong></td>
<td>38,076,123</td>
<td>37,588,336</td>
<td>37,438,852</td>
<td>37,100,948 -975,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Procurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>458,677</td>
<td>458,677</td>
<td>458,677</td>
<td>458,677 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missle Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>294,036</td>
<td>340,536</td>
<td>280,250</td>
<td>310,250 +16,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>2,425,207</td>
<td>2,678,747</td>
<td>2,406,447</td>
<td>2,551,187 +125,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>522,800</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>532,800 +57,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>5,210,405</td>
<td>6,549,905</td>
<td>5,322,905</td>
<td>6,250,505 +934,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(By transfer emergency)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total procurement (By transfer emergency)</strong></td>
<td>(5,316,406) (6,634,905) (5,322,905) (6,250,505) (934,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>200,295</td>
<td>200,295</td>
<td>200,295</td>
<td>200,295 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>71,600</td>
<td>71,600</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>66,000 -5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>133,635</td>
<td>141,735</td>
<td>133,635</td>
<td>139,635 +6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>85,672</td>
<td>78,372</td>
<td>78,372</td>
<td>78,372 -7,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>2,974,045</td>
<td>3,588,495</td>
<td>2,929,045</td>
<td>3,283,042 +308,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>289,241</td>
<td>279,241</td>
<td>269,360</td>
<td>277,309 +8,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>6,998 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>2,834,328</td>
<td>2,658,527</td>
<td>2,655,760</td>
<td>2,577,560 -256,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>591,327</td>
<td>646,327</td>
<td>591,327</td>
<td>645,300 +54,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Procurement</strong></td>
<td>16,136,466</td>
<td>18,232,255</td>
<td>15,872,045</td>
<td>17,378,594 +1,242,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds available</strong></td>
<td>(16,136,466) (18,317,255) (15,872,045) (17,378,594) (+1,242,128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>25,170</td>
<td>25,170</td>
<td>37,170</td>
<td>37,170 +12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)  
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy (emergency)</td>
<td>179,051</td>
<td>202,051</td>
<td>179,051</td>
<td>204,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>102,540</td>
<td>121,500</td>
<td>132,540</td>
<td>142,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (emergency)</td>
<td>153,561</td>
<td>159,600</td>
<td>203,561</td>
<td>203,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, RDT&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>460,222</td>
<td>508,321</td>
<td>552,322</td>
<td>597,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving And Management Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Working Capital Funds (emergency)</td>
<td>1,311,300</td>
<td>1,411,300</td>
<td>1,311,300</td>
<td>1,511,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Sealift Fund (emergency)</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>32,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Revolving and management funds</strong></td>
<td>1,343,700</td>
<td>1,443,700</td>
<td>1,343,700</td>
<td>1,543,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Community Management Account (emergency)</td>
<td>250,300</td>
<td>250,300</td>
<td>250,300</td>
<td>250,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (emergency)</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>227,000</td>
<td>242,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General (emergency)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program (emergency)</td>
<td>175,550</td>
<td>175,550</td>
<td>225,550</td>
<td>210,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Other DoD programs</strong></td>
<td>432,688</td>
<td>432,688</td>
<td>452,688</td>
<td>452,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction, Army (emergency)</td>
<td>990,100</td>
<td>930,100</td>
<td>897,191</td>
<td>847,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)</td>
<td>107,380</td>
<td>92,720</td>
<td>107,380</td>
<td>139,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction, Air Force (emergency)</td>
<td>301,520</td>
<td>301,386</td>
<td>140,983</td>
<td>140,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional transfer authority (emergency)</td>
<td>(2,500,000)</td>
<td>(2,000,000)</td>
<td>(2,185,000)</td>
<td>(2,685,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New transfer authority (emergency)</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td>(2,000,000)</td>
<td>(2,000,000)</td>
<td>(3,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Cooperation Account (emergency)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-armored humvees</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>213,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 1118 Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy (by transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq Freedom Fund (recession) (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1035 (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title I</strong></td>
<td>74,979,703</td>
<td>76,838,910</td>
<td>74,800,257</td>
<td>75,888,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer authority emergency)</td>
<td>(7,500,000)</td>
<td>(4,000,000)</td>
<td>(4,185,000)</td>
<td>(5,685,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>74,479,703</td>
<td>76,438,910</td>
<td>71,615,257</td>
<td>73,203,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE II - INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND THE WAR ON TERROR**

**CHAPTER 1**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Foreign Agricultural Service

Public Law 480 Title II Grants (emergency) | 150,000 | 150,000 | 470,000 | 240,000 | +90,000 |

**CHAPTER 2**

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY**

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

Administration of Foreign Affairs

Diplomatic and Consular Programs (emergency) | 767,200 | 748,500 | 357,700 | 734,000 | -33,200 |

Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance (emergency) | 658,000 | 592,000 | 592,000 | 592,000 | -68,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Organizations</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for International Peacekeeping</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>533,049</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-50,000)</td>
<td>(-50,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RELATED AGENCY | | | | | |
|----------------| | | | | |
| Broadcasting Board Of Governors | | | | | |
| International Broadcasting Operations (emergency) | 4,600 | 4,800 | 4,600 | 4,600 | --- |
| Broadcasting Capital Improvements (emergency) | 2,500 | --- | 2,500 | 2,500 | --- |

| STATE AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS | | | | | |
|---------------------------------| | | | | |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |

United States Agency For International Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Disaster and Famine</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance (emergency)</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>+46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Initiatives (emergency)</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses of the USAID (emergency)</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses of the USAID Office of Inspector General (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal, USAID | 133,900 | 120,900 | 133,900 | 116,900 | -17,000 |

Other Bilateral Economic Assistance

| Economic Support Fund (emergency) | 1,631,300 | 376,500 | 1,636,300 | 1,433,600 | -197,700 |
| Economic Support Fund (Transfer out emergency) | --- | 681,700 | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer emergency) | --- | --- | (-10,000) | (-10,000) | (-10,000) |
| Overseas Private Investment Corporation (by transfer emergency) | --- | --- | (46,000) | --- | --- |
| Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (emergency) | 60,000 | --- | 70,000 | 70,000 | +10,000 |
| Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union | --- | 33,700 | --- | --- | --- |
| Global War On Terror Partners Fund (emergency) | 200,000 | --- | 25,500 | --- | -200,000 |

Subtotal, Other bilateral assistance | 1,891,300 | 1,091,900 | 1,731,800 | 1,503,600 | -387,700 |

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Narcotics Control and Law</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement (emergency)</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>594,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>+40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-46,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and Refugee Assistance (emergency)</td>
<td>53,400</td>
<td>103,400</td>
<td>108,400</td>
<td>120,400</td>
<td>+67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs (emergency)</td>
<td>32,100</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>32,100</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>-7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal, Department of State | 745,500 | 714,500 | 780,500 | 765,000 | +19,500 |

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------| | | | | |
| Foreign Military Financing Program (emergency) | 250,000 | --- | 250,000 | 250,000 | --- |
| Foreign Military Financing Program (Transfer out emergency) | --- | 250,000 | --- | --- | --- |
| Peacekeeping Operations (emergency) | 210,000 | 10,000 | 210,000 | 240,000 | +30,000 |
| (By transfer emergency) | --- | --- | --- | (30,000) | (-30,000) |

Subtotal, Military assistance | 460,000 | 260,000 | 460,000 | 490,000 | +30,000 |

General Provisions

| Sec. 2102- Rescission of unexpended balances (rescission) | --- | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 |
| Sec. 2111 - Provide Additional Assistance to Sudan: Contributions for International Peacekeeping (transfer out emergency) | --- | --- | (-91,000) | --- | --- |
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror -
and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Operations (by transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int'l. Disaster and Famine Assist (by transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(41,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chapter 2</td>
<td>5,443,200</td>
<td>3,112,600</td>
<td>3,616,249</td>
<td>3,880,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>992,300</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>5,443,200</td>
<td>3,120,300</td>
<td>4,616,249</td>
<td>4,880,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Title II</td>
<td>5,593,200</td>
<td>3,262,900</td>
<td>4,086,249</td>
<td>4,128,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>992,300</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>5,593,200</td>
<td>3,270,300</td>
<td>5,086,249</td>
<td>5,128,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transfer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(91,000)</td>
<td>(-50,000)</td>
<td>(-50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer out (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-147,000)</td>
<td>(-40,000)</td>
<td>(-40,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transfer (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(56,000)</td>
<td>(60,000)</td>
<td>(+60,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE III - DOMESTIC APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE WAR ON TERROR**

**CHAPTER 1**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

National Nuclear Security Administration

| Weapons activities (emergency) | --- | --- | 26,000 | --- | --- |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (emergency) | 110,000 | 110,000 | 84,000 | 84,000 | -26,000 |
| Total, Chapter 1 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 84,000 | -26,000 |

**CHAPTER 2**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

Customs and Border Protection

| Salaries and expenses (emergency) | --- | --- | 105,451 | 49,075 | +49,075 |
| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | --- | 75,350 | +75,350 |
| Construction (emergency) | --- | --- | 41,500 | 51,875 | +51,875 |

Immigration and Customs Enforcement

| Salaries and expenses (emergency) | --- | --- | 276,000 | 340,050 | +340,050 |
| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | 589,613 | 105,200 | +105,200 |

United States Coast Guard

| Operating Expenses (emergency) | 111,950 | 111,950 | 111,950 | 111,950 | --- |
| Acquisition, Construction and Improvements (emergency) | 49,200 | 49,200 | 49,200 | 49,200 | --- |

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | --- | 2,568 | +2,568 |
| Construction | --- | --- | --- | 1,862 | +1,862 |
| Total, Chapter 2 | 161,150 | 161,150 | 973,714 | 796,150 | +635,000 |

**CHAPTER 3**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

General Administration

| Office of Inspector General (emergency) | --- | --- | 2,500 | --- | --- |
| Detention trustees (emergency) | --- | --- | --- | 184,000 | +184,000 |

Legal Activities

| Asset Forfeiture Fund (rescission) | --- | --- | --- | -40,000 | -40,000 |
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror -
and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Marshals Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Bureau Of Investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Expenses (emergency)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>78,970</td>
<td>66,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Expenses (emergency)</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>7,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chapter 3</td>
<td>87,648</td>
<td>86,618</td>
<td>93,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 4

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

House of Representatives

Payment to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress | --- | --- | --- | 162 | +162
Salaries and expenses (emergency) | --- | --- | --- | 39,000 | +39,000

Subtotal, House of Representatives | --- | --- | --- | 39,162 | +39,162

Capitol Police

Salaries | 36,483 | --- | --- | --- | -36,483
(Emergency) | --- | --- | 10,000 | --- | ---
General expenses | 23,044 | --- | --- | --- | -23,044
(Emergency) | --- | --- | 13,300 | 11,000 | +11,000

Subtotal, Capitol Police | 59,527 | --- | 23,300 | 11,000 | -48,527

Architect of the Capitol

Capitol grounds (emergency) | --- | --- | --- | 8,200 | +8,200
Capitol Police buildings and grounds (emergency) | --- | --- | 23,000 | 4,100 | +4,100

Subtotal, Architect of the Capitol | --- | --- | 23,000 | 12,300 | +12,300

Total, Chapter 4 | 59,527 | --- | 48,300 | 62,462 | +2,935

Total, Title III | 418,325 | 357,768 | 1,223,790 | 1,184,186 | +765,861

TITLE IV - INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI RELIEF

CHAPTER 1

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Other Bilateral Assistance

Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund (emergency) | 701,000 | 659,000 | 656,000 | 656,000 | -45,000
(Transfer out emergency) | (-43,000) | (-30,500) | (-36,000) | (-48,500) | (-5,500)

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Operation And Maintenance

Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency) | 124,100 | 124,100 | 124,100 | 124,100 | ---
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency) | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 | ---
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency) | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | ---
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency) | 29,150 | 29,150 | 29,150 | 29,150 | ---
### Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror -
and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1208)

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (emergency)</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program (emergency)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Chapter 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHAPTER 3

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**United States Coast Guard**

**Operating Expenses (emergency)** | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 | --- |

### CHAPTER 4

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**United States Geological Survey**

**Surveys, Investigations, and Research (emergency)** | 8,100 | 8,100 | 8,100 | 8,100 | --- |

### CHAPTER 5

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration**

**Operations, Research, and Facilities (emergency)** | 4,830 | 4,830 | 7,070 | 7,070 | +2,240 |

**Procurement, Acquisition and Construction (emergency)** | 9,670 | 9,670 | 10,170 | 10,170 | +500 |

| **Total, Chapter 5** | **14,500** | **14,500** | **17,240** | **17,240** | **+2,740** |
| **Total, Title IV** | **949,600** | **907,600** | **907,340** | **907,340** | **-42,260** |

### TITLE V - OTHER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

### CHAPTER 1

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

**Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service**

**Research and education activities (emergency)** | --- | --- | 3,000 | --- | --- |

**Natural Resources Conservation Service**

**Emergency watershed protection program (emergency)** | --- | --- | 103,000 | 104,500 | +104,500 |

| **General Provision** | **Sec. 5102 Watershed protection program (emergency)** | --- | --- | 15,000 | --- | --- |
| **Subtotal, Natural Resource conservation Service.** | --- | --- | 118,000 | 104,500 | +104,500 |
| **Total, Chapter 1** | --- | --- | 121,000 | 104,500 | +104,500 |

### CHAPTER 2

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Departmental Mangement**

**Salaries and expenses (emergency)** | --- | --- | 3,000 | 3,000 | +3,000 |

### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

**Forest Service**

**National forest service (emergency)** | --- | --- | 2,410 | --- | --- |

**Capital improvement and maintenance (emergency)** | --- | --- | 31,980 | 24,390 | +24,390 |

| **Subtotal, Forest Service** | --- | --- | 34,390 | 24,390 | +24,390 |
| **Total, Chapter 2** | --- | --- | 37,390 | 27,390 | +27,390 |
### CHAPTER 3

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

Health Resources and Services Administration

| Health resources and services (rescission) | --- | --- | -2,000 | -2,000 | -2,000 |
| Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (rescission) | --- | --- | --- | -58,000 | -58,000 |

**Office of the Secretary**

| Office of the Inspector General (rescission) | --- | --- | -700 | -700 | -700 |
| Public Health and Social Services Emergency fund (emergency) | --- | --- | 10,000 | 10,000 | +10,000 |
| Public Health and Social Services Emergency fund | --- | --- | --- | 58,000 | +58,000 |
| Assistant Secretary for Health (rescission) | --- | --- | -7,300 | -7,300 | -7,300 |

**Subtotal, Office of the Secretary**

| --- | --- | 2,000 | 2,000 | +2,000 |

**Total, Department of Health and Human Services**

| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

**RELATED AGENCY**

Institute of Museums and Library Services (emergency)

| --- | --- | 10,000 | --- | --- |

**Total, Chapter 3**

| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

### CHAPTER 4

**THE JUDICIARY**

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services

| Salaries and expenses (emergency) | 101,800 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Courts of Appeals, district Courts, and Other Judicial Services | 101,800 | --- | --- | -101,800 |

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

Housing Programs

| Housing for Persons With Disabilities | --- | --- | 238,080 | 238,000 | +238,000 |
| Rescission | --- | --- | -238,080 | -238,000 | -238,000 |

**Subtotal, Housing programs**

| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight

| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | 5,000 | 5,000 | +5,000 |
| Offsetsetting collections | --- | --- | -5,000 | -5,000 | -5,000 |

**General Provision**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

Sec. 5401 Emergency assistance (emergency)

| --- | --- | 10,000 | --- | --- |

**Total, Chapter 4**

| 101,800 | --- | 76,000 | --- | -101,800 |

---

**Total, Title V**

| Appropriations | 101,800 | --- | 243,390 | 131,890 | +30,090 |
| --- | --- | --- | 243,390 | 301,000 | +199,200 |
| Emergency appropriations | --- | --- | 253,390 | 141,890 | +141,890 |
| Recissions | --- | --- | -248,080 | -306,000 | -306,000 |
| Offsetsetting collections | --- | --- | -5,000 | -5,000 | -5,000 |
### TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Provisions Sec. 5002 (By transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons activities (transfer out)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6019 Office of the Administrator (by transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense site acceleration completion (transfer out)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6030 Defense environmental services (by transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil energy research development (CCPI loan)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6030 State and private forestry (by transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital improvement and maintenance (transfer out)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6027: Department of Homeland Security: Office of the Secretary and Executive Management (rescission)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary for Management (rescission)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-3,300</td>
<td>-3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs and Border Protection salaries and expenses (rescission)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-76,000</td>
<td>-76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Customs Enforcement salaries and expenses (rescission)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-85,200</td>
<td>-85,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund (rescission)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6035: Surface mining fees</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-41,000</td>
<td>-41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6050: U.S. Senate (emergency)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>+35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6074: Home Equity Conversion Mortgage</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-8,000</td>
<td>-8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total, Title VI | --- | --- | -41,000 | -199,000 |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>161,327</th>
<th>992,300</th>
<th>632,693</th>
<th>486,000</th>
<th>+324,673</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>81,881,301</td>
<td>81,374,578</td>
<td>81,881,332</td>
<td>83,190,478</td>
<td>+1,309,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
<td>-1,248,080</td>
<td>-1,531,000</td>
<td>-1,531,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting collections</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer authority)</td>
<td>(7,500,000)</td>
<td>(4,000,000)</td>
<td>(4,185,000)</td>
<td>(5,685,000)</td>
<td>(-1,815,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(132,500)</td>
<td>(-50,000)</td>
<td>(-50,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer emergency)</td>
<td>(85,000)</td>
<td>(56,000)</td>
<td>(90,000)</td>
<td>(90,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(41,500)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out emergency)</td>
<td>(-43,000)</td>
<td>(-30,500)</td>
<td>(-183,000)</td>
<td>(-88,500)</td>
<td>(-45,500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Grand total | 82,042,628 | 81,366,878 | 81,219,945 | 82,041,475 | -1,150 |
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us today makes clear that we have now spent $284 billion and Afghanistan since the war began. The money that has been spent in Afghanistan is certainly legitimate and justified. After all, that country harbored the people who attacked us on 9/11. The problem is, however, that $165 billion has now been spent to deal with a country that did not attack us. We have spent some $240 billion on this entire endeavor since the President first landed in his jumpsuit on that carrier and addressed the country under the banner “Mission Accomplished.” There has been quite a bit of that mission left since it supposedly was over. We have now been involved in Iraq longer than we were involved in World War I, and respectable and responsible experts have told me that we expect that we will be involved for at least another 5 years.

This whole operation has been brought to us by the same people who erroneously told us that we had to go to war because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and it was implied that they had, or were close to having, nuclear capability. That was all demonstrated not to be true. This has been brought to us by the same people who believed the assertions that our troops would be welcomed with open arms. It has been brought to us by the same people who thought they were so smart that they knew more than General Shinseki when the good general warned us that we would need substantially more troops and boots on the ground than we were scheduled to have if the postwar occupation was to go well.

And it has been brought to us by the same people who provided to our troops insufficient armor for Humvees, insufficient jammer protection, and insufficient jammers to prevent our troops from having their faces and their legs and their arms blown off by remotely detonated bombs and mines.

I want to make quite clear I will support this bill because I feel that I have no choice but to participate in cleaning up the mess which somebody else left. But I do not relish it. I believe that the entire operation in Iraq has been accompanied by incredibly naive romanticism in the White House and on the part of the civilian leadership in the Pentagon, and that has left the people fighting the war to bear the brunt of the miscalculations that have been made by the civilian leadership of our government. We have lost the lives of 1,500 American service men and women. We have seen more than 11,000 be injured. And this bill underestimates, in my view, the amount of money that will be needed eventually to restore the readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces and to minimize their casualties.

The second thing this bill does is to demonstrate once again how we, on both sides of the aisle, have had to work doubly hard to overcome the resistance of the White House in adequately funding homeland security operations. They have been especially resistant to providing the adequate funding along the borders, especially the Canadian border. And this bill has taken a bipartisan effort on the part of a wide variety of people in this Congress in order to overcome that resistance. This bill falls far short of the funding that is necessary to provide a secure set of borders with the United States. The new bill that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will help fill that gap, but that is forced to play catch-up because we have met a steady resistance effort on the part of the White House.

Lastly, I simply want to say that while I am certainly no expert on the subject, I note that there is being attached to this bill a provision which many experts in the field feel has the potential to create a nationwide database that could be very harmful in terms of people’s efforts to engage in identity theft. I hope that proves not to be the case.

I would simply make the point that certainly no one on our committee on either side of the aisle has the expertise that you would hope would be found in the authorization committees, and I wish that that provision had been found in the Republican Caucus by having it attached to an unrelated bill, and I want to make one point about that.

We are being lectured almost daily by the majority that we should not add ungermane riders to appropriation bills. I want to serve notice that if the majority feels free to add unrelated authorization bills such as this to a must-pass bill, then I feel fully within my right in whatever legislation we feel appropriate on this side of the aisle and asking that it be attached to appropriation bills. If sauce is going to be okay for the goose, then it ought to be good for the gander. So with relating months to what the attitude of the majority is when we seek to add what we feel are legitimate efforts to strengthen appropriation bills by adding various pieces of so-called legislation to appropriation bills.

So since the majority has chosen to proceed down that path, I hope they do not seek to follow it. With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I repeat I intend to vote for this bill with all of my misgivings.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), my colleague on the committee.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the chairman of the full committee on this, his maiden effort, to bring a major supplemental appropriation to the floor as chairman, and I congratulate him for the leadership that he has shown in bringing this so swiftly to this floor.

I do rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 1268. Before I address the funding that is the responsibility of my subcommittee, I want to briefly acknowledge a critically important part of this bill, border funding. The securing of our Nation’s borders to prevent the hemorrhaging flow of illegal immigration through my State of Arizona has got to be a top priority for the Federal Government. The people I represent living on the border are frustrated with the illegal immigration system, and we must address gaps in border security now. Arizona and other border States can no longer serve as the back door for this country’s broken immigration system.

Regarding the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Subcommittee chapter of this legislation, the conference report includes $2.53 billion in funding for programs under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Subcommittee, which I chair. While this overall level is $1.4 billion less than requested, let me say once again I strongly support the objectives of the President that he seeks to achieve with respect for Afghanistan, the Middle East, and the tsunami-devastated areas of Asia. I believe that this conference agreement provides the financial support necessary to help the United States achieve these objectives.

The major elements of the conference agreement that differ from the House-passed levels are additional funds for Afghanistan reconstruction, the Solidarity Initiative, and support for Ukraine. The $739 million proposed by the House for Afghanistan reconstruction represented the highest priority projects that could be implemented and executed during 2005. The Senate provided $1.3 billion, the administration’s request. And the conference level is $1.086 billion, or $347 million over what the House had recommended. This increase over the House level supports some 2006 requirements, which is, I believe, a cost-effective approach to the 2006 budget process.

The House provided no funding for the administration’s $400 million Solidarity Initiative, The Senate provide a total of $225.5 million, $230 million in the Solidarity Initiative for the Global War on Terror Partners Fund. The conference agreement provides a total of $230 million, merging the two funds into one appropriation, and places these funds within Peacekeeping Operations appropriation. This arrangement provides for regular order congressional review of the Department’s plans for these funds.
The conference agreement provides $90 million for Ukraine, and these funds will support the government of Ukraine’s highest priorities for political and economic reform, including anti-corruption initiatives and support for the upcoming parliamentary elections.

I think my colleagues recognize that we are faced with unique opportunities in the Middle East and Afghanistan. This agreement will provide the financial resources necessary to promote democracy and security by the State Department with programs and projects to support these positive influences.

Let me say that the funds we are providing in the foreign assistance chapter must be considered an investment in security both in the region and on American soil. However, Congress has the responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and transparently, and we take that responsibility seriously with reporting requirements that will continue vigilant oversight of these programs.

The greatest weight all of us must bear is the knowledge that these decisions we make directly put the lives of Americans at risk. I firmly believe the bill before us today will help build stability and freedom in Afghanistan, the Middle East, and parts of Asia. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the fiscal year 2005 emergency supplemental conference report on H.R. 1268.

Before I address the funding in my subcommittee, I wanted to briefly acknowledge a critically important part of this bill—border security funding. The securing of our nation’s borders to prevent the hemorrhaging flow of illegal immigration through my state of Arizona must be a top priority for the federal government. The people I represent living on the border are frustrated with the illegal immigration system and address gaps in border security now. Arizona and other border states can no longer serve as the backdoor for this country’s broken immigration system. By adding this funding we are taking a step in the right direction to ensure our northern and southern borders are protected.

I am pleased that my colleagues on the conference committee agreed to provide $665 million for Border Security to hire an additional 500 Border Patrol Agents, 50 additional criminal investigators, 168 Immigration Enforcement Officers, and 250 Immigration and Deportation Officers, and to fund $950 additional detention beds.

The bill also includes my amendment to strengthen the REAL ID Act to address the technology, equipment, and personnel needs improving security within the U.S., requiring Department of Homeland Security to carry out an improved global surveillance program, and requiring DHS to improve interagency communication.

Regarding the Foreign Operations Subcommittee chapter, the conference agreement includes $2.532 billion, in funding for programs under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations subcommittee of which I am Chairman. This amount is $685 million over the House level, $251 million less than the Senate level, and $1.4 billion less than the Administration’s request.

While this overall level is $1.4 billion less than requested, let me say once again that I strongly support the objectives the President seeks to achieve with this request for Afghanist-an, the Middle East, and tsunami-devastated areas of Asia. I believe that, with the understanding that we need to reduce our federal deficit, this conference agreement provides the financial support necessary to help the United States achieve these objectives.

The major portion of the conference agreement that differ from the House passed-level are: additional funds for Afghanistan reconstruction, the Solidarity Initiative, and support for Ukraine.

The $739 million proposed by the House for Afghanistan reconstruction, represented the highest priority projects that could be implemented and executed during 2006. The Senate provided $1.3 billion, the Administration’s request. The conference level is $1.086 billion, $347 million over the House recommendation.

The difference between the report level, the levels of the conference report on H.R. 1266, and the House report is $1.086 billion, a reduction of $656 million for assistance to the victims of the tsunami in Asia.

While this overall level is $1.4 billion less than requested, let me say once again that we are faced with unique opportunities in the Middle East and Afghanistan.

The conference agreement provides $60 million for Ukraine, and these funds will support the government of Ukraine.

This amount is $685 million over the House level, $251 million less than the Senate level, and $1.4 billion less than the Administration’s request.

While this overall level is $1.4 billion less than requested, let me say once again that I strongly support the objectives the President seeks to achieve with this request for Afghanistan, the Middle East, and tsunami-devastated areas of Asia. I believe that, with the understanding that we need to reduce our federal deficit, this conference agreement provides the financial support necessary to help the United States achieve these objectives.

The major portion of the conference agreement that differ from the House passed-level are: additional funds for Afghanistan reconstruction, the Solidarity Initiative, and support for Ukraine.

The $739 million proposed by the House for Afghanistan reconstruction, represented the highest priority projects that could be implemented and executed during 2006. The Senate provided $1.3 billion, the Administration’s request. The conference level is $1.086 billion, $347 million over the House recommendation.

The difference between the report level, the levels of the conference report on H.R. 1266, and the House report is $1.086 billion, a reduction of $656 million for assistance to the victims of the tsunami in Asia.
Lewis) knows what I mean. We talk to them, and because of other people over there, they do not want to admit that they need the money. This time they were very emphatic that they needed every cent and they needed it as soon as they could get it. So we added money for the types of things that they need.

Having said that, what I have said to the services because we are having such a problem, we see the recruiting problem, we are trying to figure out how to overcome that. The subcommittee I serve on, we realize and we have said for a long time, they are going to have a recruiting problem as this war gets unpopular; and we were trying to figure out how we do overcome that.

Most times I disagree with those bonuses because I feel so strongly that people ought to join the Armed Forces for the good of the country, but we have to give bonuses to send them over there. We put money in for those kinds of things. We added the amount of money they needed it as soon as they could get it. Some veterans group called me and said they were not happy with the way we added that money. They felt like there ought to be more study, and I cannot disagree with that.

But we all of us sat down, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young) and Senator Inouye and Senator Stevens, we came to the conclusion that we just did not think we could wait. So we put money in to take care of people who were injured so severely as well as the ones that were killed. And I got so many letters from the people at home, and I have had 12 killed in my district, how pleased they were about what we are doing because it helps them get through a very difficult time.

What we have tried to do over the years is make sure that the people that were in the Armed Forces had what they needed. Our sub-committee brought to the attention of the country that they were without a lot of equipment in Iraq. We are working right now. New trucks, we are trying to figure out how to put new trucks in the field. We added money because we have taken care of the Humvees, but we need to take care of the trucks now. So we got some commercial trucks which were recommended which were $100,000 less, but it was so late, we could not get it in the bill. We are going to ask for reprogramming for that amount of money.

So this bill is taking care of equipment shortages, not all of them, but it is taking care of as many as we could possibly squeeze in. It is taking care of Reset. We forced the military to ask for Reset. The minute that this war is over and the money starts to dry up, Reset will be the first thing they do not do; so we have to do it now. And I have said to many of the industrial leaders in this country, the minute the war is over, there will not be any supplementals, there will be a lot less money to be spent, and we have got to spend this money now in the supplementals to make sure that that gets done. Armor modularity, there is some argument about that; but we think it ought to be done, and we have pushed this.

Mr. Young, Many of the programs that the Army has today have come about because of the Defense Subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) and chaired by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young). Many of the things that have happened have happened because we see it out in the field. We go out in the field, talk to the people, make sure that we are doing the right thing, and then we try to send defense in the right direction.

So I urge everyone to vote for this. The troops need it, and it helps dramatically for the amount of money that is needed by the Armed Forces.

Mr. Lewis of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for one of the most illuminating, but also one of the longest, statements I have ever heard him make on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), chairman of the greatest sub-committee in the appropriations process.

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding me this time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha), the ranking member on our Defense Subcommittee, has explained the bill quite thoroughly as it relates to the war fighters. The biggest part of this supplemental is for war fighters, and the bill we have put together goes just to that issue.

The increases that we have added in this bill go to the urgently needed items such as ammunition, weapons, up-armored Humvees, transport vehicles, Jammers, night vision equipment, radios, add-on armor kits; and the list goes on and on. And I include a list of those items that are for the war fighter and force protection. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha) and the gentleman from California (Chairman Lewis) and I and many of our colleagues have visited our hospitals to visit with our soldiers and Marines at Walter Reed and at Bethesda Naval Hospital and also at Landstuhl, where many of our service men come first before they get transported back to the United States, and we have located a number of areas where the government just does not take care of these soldiers and the Marines. And this bill goes a long way towards taking care of that.

It has been pretty generally known that we have in this bill increased the death benefit for those who make the total sacrifice and lose their lives in working and supporting the Nation’s security. We have also increased the service group life insurance programs substantially so that those who prefer to take part in that program can have additional benefits and many of these benefits are really needed. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha) referred to this, but I want to take just a minute and explain. We added, basically, a new program, and that is for a traumatic injury insurance benefit for members of the service. We provide up to $100,000 to compensate for injuries such as loss of sight, losing a hand or a foot, or other debilitating injuries. And these benefits would be retroactive to October of 2001, when the war started.

There are many soldiers and Marines today who have been wounded so seriously that in previous wars would have died on the battlefield but who are living today because of this improvement and better medical care and the ability to transport from the battlefield to a medical facility. So these soldiers and Marines are hurt really bad, and we have an obligation to take care of them, and this bill goes a long way toward beginning that process, to take care of things for our heroes and our fallen heroes who have not been taken care of by the government previously.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

Conference Agreement for Additional Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missle Procurement, Army</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>69,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>55,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>57,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>66,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps</td>
<td>1,166,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conferees:
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Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am of course going to vote for this emergency supplemental appropriation because I believe it is absolutely essential to support our brave men and women in harm’s way in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I know that even today, 2 years after the onset of Operation Iraqi Freedom, there are still Afghanistan and Iraqi Marines Company E, an experience that, in my view, has punctuated not only by a lack of armor and night vision goggles, and, in addition, for outfitting troops rotating into Iraq and Afghanistan.

Over the last 4 years, this administration, however, has refused to ask the American people, particularly the wealthiest American people, to make even minimal sacrifices, while we ask our men and women in Afghanistan and Iraq for some to make the ultimate sacrifice.

The very least, in my opinion, that we can do is give them the resources they need to achieve victory and to return home safely.

I also support, Mr. Speaker, the important funding in this bill for tsunami relief, foreign assistance, and domestic homeland security as well as the $230 million in assistance for the Palestinian Authority for infrastructure and economic development projects. Those are all worthwhile, necessary, and important projects. The political reforms taking place in the territories must be accompanied by an end to the poverty and lack of opportunity facing the Palestinian people. That is ultimately how we will defeat terrorism.

Finally, however, let me raise, Mr. Speaker, one objection, among others, to the funding bill: the $592 million for a new embassy compound in Baghdad. That is not an emergency. This funding, Mr. Speaker, is not only inappropriate in this emergency supplemental appropriation process but, in my opinion, is substantially excessive in its expenditures; not to keep the people safe, we can do that, but to create an embassy in a relatively small country that, hopefully, in the years ahead, will be more peaceful than we have found it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are at a critical juncture in Iraq. Victory is imperative, although it is not certain. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS). Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the other conferees for giving us a whole new effort, a major effort to try to control the borders and to deal with the massive illegal immigration problem that the country is facing. We have 11 million estimated illegal aliens in the country, and 800,000 or so of them are apprehended and ordered deported and yet have ascended. Eighty thousand of those have criminal records.

This bill, when combined with the homeland security appropriations bills for 2006 that we marked up yesterday in the subcommittee, those two bills combined will give us a new, massive effort to deal with the problem. These two bills will give us 1,500 new Border Patrol agents, 568 new Immigration and Customs enforcement officers throughout the country, and some 3,900 new jail bed space to try to deal with this massive, overwhelming problem.

I want to commend the chairman for having the foresight, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the other members of the conference, for giving us the new capability to tackle a problem that is proving to be very elusive.

So I compliment the chairman, and I urge everyone to support this bill. Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference committee report. But, Mr. Speaker, the American people whose sons and daughters are fighting this war and the senior military officers who are directing this war deserve to know what the White House will consider to be success in Iraq.

Now, this conference committee report includes language that would require the administration to fully evaluate the situation in Iraq and provide the Congress with measurable, achievable criteria, including the following: an assessment of the number of troops it will take to secure the peace and how those troops would be rotated; key measures of political stability, such as ratification of a national Constitution and the appointment of a new prime minister now scheduled for next year; the estimated strength of the Iraqi insurgency and the extent to which it is composed of non-Iraqi fighters; the operational readiness of Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations independently; and the readiness of Iraqi police forces to perform all duties now being undertaken by coalition forces; as well as the viability of economic sectors that are crucial to Iraq’s economic recovery, as measured by unemployment levels, utility availability, and oil production rates.

The fact is that our long-term presence in Iraq will only give our enemies in the region a greater ability to recruit terrorists and build public support for violence. That is the opposite of our objective there. I do think it is past time to lay out for the American people what is our strategy for success. This language that is included in the report will require the Secretary to report no later than 60 days after the enactment of the supplemental and every 90 days thereafter. That is progress.

We support our troops. We have to complete this mission, but we need to work together. The fact is, the American people whose sons and daughters are fighting this war do not have the ability to require this of the administration, nor do the senior military officers. It is our responsibility, and I am glad that this Congress is committed to performing that responsibility. On balance, it is a good bill, and I support it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to our majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise, of course, in support of this supplemental.

I also want to rise to truly express my appreciation to the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the tremendous job he has done in limiting the scope of this supplemental and getting this work done in a quick way, and moving forward on the rest of our appropriations process at the same time. These measures can often become reasons not to move forward with the normal work of the House, and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and his committee and their staff have really accepted double responsibility and double duty by doing these things at the same time.

This bill does include, as my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) mentioned, the embassy compound in Baghdad. He
Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, why is Congress approving yet another multi-billion dollar spending bill when the previous 3 multi-billion dollar spending bills have been misused, improperly managed, and, in some cases, downright stolen?

A report by the Special Inspector General for Iraq’s reconstruction has stated that nearly $60 million for reconstruction projects in southern Iraq is missing and cannot be accounted for. These funds must be accounted for before allotting one more dollar for the war in Iraq.

And where is the congressional investigation into the $8 billion that mysteriously disappeared from the books at the Coalition Provisional Authority? Why are we voting on writing another check for a mission that has been so badly bungled? Who is being held responsible for the billions of dollars that we have allocated to Iraq? Where is our exit strategy?

This bill is nothing short of highway robbery, and the victims are the troops and the American people. No more blank checks, Mr. Speaker. No more war without reason. I will vote against the supplemental.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to fund urgent supplemental requirements for the military.

For the State Department, we have included just over $2 billion, a reduction of $190 million from the President’s request.

The bill includes the necessary funds to maintain our diplomatic presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. We will force our personnel to carry out their duties in the most secure manner. Iraq and Afghanistan are the front lines of our foreign policy. This conference report provides the necessary resources for operations, logistics, and security in those dangerous, but critically important, parts of the world.

There is also $582 million to allow State to move quickly to build a secure compound in Baghdad and, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) said, these facilities are not secure now, and they are needed. This money will result in the completion of a secure living and working compound facility within 24 months.

The $680 million, $100 million below the President’s request, pays for the U.S. share of ongoing peacekeeping missions, including a new mission for Sudan, where it is absolutely critical, now that there is a north-south peace. And, by sending this mission there, hopefully, it will bring peace to Darfur.

The conference report also includes $241.6 million for domestic appropriations to support the war on terror, including FBI counterterrorism efforts and, for DEA, a counternarcotics program in Afghanistan.

Finally, it includes $17.2 million to jump-start the improvement of the United States tsunami warning capabilities on both coasts.

The conference report before us provides funding for important security measures for our diplomatic personnel, for our ongoing State Department and Justice Department commitments, and I strongly urge support of the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, why is Congress approving yet another multi-billion dollar spending bill when the previous 3 multi-billion dollar spending bills have been misused, improperly managed, and, in some cases, downright stolen?

A report by the Special Inspector General for Iraq’s reconstruction has stated that nearly $60 million for reconstruction projects in southern Iraq is missing and cannot be accounted for. These funds must be accounted for before allotting one more dollar for the war in Iraq.

And where is the congressional investigation into the $8 billion that mysteriously disappeared from the books at the Coalition Provisional Authority? Why are we voting on writing another check for a mission that has been so badly bungled? Who is being held responsible for the billions of dollars that we have allocated to Iraq? Where is our exit strategy?

This bill is nothing short of highway robbery, and the victims are the troops and the American people. No more blank checks, Mr. Speaker. No more war without reason. I will vote against the supplemental.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to fund urgent supplemental requirements for the military.

For the State Department, we have included just over $2 billion, a reduction of $190 million from the President’s request.

The bill includes the necessary funds to maintain our diplomatic presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. We will force our personnel to carry out their duties in the most secure manner. Iraq and Afghanistan are the front lines of our foreign policy. This conference report provides the necessary resources for operations, logistics, and security in those dangerous, but critically important, parts of the world.

There is also $582 million to allow State to move quickly to build a secure compound in Baghdad and, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) said, these facilities are not secure now, and they are needed. This money will result in the completion of a secure living and working compound facility within 24 months.

The $680 million, $100 million below the President’s request, pays for the U.S. share of ongoing peacekeeping missions, including a new mission for Sudan, where it is absolutely critical, now that there is a north-south peace. And, by sending this mission there, hopefully, it will bring peace to Darfur.

The conference report also includes $241.6 million for domestic appropriations to support the war on terror, including FBI counterterrorism efforts and, for DEA, a counternarcotics program in Afghanistan.

Finally, it includes $17.2 million to jump-start the improvement of the United States tsunami warning capabilities on both coasts.

The conference report before us provides funding for important security measures for our diplomatic personnel, for our ongoing State Department and Justice Department commitments, and I strongly urge support of the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a great member of our committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been flying wing on the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTA) for about 14 years, and he has always got me home safely. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and his wife are out at Bethesda in the hospitals every single day.
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taking care of our troops. There is no better team than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha) to make sure that our men and women in uniform are taken care of.

I have another great friend in the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey). And if we were back in the times of Troy, I would be Achilles, and he would be Hector, and we would cross swords, but we respect each other. And there is one area, Mr. Obey, when you mentioned homeland security we can seat those swords. The gentleman from California (Mr. Cox) is working on the abuses of the homeland security money. That is being taken on.

I think we can work in a very bipartisan way to make sure that that happens. I would like to thank the chairman for the border issues, that we have been able to secure our borders with this money. That is what is needed for border patrol. Many of us have been working on this for years. And the Speaker has granted us that at the first must-pass bill we can bring this forward.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaTourette). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) has 71/2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Speaker, I yield for purposes of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from California (Mr. George Miller). (Mr. George Miller of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Obey. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since President Bush stood aboard the USS Lincoln aircraft carrier and declared, "Mission Accomplished" in Iraq. And in those two years it has become increasingly clear that the war in Iraq is far from over, and that the American people are paying the price.

Let's just take a look at the facts:

There are currently 150,000 American troops now serving in Iraq, including 8,000 Reserve and National Guard troops.

Tragically, 1,582 American service members have been killed in the Iraq war.

At least 12,243 U.S. troops have been wounded in action, many with grievous injuries that will require a lifetime of medical assistance and other types of support.

More than one in five Iraqi war veterans have some type of mental disorder caused by their wartime service.

In addition to the cost of life and quality of life for the brave American men and women who are fighting in Iraq, the dollar cost of the war is also taking its toll on the American people.

To date, $217 billion in American taxpayer dollars have gone to fund the war in Iraq. We were told our allies would share the cost of the war; we were told Iraqi oil would pay for the cost of the war. Now it is clear, there was no plan: The American taxpayer is paying for the cost of this war to the tune of $5 billion a month.

In fact, today's $82 billion supplemental is the fifth such supplemental Congress has passed at the request of the Bush Administration to fund the war on terror. That's billions of dollars not spent on pressing problems right here at home.

Problems such as:

The price of gas at the pump. Gas prices remain at record levels at $2.24 per gallon nationwide, with some states topping $2.60. That means gas prices have risen 33 cents in just the last two months and are 42 cents a gallon higher than a year ago. The Energy Department predicts the price will climb to a record $2.35 by Memorial Day—averaging $2.28 this summer.

The high cost of health insurance. Health care costs for families have skyrocketed almost 50 percent over the past five years. A lagging economy. The economy grew at just 3.1 percent in the first quarter—the slowest pace in 2 years and down from a 3.8-percent pace logged in the final quarter of 2004. Declining wages and benefits. Workers' salaries and benefits have suffered the largest 3-year decline in real terms (inflation-adjusted value of our economy) even as corporate profits continue to rise.

Fewer jobs. 446,000 private-sector jobs and 2.8 million manufacturing jobs have been lost. Record budget deficits. The annual deficit is on track to reach a record $427 billion. Veteran's benefits. Over the next 5 years, the budget for veterans programs, primarily health care, is $14.2 billion below the amount needed to maintain services at current levels.

And, record trade deficits. The U.S. trade deficit surged to an all-time high of $61.04 billion in February.

Two years after President Bush declared mission accomplished in Iraq, there is still no end in sight. Instead of just signing another multi-billion dollar check to the Administration, isn't it time to develop a real plan to stabilize Iraq so we can bring American troops home and concentrate on our problems here at home?

Mr. Lewis of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Sensenbrenner) as I express my deep appreciation for his cooperation in this project.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the $17 million included in the Supplemental that we are considering today, which will support the expansion of the U.S. Tsunami Warning Network. These funds will help NOAA to procure and deploy tsunami detection buoys in a system designed to provide continuous tsunami warning capability for both the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of the United States. Detection is a critical part of a warning system which I hope will be included in a comprehensive approach to educating communities about, and preparing them for, tsunamis.

Compounding 70 percent of the Earth's surface area, our oceans support a growing source of protein for many developing countries, promising sources of medicines, and efficient transport of goods between continents and among nations. They also strongly influence our climate and weather and provide economic and measurable quality of life...
benefits. For proof of this, one only needs to know that the U.S. coasts support over 50 percent of the U.S. population and comprise only 17 percent of our land base.

When South Asia was struck by tsunami waves on December 26, the world’s interest in tsunami warning systems was heightened. The impact of these waves was felt around the world, and the tragedy of its immediate effect on Indian Ocean coastlines has painfully exposed our lack of ability to provide early warning and coastal community education. Many lifelong residents of Indian Ocean coastal towns fear the sea—the primary source of their livelihoods for generations. It is critical that individuals in high-risk areas are educated about and prepared for tsunamis before they strike. Coastal communities need assurance that technology exists and will be applied to increase warnings for such events and to prepare them for evacuation to avoid catastrophic loss of human life.

In contrast, developed nations use increasing technological sophistication to acquire from the sea its bounty—with little thought for the long-term effects of this activity. In time, without increased understanding of our ocean ecosystems and the impact of our harvest and extraction of its resources, developed nations may also come to fear the sea. The antidote to the disease of fear is understanding. New technologies have already led to enormous advances in our understanding of the coastal and marine environment. However, advanced sensors have been deployed only on relatively small scales, and the systems that are deployed have not been coordinated into an integrated system that will optimize our understanding of the oceans.

Since the U.S. hosted the Earth Observation Summit in July 2003, we have been working with our partner nations to adopt a comprehensive, coordinated and sustained Earth Observation System to collect and disseminate data, information and models for more effective and responsible use of our resources as well as to inform decision-makers about impending disasters. Most recently, the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy made an integrated Earth Observation System a top recommendation in its report, An Ocean Blueprint for the 21st Century.

Our space exploration and our weather programs show that when our scientists and the Nation support a program and devote time, money and, most importantly, the human mind into these types of endeavors we are highly successful. The ocean, however, is often referred to as the last frontier, a place where we continue to find new organisms and species. Many lifelong residents of Indian Ocean coastal towns fear the sea—the primary source of their livelihoods for generations. It is critical that individuals in high-risk areas are educated about and prepared for tsunamis before they strike. Coastal communities need assurance that technology exists and will be applied to increase warnings for such events and to prepare them for evacuation to avoid catastrophic loss of human life.

Unfortunately, the horrible tragedy in South Asia has meant the diversion of funds needed to address ongoing problems in the democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Ethiopia, and Uganda. This 100 million, along with additional funds for public health, will go a long way toward easing the pain and hunger expressed by many women and children throughout Africa.

While I have deep concerns about other provisions included in other sections of this supplemental, I am pleased to support the foreign aid, which will go to the operations section. I believe it goes a long way toward fulfilling our many commitments around the world.
However, I am concerned about some of the baggage that seems to have been added to the supplemental. And I think maybe in the future we should be careful about adding things that are not really important emergencies, such as in this supplemental conferring eligibility for rural housing assistance grants in the village of New Miami, Ohio; allowing some farm service accounts for the Alaska dairy farmers; increasing the cost of the Fort Peck Fish Hatchery Project in Minnesota; and adding to the National Center for Manufacturing Services in Michigan; along with $500,000 for the oral history of negotiated settlement projects at the University of Nevada.

I think these belong in some other bill. They may be great projects, but they certainly are not emergency projects. But I do urge all Members of the House to support this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conference report includes the REAL ID Act, which I co-sponsored. And of course the goal of this bill is straightforward. It seeks to prevent another terrorist attack on U.S. soil for which terrorist travel was a factor. These provisions were called for by the 9/11 Commission. And this legislation uses existing States driver’s license systems to ensure we know who is in our country, that people are who they say they are, and that the name on a driver’s license is the holder’s real name, not an alias.

All but one of the 9/11 hijackers used U.S. driver’s licenses to board the planes that day because these documents allowed them to circumvent their expired visas. It allowed them to not raise suspicion or concern.

Mr. Speaker, on March 30 the administration announced it would add more than 500 agents in Arizona, but those are not new agents. 135 of them or so will come from other southwest and southern border patrol locations, and the remainder are simply new trainees who will replace agents retiring or leaving the border patrol across the country.

So I would simply urge House Members to vote for this motion. It ought not be at all controversial. It is practical if you want to put your money where your press releases have been with respect to border security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this supplemental appropriations bill, not without very serious misgivings. I will vote for this legislation because it contains support for our troops in the field and important tsunami relief. With American soldiers in harm’s way, I am very reluctant to vote against funding of military operations. And, having personally seen the devastation caused by Tsunami in Indonesia, I feel that aid to the victims is critical.

Nevertheless, I am disgusted by the process by which this legislation came to the floor and by the immigration-related provisions in the bill. This is an appropriations bill. It is not the place to write new immigration law or to include seriously flawed driver’s license provisions. The Republicans are clamoring in the Senate about the lack of up or down votes on judges and, today, they denied the House not only an up or down vote on the so-called “REAL ID” Act, but even a real debate on this issue.

The immigration sections are seriously flawed. They impose onerous restrictions on foreign nationals in the U.S., not to mention upon American citizens, and slap a massive unfunded mandate upon the states. Shortly after this legislation takes effect, I can only imagine that, instead of more licensed drivers on the roads, there will be less. Instead of safer roads, we will have more reckless drivers operating completely outside of our laws.

America is a nation of immigrants and our strength is in our diversity. We are founded and were built by the unique strengths that they add to our national mosaic. We must not undermine the careful balance our nation has struck. I, therefore, strongly oppose these ID and immigration-related sections and pledge to fight hard in the future to remove the offensive provisions from the law.

in the end, as a legislator, I must vote on the bill in front of me, and in this instance I must vote for the vital funding contained in this bill. But, Mr. Speaker, please know that I will work hard in the days ahead to strike the dangerously flawed sections from the code.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the emergency supplemental because of the horrific and ill-advised immigration-related provisions and the lack of oversight that has been given to the provisions in this section. I hope we will have an opportunity to address this in a comprehensive manner.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today very conflicted over a piece of vital legislation for which this entire body should really be in solidarity. The Conference Report on H.R. 1268 provides for emergency FY2005 funds for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, tsunami relief efforts, foreign assistance programs and domestic homeland security priorities. However, this legislation also includes an insidious section with provisions of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act, which has nothing to do with what should be the real intent of this Emergency Supplemental. Instead of funding our troops and the lack of oversight that has been given to the provisions of the REAL ID Act.

The issues of importance addressed by this Emergency Supplemental do not give rise to a need to include provisions from H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act—legislation for which Congress
has not held a legislative hearing, markup, nor full debate in the House. Just last year, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle attempted to force these provisions in the context of the 9/11 Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, H.R. 10. The forced provisions would have gone far beyond the scope of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. The 9/11 Commission did not suggest that the standards should be federally mandated without state participation, that a database should be created to share personal identification information, that undocumented immigrants should be prevented from getting licenses or that non-citizens should get an identifiably different driver’s license.

Finally, none of the REAL ID Act sponsor’s provisions have been reviewed by the Congress or the Commission. There have been no hearings or debates on these significant changes to existing law. The immigration provisions that have been forced into this supplemental include numerous provisions restricting the grant of asylum protection, imposing onerous new driver license requirements on the States, making it easier to deport legal immigrants, waiving all Federal laws concerning the construction of fences and barriers anywhere within the United States, and denying immigrants long-standing habeas corpus rights.

The USA PATRIOT Act, for which we in the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security of the Judiciary are only now holding hearings in piecemeal form, already has been forced from receiving any protection in the United States. None of the people associated with recent attacks, or plans for terrorist attacks in the U.S., were here under grants of asylum. Instead, these changes will make it harder for people legitimately fleeing persecution to prove their asylum claims and gain protection here. Bona fide refugees who cannot meet the higher standards will be returned to countries where they were persecuted, possibly to face terror, torture and death.

The forced provisions will set a dangerous legal precedent by requiring the government to waive all federal, state and local laws to build barriers and fences to deter illegal entry into the United States. This waiver would require violating laws that protect sacred Native American burial sites, important environmental regions, and the wages of laborers. Yet this policy is unnecessary. In the 9–11 Act, we passed language to develop and implement a comprehensive plan for the systematic surveillance of the Southwest border by remotely piloted aircraft and other electronic means. We can preserve our legal rights and regimes and still secure our Nation.

The great majority of this Emergency Supplemental, a sum of $75.9 billion goes towards U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. In this Conference Report’s military spending total of $75.9 billion includes $37.1 billion for military operations and maintenance spending, $17.4 billion for personnel, and $17.4 billion for new weapons procurement. I am very pleased to say that this Conference Report increases the military death gratuity to $100,000, from $12,420, and increases the survivors’ benefits to $400,000, from $250,000, for families of soldiers who died or were killed while on active duty beginning from Oct. 7, 2001. I can not describe how fundamental it is that we take care of our armed forces and their loved ones. This Conference Report addresses some of the concerns that Democrats have had about the fact that the families of soldiers who were killed while on active duty were not being given the necessary assistance by the VA. In addition, this Conference Report provides $308 million more than requested for add-on vehicle armor kits; large increases for new trucks; added funds for night-vision equipment; and $60 million in unmatched funds for radio jammers to disrupt attempts by Iraqi insurgents to explode remote-control bombs and mines. As with the increase in death benefits, Democrats in this body have been advocating for increased funds to provide the necessary armor and equipment to protect our troops. While I am supportive of our troops and their families, I am disappointed that this war continues with no end in sight. How long will it be before our brave men and women of the Armed Forces can come home and embrace their families? This is the question Democrats have been asking for months and we still don’t have a real answer. Again, while I support funding our soldiers and their families to ensure that their safety and financial needs are met, I am deeply disappointed that we still do not have a proper exit strategy in Iraq.

As I stated before, provisions of this Emergency Supplemental in which this body can be united in agreement. One such issue is the tsunami relief provided in this Emergency Supplemental. The Conference Report before us today appropriates $907 million in direct assistance for disaster relief for countries affected by the Dec. 26, 2004, earthquake and tsunami. In addition, this measure also provides $226 million to reimburse the U.S. military for expenses incurred in providing emergency relief to the tsunami victims, and $25 million to build and deploy new tsunami-detection buoys in the Pacific, Atlantic, the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico to provide warning to communities of approaching tsunamis. I had the opportunity to see the damage caused by the tsunami when I visited Sri Lanka with my colleagues led by Mr. Obey and Mr. Lewis. I had the opportunity to visit with USAID personnel who were there trying to aid the Sri Lankan people. While I was there, the smiles they brought to the face of the Sri Lankan people would make every member of this Congress very proud. We talk about public diplomacy with the international world and I firmly believe that the funds appropriated here along with the work of our personnel on the ground help make a great case for our Nation. I am similarly pleased that about $400 million in this Conference Report will go towards humanitarian assistance in Darfur, Sudan. I recently had the opportunity to visit refugee camps in neighboring Chad where thousands of Sudanese in Darfur have fled to escape the conflict. Needless to say, I was able to confirm from eyewitness accounts that the conflict in Darfur is indeed even more shocking and deeply disturbing in its viciousness than has been reported to us. We as a nation must stand against such brutality and the funds that this supplemental will help to ease the suffering of those involved in this conflict. In addition, this Conference Report includes $920 million for all peacekeeping programs, many of which are in Sudan. However, while I have always been a strong advocate for peacekeeping operations, I am disappointed that the total money appropriated is $70 million less than the President’s request. We must continue to support such operations because the alternative can only be to the detriment of the international community, including our own Nation.

Again, I am in general support of the goals proposed by H.R. 1268, but I am troubled by the implications of the Supplemental Appropriations measure that this body is poised to pass that relates to legislation that underlies the 9/11 Commission recommendations that pertain to Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, in Afghanistan; Army and Marine Corps restructuring; recapitalization and replacement of equipment; and replenishment of cash balances in certain working capital funds. In truth, this Emergency Supplemental funds many needed priorities, but it is the one issue of the REAL ID Act, which is not a priority, that poisons this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. Pelosi), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey), our distinguished ranking members on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) and our distinguished ranking members on the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Defense. Over the years, they have worked very hard and provided great leadership for our men and women in uniform and for the security of our country.

There is much about this bill that I support. I have some concerns which I will express but none of that diminishes the regard and appreciation I have for the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey).

Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time since the President ordered the invasion of Iraq 2 years ago, Congress has been asked to provide funds for the war outside the regular budget. With nearly 140,000 troops in dire need of equipment and supplies, this legislation will be overwhelmingly approved and I will support it.

A willingness to provide our troops the support they need, however, should not be mistaken for support for the repeated failures in judgment that first put our troops in harm’s way and that keeps them there today.

Two years ago this week on May 1, 2003, President Bush stood on an aircraft carrier under a banner that proclaimed ‘‘Mission Accomplished.’’ Considering the events that followed and what has been disclosed since then, if the President were to stand under a
banner today it would have to read "Credibility Demolished.'

We are in the war's third year. Daily headlines are grim reminders of how far we are from a stable and secure Iraq, and the President has yet to provide us to that place. We are fast approaching sadly 1,600 U.S. military deaths and thousands of more have suffered grievous and lasting wounds.

I have had the privilege to pay my respects to troops in theater and in hospitals in Europe and in the United States. Whatever our disagreement about the policy which brought us into the war, whatever our disagreement on the lack of planning to end it, it never diminishes the regard that we have for our men and women in uniform. We respect them and we appreciate their sacrifice they are willing to make for our country. And on any opportunity that many of us have, we express that to them personally.

The President's rationale for the invasion was discredited long ago. Iraq remains unsafe. I talked about credibility in terms of the lack of planning. There is also a lack of credibility in budgetary appropriates for Iraq. As Iraq approaches $200 billion, the President's budget requests no money for the war on the grounds that the cost is unknowable. Instead, the President chooses to include a figure for the war's cost, zero, that everyone knows to be wrong.

Here we are today on Thursday talking about a supplemental with a set amount in it of emergency funding for our troops, and we passed the budget last Thursday. It was not one week ago we did not know what the cost would be and now we do this week.

This is simply not an honest way to do our budgeting.

Our troops need relief and their equipment needs repair and replacement. The risk assessment released by the Joint Chiefs of Staff this week shows the strain on our military is real and unsustainable. And it is clear that the figure in the supplemental is really not enough to meet the measure that the chairman mentioned.

Providing money alone as this bill will do is not enough. A way out must be provided as well. We must focus on quality rather than quantity when training, equipping, and housing our security forces. Accelerate Iraq's reconstruction in ways that give Iraqis a major stake in rebuilding their country, and step up regional diplomatic efforts to heal the strife on which the insurgency thrives.

I was pleased to be part of the bipartisan delegation that visited Iraq during Holy Week, and I can tell you that firsthand that we have a long way to go to reaching those goals.

Our experience in Iraq strongly suggests that if we do not take these steps and soon, about training the security forces, accelerating Iraq's reconstruction, and stepping up regional diplomacy or as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) would say, Iraqatize, internationalize and energize, if we do not do this and soon, Americans may wonder for years to come if the end will ever be in sight.

The funds provided for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, for the relief of those devastated by the tsunami, to aid those suffering in Darfur and elsewhere, and to promote Middle East peace are necessary and important.

We are focusing solely on these issues, their final product would have been much stronger. However, since this bill is must-pass legislation, House Republicans demanded the inclusion of controversial immigration provisions which makes it all the more inexplicable that the President did not request in his budget the extra border patrol agents and detention beds authorized by Congress last year in response to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

Bipartisan efforts in the Senate do more for border security in this bill and were rebuffed by House Republicans in favor of that trampling on the rights of individuals and States, and may result in the diminishment of the safety of the American people.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEN) for offering his motion to recommit to fund border security at the Senate levels. He also had this as a motion to instruct when the conference was named, to add $1 billion so that we could have the border security that was recommended by the 9/11 Commission. But that was rejected.

So we talk a great deal about securing the border, but we are not putting the resources there to do the job. Thank heavens Senator BYRD prevailed with part of the money in the Senate. We can do more. We should have done more. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEN) has been a champion on this issue year in and year out as far as this discussion has been going.

Again, border security, border security, border security, and then we can talk about a comprehensive immigration policy.

I hope that all of our colleagues will give an overwhelming support of this body to the Obey motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, for many reasons, this is not an easy bill to support. The legitimate emergency needs to which it responds, particularly the needs of our forces are on gas fumes, rather than real gasoline. It is very, very critical that we get this bill moving towards the President's desk and to the troops as quickly as possible.

I would like to speak for a moment about some of the things that the bill does that may be of great interest to the Members who are concerned especially about border security.

Within this package there are some 500 border patrol agents, added as a result of this measure as it goes to the President's desk. There are 210 immigration enforcement agents and criminal investigators. There are some 1,950 detention beds. The bill is designed to take every step that we possibly can on short order to secure our borders.

At the same time, just yesterday the Subcommittee on Homeland Security marked up their 2006 bill to move further down this same pathway. We are moving very quickly to strengthen and secure our borders by way of this legislation, as well as regular order this year.

From there, Mr. Speaker, let me express my deepest appreciation to Members on both sides of the aisle who have worked very hard, their staffs, as well as the Members themselves, to make sure that this supplemental would arrive. This is the duty. Virtually nobody thought we would be here at this moment. The reason we are is because the Members recognize
how critical it is that we get this sup-
port to our troops immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate
my colleagues’ patience as we work
quickly on this bill. It is a very good
bill. I urge my colleagues’ support.

Mr. DAVIS, Mr. Speaker, during times of war, the United States Congress has an
obligation to act. With this bill, we do just that.

I want to commend Chairman JERRY LEWIS
and the Appropriations Committee for their
hard work on this legislation. This is the first
appropriations bill that I believe has been
under the leadership of the gentleman from California. He and
our colleagues did a tremendous job of crafting this
war supplemental promptly and responsi-
ibly.

H.R. 1268 provides the funds needed to
pay, equip and protect our military during a
time of overseas conflict. It supports the war
on terrorism at home and abroad.

It also is important to note that tomorrow is
Military Spouses Appreciation Day, and this
bill provides for spouses and families who
might tragically lose a loved one at war. The
bill includes $176.3 million in additional funds, I believe, to support children of mar-
gen police and help farmers produce alter-
ning to enter into a Memorandum of Under-
standing to reporting small business prime
contracts and subcontracts at the Depart-
ment of Energy. This language does not
change the Small Business Act’s clear
distinction between prime contracts and
subcontracts, does not amend the statu-
atory small business contracting goal
requirements which are binding on the De-
partment of Energy, and does not obviate
Congressional and regulatory policies
against contract bundling. This language
does not repeal the President’s Executive
Order 13360 directing the Department of En-
ERGY to comply with its separate statutory
mandates for increasing contracting goals
for awards to small businesses owned by
service-disabled veterans. Any interpreta-
tion to the contrary would be unreasonable
and contrary to Congressional intent.

In subsection 6022(c), the replacement
language mandates a study of changes to man-
gagement prime contracts at the Department
of Energy to encourage small business prime
contracting opportunities. The object of the
study is to examine the feasibility of estab-
lishing a procurement agency relationship
between the management prime contractors
and the Department of Energy in accordance
with the requirements of Federal procure-
ment laws. Federal procurement regulations,
the “Federal Government contracting as recog-
nized by the Comptroller General, and applicable judicial precedent
such as U.S. West Communications, Inc. v.
United States, 941 F.2d 622 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Finally, in subsection 6022(d), the replace-
ment language imposes certain requirements
upon the Department of Energy concerning
break-outs of services from large prime
contracts for awards to small businesses. First,
the Secretary of Energy is required to con-
sider whether services performed have been
previously provided by a small business con-
cern. This requirement is for acquisition
planning purposes only, and shall not be con-
sidered as imposing a restriction of any kind
on the ability of the Department of Energy to
break out its large prime contracts for award to small businesses. Congress recog-
nizes that if it will work currently contracted
by the Department of Energy to its large
prime contractors has never been histori-
ically performed by small businesses. How-
ever, the new language is not superfluous. The
replacement language mandates a study of
the Small Business Act, the President’s Ex-
ecutive Order 13360, or the President’s initia-
tive against contract bundling to the Depart-
ment Energy. Section 6022 of the
Conference Report directs the Department
of Energy is required to—impose certain subcon-
tracting requirements as the text plainly
indicates, this provision applies solely to
small business prime contracts which were
formerly small business subcontracts for
services.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker,
when H.R. 1268 was first considered on the
floor in March, I reluctantly supported its pas-
sage. Now that the conference report has
been returned to the House for this chamber’s
approval, I still find myself torn because I do not see how additional funding for the Iraq
War effort will ultimately produce a positive
outcome for the United States or for the peo-
ple in Iraq. I want a successful exit strategy—
not a permanent occupation in Iraq.

Despite my misgivings for the direction of
our Iraq policy, or lack thereof, I do not believe
our troops, who are fighting so bravely, should
be penalized for the mistakes in judgment of
Smiley, former White House and the Pentagon. As we speak, our
ground forces scrounge for scrap metal
to make the unarmored vehicles more safe
against insurgent attack. The funds provided
in this bill will enable our soldiers and Marines
around to uparmor their vehicles. There
should be more outrage from the American
public that they were deployed without ade-
quate equipment from the beginning. But they
are there. It is vital that our troops receive
the equipment they need to defend themselves against attack.

I have been critical of our war planning from
the outset. I voted against the authority that al-
lowed the President to take action in Iraq. I
continue to be frustrated that our war plan still
contains no game plan on when we can begin to
bring our troops home. I am pleased that
the bill does contain provisions that require
the administration to develop a set of performance
indicators and measures for determining the
stability and security in Iraq and report its find-
ings to Congress. This requirement falls well
short of the exit strategy that I believe must
determine how long our commitment in Iraq will last.

The bill also funds tsunami relief, which is
well overdue. The agreement appropriates
$656 million in direct assistance to tsunami
disaster relief for countries affected by last De-
ember’s tragedy. The total includes $5 million
to support environmental recovery activities;
$10 million to create new economic opportuni-
ties for women; and $12.5 million to support
initiatives that focus on the immediate and
long-term needs of children.

This provides $700 million for humani-
tarian assistance in the Darfur region of Sudan
and elsewhere in Africa, including funds for
the temporary resettlement of refugees. It also
funds $240 million for international humani-
tarian food assistance through the Food for
Peace Program, much of which will go to the
Darfur region. This provides $340 million for
some relief to those who are being victimized
by the ethnic cleansing that is being waged
against the black Muslim population by the
Arab Muslim-dominated Sudanese govern-
mnt. In a period when the President and this
Congress proposes reductions in programs
that support the development of local commu-
nities and neighborhoods, the bill provides
$592 million for a gold-plated embassy compound in Iraq. I find it very difficult to defend such spending when the budget priorities of this administration propose disinvesting in our cities, towns and our American workforce. Money for this project goes beyond providing office and working space for U.S. foreign service personnel. The proposals to build a permanent occupation in Iraq is not an embassy, but a compound, with stores and other amenities which will further distance our American embassy personnel from the Iraqi civilian and political population. We are constructing a fortress, not an embassy, that is not a successful exit strategy—not a permanent occupation in Iraq.

Another key element of this agreement with which I take issue is the mandate imposed on states that requires certain identification standards on driver's licenses for federal identification purposes. The measure mandates that states meet certain requirements for determining the validity of persons applying for drivers' licenses. Although the bill provides authority for states to receive federal grants to comply, it is insufficient and amounts to an unfunded federal mandate.

The money contained in this bill will go a long way to saving lives, saving the lives of our land forces in Iraq and Afghanistan and reconstructing the lives of those who experienced the devastation of last year's tsunami. After weighing the alternatives, I reluctantly support the passage of this bill. I am not happy with the choices we are making today. I feel backed into a corner without much wiggle room, but the lives of our troops matter to me and they deserve the protection this bill is designed to provide them.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1268, the War Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005, which will provide funding for military operations and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as important funds for tsunami relief and recovery.

I say "reluctant support" because the Republican leadership has made a very poor and political decision to include controversial legislative provisions in this emergency spending bill that looks almost universal support because it provides needed assistance for our servicemen and women overseas. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that our servicemen and women deserve to have the equipment and support they need to keep them safe as they fulfill their missions abroad. Towards that end, the Appropriations Committee increased funding by 69 percent above the President's request for add-on vehicle armor kits, new trucks, and radio jammers to disrupt attempts by Iraqi insurgents to explode remote controlled bombs and mines. The bill also included several important provisions to increase the military death gravity and to provide subsidized life insurance benefits for families of soldiers who die or are killed on active duty. No amount can compensate for the tragic death of a loved one, but an increase in these benefits helps a family cope with the financial impact of a combat death.

I am also pleased that additional funds have been provided for humanitarian relief and disaster assistance, including $400 million for Sudan, $907 million for Indian Ocean tsunami relief, in P.L. 480 grants for emergency food assistance.

But I am extremely upset and disappointed that the Republican leadership is using this critical bill as a vehicle to pass unrelated and controversial policies, that will allow the Department of Homeland Security to preempt state and federal laws to build border fences, require uniform national standards for issuing driver's licenses, and change the asylum standards for immigrants seeking to flee to the United States. In particular, the bill includes an assault against the matricula consular cards issued by Mexican and other Latin American consulates, and consequently makes it an assault on our immigrant families who rely upon this form of identification for transactions involving banking, housing, education and even proving, when necessary, that they are the parents of their own children. These provisions were not openly debated or negotiated with the minority, but once again decided behind closed doors by the Republican leadership. I am outraged that this Republican leadership essentially has chosen to pit support for our troops against support for hard-working immigrants, many of whom have their own sons and daughters fighting to protect our country abroad.

Why does the Republican leadership continue to abuse its power and shut out the American public? Because the Republican leadership knows that if these controversial provisions were openly debated in the House and Senate they would not pass. Only by tacking these provisions to a must-pass bill like the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for our troops in Iraq could they hope to be successful.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more example of abuse of power by the Republican leadership that continues to act irresponsibly on issues of importance to our American society.

Nevertheless, in spite of my concerns, given the choice before us, I believe it is my responsibility to provide our servicemen and women the resources necessary for them to fulfill their mission and come home safely. Protecting our troops, who are sacrificing so much on our behalf, and providing for their families, will always be one of my highest priorities, and that is why, once again, I will support this necessary supplemental conference report today. Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MALONEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CROWLEY and myself, which was agreed to by the Chairman of Appropriations.

The amendment took $3 million from the "Economic Support Fund" and put it toward the "Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund," for the express purpose of the providing the United Nations Population Fund, UNFPA, with these funds. In early January, UNFPA asked for $28 million to support its tsunami-related work. Our amendment would have given them $3 million, which is about 11 percent of what they requested. By late February, over 70 percent of the requested funding had been received or pledged. Germany gave $8 million. Japan gave $5.5 million. The Netherlands gave $1.5 million. Norway gave $1 million. New Zealand gave $700,000.

The United States has not given anything to this organization that is the most experienced and successful in addressing the distinctive needs of women during times of natural disaster. But this is not unusual. We have not given the UNFPA the money they need for some time.

The Omnibus for 2005 earmarked $34 million for UNFPA, however, the UNFPA has not and will not receive it. The UNFPA also received no funds from the United States in 2002, 2003, and 2004. Unhappy with the omission of an amendment sponsored by Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CROWLEY and myself, which was agreed to by the Chairman of Appropriations.
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and Iraq. This bill also has important additional funding for border security, and language important to South Texas shrimpers that will make it easier for them to hire workers for the coming season.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I am grateful that the conferees included desperately needed funding for border security. I have been relentless in talking to so many of you about my concerns related to spending on border security matters. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, for his work in negotiating tics to include this spending. While this is a good start, it still comes up short of both what we need and what the Intelligence Reform bill mandated we do.

The Intelligence Reform bill passed by Congress last year mandated $2.0 billion to refresh the supply of border patrol agents a year for the next 5 years. The President came to the table with only 210 in his budget; today we are adding another 500. That's still over 1,000 short of what this government agrees is the very least we should do to protect this nation. We do not agree with some of the so-called security provisions in this bill, mainly the stricter asylum laws and national standards for drivers' licenses. A country like ours that believes so greatly in freedom and the protection of the oppressed should not be persecuting those that are being persecuted by their governments because of their race, religion or political beliefs, which is why we are fighting the war we fund in this bill.

Unfortunately, the Leadership decided to include many controversial provisions that members wouldn't otherwise support if they weren't linked to the funding for our troops. I do not agree with some of the so-called security provisions in this bill, mainly the stricter asylum laws and national standards for drivers' licenses. A country like ours that believes so greatly in freedom and the protection of the oppressed should not be persecuting those that are being persecuted by their governments because of their race, religion or political beliefs, which is why we are fighting the war we fund in this bill.

I am also disappointed Congress has gone one step further in creating a national ID. Many would suggest that a drivers' license is the way terrorists are infiltrating our country. That is simply not the case. Standardizing a drivers' license would not have precluded the 9/11 terrorists from entering this country—immigration reform and better border security practices would have worked.

Today's bill is a start in putting our money where our mouth is, but it is still insufficient to the monumental border security task before us and I ask our appropriators to ensure the necessary funds are provided in the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill.

Mr. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Democrat of the Committee on House Administration, I wish to comment briefly on key provisions of this supplemental appropriations bill that touch upon my committee's jurisdiction.

I commend the conferees for including $2.6 million for taking “technological countermeasures” to assure the electronic integrity of the Visitor Center now under construction here at the Capitol. What is the construction project, this matter is time-sensitive, and while we have no reason to believe anyone involved with the construction may be seeking to install surreptitious listening devices within the building’s walls and fittings, we know there are people in this world who might like to do so. It is prudent to take reasonable steps against it, and thus eliminate any chance of repeating what happened during construction of the U.S. embassy in Moscow some years ago.

I also commend the conferees for including $8.4 million to purchase “supply of quick masks” designed to reduce the complexity of protecting persons against chemical or biological attack. The current masks have a limited shelf-life, and making these funds available now will expedite the process of replacement as they approach their expiration dates.

There is no question that the Congress needs a new off-site delivery center, to facilitate the secure, timely delivery of packages to the Capitol and congressional office buildings. I am pleased the conferees included funds for a temporary facility to replace the substandard site now used, and funds for design of a permanent facility. I trust that given the importance of deliveries to the Capitol, any difficulty between the two nature of the delivery system can be resolved quickly.

Finally, I wish to comment on something the conferees did not include in this bill, namely, any funding for up to 132 additional Capitol Police officers during fiscal 2005. These 132 officers, when added together with 122 more requested as part of the Police's fiscal 2006 request, would increase the sworn ranks by another 254 officers, an increase of roughly 16% within two years. Obviously, with less than five months remaining in fiscal 2005, the process. I am strongly opposed to this request. Our Capitol Police officers are working hard and doing an excellent job. They need the support of this Congress to do their job safely and effectively.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations (HR 1268), on substance and process. I am strongly opposed to the funding for up to 132 additional Capitol Police officers during fiscal 2005. These 132 officers, when added together with 122 more requested as part of the Police’s fiscal 2006 request, would increase the sworn ranks by another 254 officers, an increase of roughly 16% within two years. Obviously, with less than five months remaining in fiscal 2005, the process. I am strongly opposed to this request. Our Capitol Police officers are working hard and doing an excellent job. They need the support of this Congress to do their job safely and effectively.
the opportunity when the leadership attaches non-germane immigration measures to a funding bill.

To better demonstrate how the process has been hijacked by a minority of the majority, many of the same provisions that constitute the REAL ID Act were also included in the supplemental being considered today were stripped from the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (PL 108–458) in conference because of their extreme nature.

One of the most egregious provisions in the REAL ID Act, the supplemental is the blanket authority given to the Secretary of Homeland Security to expedite construction of the remaining three miles of the southern border fence in San Diego. All Americans should be concerned that the DHS Secretary has carte blanche authority to waive any and all laws in the name of border security. This provision is a dangerous attack against the civil rights of all Americans, when any law can be waived under the guise of border security. Blanket authority to complete the three mile border fence is especially “in your face” politics when, under current law, the DHS Secretary already has a national security waiver for the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act. We must work harder to strike a balance between our national security and environmental protection, not simply ignore environmental laws.

Furthermore, the driver’s license provisions of this bill touted in the name of national security are equally concerning. It is indeed ironic that these provisions would not have stopped the 9/11 hijackers from obtaining driver’s licenses. The breach of our border security was a result of the hijackers having been issued legal visas to enter the US, which many of them used to apply for driver’s licenses and identification cards. Even if the REAL ID provisions had been in place before the 9/11 attacks, the hijackers still would have been able to obtain a driver’s license or state-issued ID.

Again, a minority of the majority is playing on the fears of this nation to enact a flawed policy that does not actually address the problem it purports to fix.

For our second, I do not support illegal immigration, but I do support a regulated policy for immigrants who enter the US legally, pay their taxes and play by the rules to earn US citizenship. No one can deny that comprehensive immigration reform is a topic on the minds of our constituents—but such a critical policy debate should be conducted on its own merits.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the War Supplemental Appropriations Act but must voice my incredible misgivings for what the Republican majority has attached to legislation that should solely be about how we provide for our brave men and women in harm’s way in Iraq and Afghanistan.

There is much in this bill to be proud of. Our military, despite the job of the civilian brass and this Congress, have been performing heroically. They have accomplished much more than we could have ever hoped for, and if any fault needs to be assigned it is to the policy makers, and not to those in uniform.

However, I am ashamed that this body has taken something as important as securing our troops, and attached to the bill in the most hastily considered immigration provision that will result in massive unfunded mandates being passed on to our states. I am ashamed that the conference committee removed language that would have created a Truman-style Commission to examine war profiteering, largely to ensure that this administration would not be embarrassed. Finally, I am ashamed that this Congress has turned its back on a promise made by our President to the Palestinian Authority to help improve the lives of the 4.5 million displaced people and further the cause of peace for all in the Middle East.

I am concerned that the immigration provisions will force our great nation to turn our back on the thousands of political and human rights activists who look toward America as their last and best hope. The Real ID Act will force the most vulnerable to have their torturers corroborate their tales of persecution.

I understand that we must protect our borders, and I understand that changes must be made to keep out those that seek to do us harm. But we should not hastily foreclose the dream and promise of America because of fear. We should not send back asylum seekers back to their torturers. Under these standards, Iraqis seeking to escape the rape rooms of Saddam Hussein would have been sent back to the Ba’athist prisons if they fled Iraq without the proper documentation.

I am also dismayed that rather than seeking to be responsible stewards of the public’s trust, the Republican majority in charge of the conference once again decided to ignore its oversight responsibilities. It seems that rather than doing our oversight job as a separate and equal branch of government, the GOP leadership would rather save the Bush Administration and corporate CEOs some embarrassment.

I am old enough to remember the Truman Commission. I remember that Sen. Truman went against a Democratic administration, and saved our military and our tax payers billions of dollars in waste and fraud. I cannot understand why we do not do the same.

My friends on the other side of the aisle should be ashamed of the fact that Mr. Waxman and I have probably done more on this front from the minority, than has anyone with a gavel. Reconstructing Iraq and Afghanistan is the reason America fought, but confronted yet again with evidence of massive fraud and egregious war profiteering, my Republican colleagues are again choosing to bury their heads in the sand, plug their ears, and turn out the lights on our duty.

Finally, this bill, by intention or not, has the potential of undoing all the progress that the Middle East Peace process has made since the death of Yasser Arafat. Mr. Speaker, the new president of the Palestinian Authority is in an almost untenable position. In order for Palestinian democracy to succeed over radical terrorism, President Abbas must be provided with the resources to open hospitals, create jobs, arm a police force, build jails, and take the fight to the terrorists.

President Bush recognized this. He made a statement asking for $200 million to support a nascent Middle Eastern democracy. Instead of allowing President Abbas to use American aid to build his security forces to take on terror, we instead set him up for failure. My friends, if you want to see Hamas win the upcoming municipal elections; if you want to see the peace process come to an halt; if you want to see more dead young Israelis and young Palestinians you should support this language.

It surprises me that the only thing that this Congress is capable of bucking and embarrassing this Administration on is the prospect of peace. I hope, for the sake of peace, we can correct this colossal error in judgment and that the President and the State Department speak out against Congress’ ill-advised policy making.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 2004, the national debt of the United States exceeded $7 trillion for the first time in our country’s history. One year later, our national debt is $7.7 trillion. In the past year, our country has added $700 billion to our national debt.

The conference report for the FY06 budget resolution that is before us today would increase the statutory debt limit by $781 billion to a record $9 trillion. Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. The out-of-control rise in our national debt over the last year and the rise in our debt envisioned in this conference report are further signs of the terrible fiscal position in which we now find ourselves.

In 2001, we had ten-year projected surpluses of $458 billion (2002–2011). Now, over that same time period, we have likely ten-year deficits of $3.9 trillion. That’s a $9.5 trillion reversion in our ten-year fiscal outlook.

Whether intentional or otherwise, our country’s current fiscal policies are depriving the government of the revenue at a time when we ought to be preparing for an unprecedented demographic shift that will strain Social Security and Medicare. Our current fiscal irresponsibility will eventually land squarely on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren, who will be the ones who will be carrying the debt we are accumulating today. The “debt tax” that we are imposing on our children and grandchildren cannot be repealed. It can only be reduced if we take responsible steps now to improve our situation.

Both parties need to work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring our budget back into balance so we can avoid the higher long-term interest rates and weakened dollar that are the inevitable consequences of rising deficits and a high national debt. We are witnessing on a daily basis the reaction of the global financial markets to our fiscal irresponsibility, and as we can see in this conference report, Congress has not yet gotten the message that deficits and debt matter.

For starters, Congress needs to reinstate PAYGO rules for the entire budget, including spending and revenue measures. Budget enforcement rules that apply to only certain parts of the budget will not have a significant impact on our rising deficits, as Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan mentioned in his recent testimony before the Budget Committee.

This fiscal year alone, interest on the national debt is expected to rise to $178 billion, and the administration projects that that figure will increase to $211 billion during the next fiscal year. To put that figure in perspective, projected interest on our national debt will be $75 billion more than projected spending on education, public health, health research, and veterans’ benefits combined [$138 billion].

Furthermore, the budget conference report before us today, which was filed only three hours before the House began to consider it, would require the House to cut Medicaid funding by as much as $15 billion over the next five years.
Just two days ago the House voted, by a vote of 348–72, to reject harmful cuts to the Medicaid program, and this conference report blatantly ignores the will of the House.

In addition to assuming an ever-larger share of our annual budgets, the interest on our debt, and the debt itself, and increasing our reliance with every dollar we spend, which will change our position in the world and increase the risk that another nation will be able to assert greater leverage over America. Over the last year, our country has borrowed nearly $400 billion [$389 billion] from foreign countries, and almost half [44%] of our publicly-held debt is held by foreign creditors [$1.96 trillion, out of $4.4 trillion of publicly held debt].

Finally, our deficits and debt threaten the Social Security and Medicare programs that have raised so many of our seniors out of poverty and helped sustain the strongest middle class in history. With a projected 75 year unfunded liability of $3.7 trillion, both parties in Congress need to work together to address Social Security’s solvency problem, and this conference report does nothing to protect Social Security and Medicare. They can laud its new democracy as one of the key foundations necessary to sustain it—America’s economy—continues to flounder. The Bush Administration can do all these things, but the end of this war will not come any day sooner.

What America needs most is honest leadership and a clear strategy for Iraq. That’s not reflected in this bill. It’s just more money thrown at a crisis we cannot solve through force of will alone.

That is our problem here today. Congress won’t force our President and his advisors to live up to their failure. We’ll vote to give them another billion dollars instead of addressing the fundamental illusion of our Iraq policy: we can win the peace alone. That’s a costly falsehood.

I urge my colleagues to take responsibility for the lives of our soldiers, Iraq’s future, and the future security of the United States and the world. Vote down this bill. It is time to bring our troops home.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation bill contains much crucial funding, most importantly money to provide additional security for our forces in Iraq and electronic jammers to protect them from roadside bombs. While I strongly support this funding, I am disappointed that I must vote “no” on this bill.

We have a responsibility to the men and women who we send into harm’s way as members of the United States Armed Forces. It is because of my desire to support our troops that I continue to insist that the administration develop a plan to win the peace in Iraq and, to the best of our capability, protect the troops and the American mission. I believe that Congress must hold the administration to the highest standards when the lives of our service personnel are at risk. A “no” vote is one of the few ways I have to protest the continued abdication of this responsibility by the highest levels of the Bush Administration.

One positive part of this legislation is an amendment that I offered during House consideration with Mr. MARKEY to prohibit funds for torture and for sending detainees to countries that practice torture, which was carried into this conference report. The use of torture and rendition is morally reprehensible, puts Americans at risk, is a poor way to obtain reliable information in our fight against terrorism, and sets back the cause of democracy. This is the very least that we can do as Congress continues to abdicate its responsibility to investigate this horrific aspect of administration policy.

Perhaps most disappointing, this legislation also continues to be ridden with all the flaws of H.R. 418, the “REAL ID Act,” which, among other things, placed the entire 7,514 mile border completely outside all legal protections. This is perhaps the single most damaging precedent since I’ve been in Congress. Do we really want to be giving this responsibility to the Department of Homeland Security, which has not been a paragon of efficiency and sensitivity during its three years of existence? Some of the environmental laws waived by this provision include: the Noise Control Act, the Clean Water Act, the Farmland Protection Policy Act, and the Bald Eagle Act. This is not only bad public policy, it is unnecessary, as most of these laws have security exemptions already written into them. However, in addition to environmental laws, this provision would waive labor laws, safety standards, the National Aeronautics Act, and the Native American Graves Protection Act. If this provision were to become law, the Department of Homeland Security could build a road that has no safety standards, using 12-year-old laborers, through the site of American burial ground, killing hundreds of bald eagles during construction, and polluting the drinking water of a nearby community. The proponents of this provision have given us no compelling reasons for why this broad exemption is necessary.

Mr. Speaker. I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief. This essential legislation will support and defend America’s values both at home and abroad.

Our troops serving in Iraq will have the necessary tools to continue their rebuilding efforts in Iraq and to continue the War on Terror. At home, the REAL ID provisions will strengthen our Nation’s driver’s license laws, providing each citizen with another layer of security. Right now, terrorists could easily exploit weak driver licensing laws and obtain fake documents. With a license in hand, terrorists were better able to blend in, avoid detection, and harm our nation’s citizens. This is exactly what several of the 9/11 terrorists did, using false documents to board airplanes and murder thousands of innocent Americans on September 11, 2001.

We in Congress have been working on ways to prevent our Nation from experiencing another terrorist attack by establishing stronger and more secure programs. Stronger driver’s license standards made possible by the REAL ID provisions will be another step towards American security.

The REAL ID provisions will close dangerous gaps that require licenses in law and that allow terrorists to abuse our asylum and driver’s license systems. The new law will protect innocent Americans by setting up national driver’s license standards, networking State motor vehicle data bases, and linking visa and license expirations.

In 2003, the former Attorney General of Virginia, Jerry Kilgore, and I worked together on the Driver’s License Integrity Act. That legislation required non-immigrant aliens to show
their visas when applying for State identification and tied the expiration date of the identification to that of the visa.

Due to Mr. Kilgore’s leadership on this issue, the Commonwealth of Virginia was one of the first States to clamp down on terrorists’ abuse of the trust that a driver’s license conveys. To date, we have seen Virginia’s Driver’s License Integrity Act provisions in this piece of legislation before us in the House of Representatives.

Since the beginning of the War on Terror, Congress has fought to ensure that our Nation never again suffers at the hands of terrorists. The provisions in this bill provide us with more weapons in our arsenal against terrorism.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1268, to authorize emergency supplemental appropriations for our military. The vast majority of this $82 billion bill will go directly to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Congress has a responsibility to work with the President and the national security team in the best interests of our Nation. When our soldiers are sent in to war, it is the Congress’ responsibility to make sure that all resources necessary are provided to carry out their missions.

I stand behind our brave men and women who have performed admirably in Iraq and Afghanistan. I oppose these sacrifices on behalf of their country and have served longer deployments than expected.

This bill provides important new benefits for our troops and their families. The legislation: increases the military death gratuity; increases subsistence and reemplacement benefits; creates a new insurance benefit for soldiers who have suffered traumatic injuries, such as the loss of a limb; extends the Basic Allowance for Housing for dependents of soldiers who die while on active duty; and provides additional funding for add-on vehicle armor kits, night-vision equipment, and radio jammers that disrupt remote-control bombs and mines.

The conference report also contains important measures to strengthen our domestic border security, by providing funds for new border patrol agents, immigration and customs investigators, enrollment agents, and detention officers. The bill also provides additional foreign assistance for: tsunami reconstruction; humanitarian and peacekeeping programs in Darfur; democracy assistance in Belarus; and political and economic reforms in Ukraine to strengthen their new democracy and legal system.

I regret that the Administration has consistently failed to properly budget for our ongoing military and reconstruction operations in Iraq. Congress should not repeatedly rely on emergency supplemental bills to provide the critical funding, resources, and equipment for our troops in battle by using emergency supplemental appropriations bills.

The United States is only belatedly seeking international support for our reconstruction efforts in Iraq, and we have failed to broadly engage the international community, to establish order and security in Iraq, and to help the interim Iraqi government assume more responsibility for its own affairs as they establish a democratic state.

I am also disappointed that the Republican leadership decided to insert extraneous provisions into this legislation, which go beyond the scope of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. I voted against the “REAL ID Act” when it was considered by this House as a separate bill earlier this year. I am particularly concerned that this legislation repeals a number of provisions of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which enacted the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. The 9/11 bill established a negotiated rulemaking process for establishing the identity requirements for federal, state, and local government agencies and operations; these identity requirements are critical input from governors, State legislators, State officials, and other stakeholders— which would provide the opportunity to develop effective national standards for driver’s licenses. I am concerned that this legislation does not give the States the opportunity to implement the 9/11 bill, and that this legislation may also create serious unfunded mandates and administrative burdens for the States.

As the ranking member of the Helsinki Commission (Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe), which promotes human rights and rule of law in Europe, I am also concerned about many of the asylum law changes contained in the REAL ID Act, which again go beyond the scope of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. These provisions may have a harmful effect on true asylum seekers, trafficking victims, women and children who are victims of domestic violence, and others seeking protection against persecution. This legislation may create higher burdens for legitimate asylum seekers, restrict judicial discretion to grant asylum, and take away some of the tools and appeal for certain refugees and asylum seekers.

Over the past week I have heard from a number of groups in Maryland that provide legal and social services to immigrants, asylum seekers, refugees, and survivors of torture and slavery. These groups have reported to me that it is already extremely difficult for legitimate asylum seekers to prevail in their case, as they have often left their home country on short notice, and do not have documentation of their persecution. It can take months or years for a case to work its way through our legal system. During this period, the asylum seeker often has neither legal representation nor work documentation.

I hope that in the near future Congress will have the opportunity, in a more thoughtful manner, to consider comprehensive immigration reform measures.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report to H.R. 1268, legislation providing $81.3 billion in emergency wartime supplemental appropriations to fund operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The conference report’s immigration-related provisions are neither wise, nor consistent with our national values. I am equally disturbed that Congress declines to institute greater accountability for the Bush Administration’s use of wartime appropriations. Accordingly, I cannot in good conscience support this conference report.

On March 16, 2005, I joined the vast majority of my colleagues in voting for H.R. 1268. The legislation included many laudable provisions, including funding for tsunami relief, humanitarian assistance in Darfur, and needed equipment for our Nation’s soldiers. On the other hand, I was deeply troubled by the bill’s inclusion of the REAL ID Act, which called for egregious, new restrictions on immigrants and put us on the path to creating a national identification card. I had hoped that the Senate would prevail and remove these indefensible provisions proposed in the legislation.

I am particularly concerned with provisions in the bill that affect asylum seekers. This conference report would require that asylum seekers establish first that they would be subject to persecution if returned to their home country, something that U.S. immigration agencies is prohibited from doing. Membership in a social group, or political opinion is at least one “central reason” for that persecution.

These changes will make it more difficult for asylum to people who cannot prove the central motive of their persecutor, who cannot produce corroborating evidence of their account, or whose demeanor is inconsistent with an immigration judge’s preconceived expectations. This measure could place insurmountable legal obligations on already vulnerable asylum seekers by requiring unrealistic and unfair burdens of proof. U.S. law already has safeguards to prevent immigration by known terrorists and criminals.

Another section of the conference agreement establishes minimum requirements for States issuing driver’s licenses and identification cards, including acceptable documentation for issuance of identification cards. As a result, States will have the burden of determining the authenticity of a wide array of documents. Placing these types of requirements on State motor vehicle authorities is prohibitively costly and ultimately unworkable. Federal authorities will not recognize State identification cards that fail to meet these requirements.

With respect to the current military operation, I cannot also dismiss the fact that Congress remains unwilling to hold the Bush Administration accountable for its many missteps in Iraq, and I am troubled that the President may interpret this emergency supplemental as another blank check. The Bush Administration cannot account for billions of Federal dollars targeted for Iraq, and allegations of inappropriate no-bid contracts to “well-connected” multi-national corporations have never been thoroughly investigated. Efforts on the House floor by Representatives JOHN TIERNEY and JIM LEACH to establish a bipartisan commission to investigate allegations of war profiteering were rejected by the Republican leadership, and no substantive accountability measures were included in the conference report.

I understand well the responsibility the Congress has to fully support our Nation’s troops, and as former Peace Corps volunteer, I appreciate the value of humanitarian aid to regions ravaged by natural disasters and human conflict. I would proudly support a bill that meets these important priorities, but I cannot vote for a conference report that incorporates unnecessary and unjust provisions designed to hurt immigrants.
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This conference report is an abuse of the legislative process and a threat to the fabric of this Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1268 making supplemental appropriations to ensure that our forces who are hard at work in Iraq and Afghanistan have the tools they need to do their job, and are well protected.

Mr. Speaker, this week we witnessed the establishment of Iraq’s first democratically elected government in over half a century and their swearing in. This event is yet another historic step in Iraq’s progress toward a representative and transparent government.

But even as we see important movement toward democracy, we are reminded that “freedom is not free.” As those of us who have seen war know, it is paid first by the sacrifices of those who serve.

Their courage is our inspiration. We wish them Godspeed, swift victory and safe return.

However, while it pales in comparison to the sacrifices of our brave men and women in the field, there is another part of the equation. And it is before us today.

With this legislation, Congress is acting decisively to ensure that our soldiers, sailors and airmen have the resources they need to keep Iraq on the road back to the community of civilized nations.

This bill contains over $76 billion to support military activities. This sum will: pay for the troop deployment; repair and replace damaged vehicles being chewed up in an extreme harshly operating environment; replenish stores of munitions and supplies; and provide additional armor for vehicles, improved communications gear and more night-vision equipment.

I would also add that this bill also provides over $60 million for additional electronic devices designed to protect our forces from the “weapon of choice” of the insurgents—IEDs.

Mr. Speaker, this “wartime supplemental” appropriations bill meets our military, humanitarian and foreign policy requirements.

We have every reason to be proud of young men and women at war. Every single word of praise uttered on this floor today is justified.

But while our young men and women in uniform appreciate our vocal support, they need this bill. It will provide them with the tools they need to get their job done as quickly as possible so they can return home to their families.

I commend Mr. Lewis, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee—the gentleman from California—for his leadership.

And I urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment briefly on the $82 billion spending bill that will be approved today for the ongoing U.S. military campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I will support this bill. I am pleased it includes additional money for body armor and armored vehicles for our troops. It includes money to purchase bomb-jamming devices to protect our troops from roadside bombs. I also support the improved life insurance death benefits for military personnel and their families.

And, I am hopeful that the additional funds that are in the bill to train and equip security forces in Iraq all Afghanistan will be expeditious. This money is needed. Afghan and Iraqi forces are to take over security duties from American troops, which will allow our men and women to finally come home. I have called for negotiating a timeline for the withdrawal of American troops with the new Iraqi government, hopefully to be completed within the year. But, for that to become a reality, well-equipped and competent security forces in Iraq and Afghanistan must be prepared to take our place. This bill will help achieve this goal.

I am also pleased that the final bill retained language inserted in the Senate directing the President to include future requests to fund the U.S. presence in Iraq in his regular budget. We have been in Iraq for more than two years and are in Afghanistan for more than three years. The fact that we still have troops in Iraq should not come as a surprise to the budget writers at the White House and the Pentagon. It is not appropriate to continue funding these long-term, ongoing operations via supplemental appropriations bills, which are considered outside of the normal budget procedures and restrictions.

While I support the bill, I am outraged that, more than two years after the U.S. invaded Iraq, the Pentagon leadership has not gotten its act together to adequately protect our troops and to come up with a plan to get them home.

As columnist Mark Shields pointed out late last year, in the three years immediately after Pearl Harbor, the United States produced the following to win World War II: 296,429 aircraft; 102,335 tanks; 87,620 warships, and 2,455,694 trucks. At the time, the U.S. population was 132 million and the size of our economy was less than $100 billion. Yet, approaching three years into the U.S. occupation of Iraq, with a population of almost 300 million and defense spending of $500 billion a year, under the failed leadership of the Pentagon, only 6,000 of the nearly 20,000 Humvees in Iraq are factory armored versions and more than 8,000 of the 9,128 medium and heavy trucks used in Iraq are without armor.

Despite repeated promises from the Pentagon leadership that the situation is getting better, a recent article in The New York Times showed that the emperor has no clothes. As the article details, one Marine Company has returned home to expose the reality of their tour in Iraq, “one they say was punctuated not only by a lack of armor, but also by a shortage of men and planning that further hampered their efforts in battle, destroyed morale and ruined the careers of some of their most competent warriors.”

I have heard similar stories from the Oregon National Guard members I have talked to.

How did this happen?

Since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks against the United States, Congress has provided the Pentagon with $1.6 trillion—$167 billion in supplemental appropriations bills for fiscal years 2001–2005; and $1.45 trillion in regular defense appropriations for fiscal years 2002–2005. Today’s bill will add $75 billion or so to the Pentagon budget. Given all this funding, it is hard to understand why our troops continue to suffer shortages of critical equipment.

It is hard to understand until you remember that Secretary Rumsfeld and the other civilian leaders at the Pentagon argued that one troop could be greeted in Iraq with flowers and candy, not the bullets and bombs that have led to more than 1,500 of our soldiers getting killed. Before, the invasion, the Pentagon planned to reduce our troop levels to 20,000–30,000 within a few weeks of overthrowing Saddam Hussein. The fact that 150,000 U.S. troops remain in Iraq more than a year and a half after the war began shows how badly the Pentagon leadership miscalculated the post-war situation.

For example, the report will bring the total cost of operations in Iraq to well over $200 billion—and by now, two years after President Bush prematurely announced the end of major military activities in Iraq, I think even those who have been un-critical supporters of the Administration should be deeply concerned. Congress has been a disgrace. Unfortunately, it is our troops who have had to pay the price.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this conference report includes some items that I strongly support, and other things that I think should not have been included. On balance, I will vote for it because I think it would be unrealistic and irresponsible to do otherwise.

FUNDING FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES

Most of the money appropriated by this legislation is for our ongoing military activities, especially in Iraq. Passage of this conference report will bring the total cost of operations in Iraq to well over $200 billion—and by now, two years after President Bush prematurely announced the end of major military activities in Iraq, I think even those who have been un-critical supporters of the Administration should be deeply concerned about the costs not just of the war in Iraq but of the Administration’s overall foreign policy. This should be the last thing the Administration or the Congress pays those costs through a supplemental appropriation bill instead of the regular budgetary and appropriation process. The American people deserve to know in advance what they will be asked to pay to support the Administration’s policies.

Nonetheless, Congress must not fail to supply our troops. Funds in this conference report will pay for more resources, including body armor and military equipment, needed to safeguard their lives. The conference report also includes important provisions to raise the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000 and to include a new insurance benefit of up to $100,000 for soldiers who have suffered traumatic injuries. The report also increases funding for body armor for the Army and Marines, add-on vehicle armor kits, night-vision equipment and electronic roadside-bomb detectors—and includes funding for contract linguists for the Army.

Further, there is an imperative need for this funding. The Defense Department reports that
operating funds for the Army are nearing exhaustion and that it will be necessary to transfer more than $1 billion from other accounts to continue essential activities at home and abroad until these supplemental funds are available.

In short, the choice before us today is to vote for this supplemental or, by voting against it, to in effect require an immediate halt to military operations not just in Iraq but elsewhere.

And while I remain convinced it was an error to go into war in Iraq, I am equally convinced it would be just as much an error to rush to withdraw.

We do need a strategy to get us out—which is why I’m pleased that the conference included language directing the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with a report that identifies security, economic, and Iraqi security force training-performance standards and goals, accompanied by a timetable for achieving these goals.

But an immediate departure is neither good strategy nor would it mean peace for Iraq.

I recently returned from my second trip to Iraq—this time as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee. As a critic of the Bush administration’s policy in Iraq, I did not go there to oppose the war, but rather, to gain knowledge based on face-to-face conversations with our military leaders, the Iraqi leadership, an extraordinary group of Iraqi women, and most important for me, with our troops on the ground.

I am convinced that there can be no successful exit strategy without first doing what is needed to enable the new Iraqi government to take up the burden of providing security. That will take time and money, and in the meantime we must maintain our efforts. As the former head of the Senate’s northern Iraq task force, Brig. Gen. Carter Ham, said recently, “We don’t want a rush to failure.”

So, for me, the need to support the military funding in this conference report—however unpleasant—is clear.

OTHER FUNDS

The conference report also provides funding for tsunami disaster relief as well as for assistance in Darfur, food aid to Sudan and Liberia, and for peacekeeping programs, most of which I supported in the Senate. Importantly, the bill appropriates the president’s request of $200 million for economic development in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

Other parts of the conference report are problematical, particularly the inclusion of provisions like those in the “REAL ID Act,” legislation that I opposed when the House passed it in February. I believe these provisions will not strengthen national security, but will create undue difficulties for asylum seekers and likely to have unintended consequences.

Several industries in Colorado are heavily dependent on the H–2B visa program to provide seasonal employees—some in the summer and some in the winter. While most of these companies try hard to find Americans to fill these jobs, they have not been fully successful. Some numbers that I’ve heard, however, of visas has made it difficult for many of them to find the people they need. So, they have been asking Congress to revise the program. However, while I am pleased that the report attempts to provide relief to companies struggling to do business, the specific provisions have some problems and may detrimentaly affect some of the companies that have employed people entering under the H–2B program. This is particularly true for companies whose busy season is in the winter, such as the ski industry. They would actually be detrimentally affected by this provision because they do not rehire the same workers every year, and thus do not benefit from the provisions in the conference report that will exempt previously hired workers from the overall limit on the number of visas.

I wrote to conferees to urge a solution to the H–2B visa problem that would be equitable for both the winter and summer industries. Regrettably, the conference report does not fully address that. Senator Reid introduced in the Senate by Senator Reis of Nevada. I applaud Senator Reis’s leadership in having this included when the Senate considered this supplemental appropriations bill and I am glad that it was accepted by the conferees. It will do two things:

1. Declare as Congressional policy that it is in the public interest for each State to continue to regulate the taking of fish and wildlife within its boundaries, including by means of laws or regulations that discriminate between residents and non-residents.

2. Provide that courts should not use Congressional silence as a reason to impose any commerce-clause barrier to a State’s or tribe’s regulation of hunting or fishing. Its purpose is to reaffirm the authority of States and Territories to regulate hunting and fishing by resolving questions that have arisen in the wake of a recent 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision that held that some Arizona limits on non-resident hunting permits had constitutional deficiencies.

Ideally, of course, legislation of this sort should be handled through the regular authorization process, and I had hoped that the Resources Committee would have taken it up by now. However, State fish and wildlife agencies will soon be considering regulations for coming seasons, and it is important that questions about their authority be resolved without unnecessary delay.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new about a State’s having different rules for resident and nonresident hunters or anglers. Colorado draws that distinction in several ways, and many other States do so as well.

And while there have been challenges to the validity of such rules, until recently the Federal courts have upheld the right of the States to make such distinctions. For example, in 1987 the Federal district court for Colorado, in the case of Terk v. Ruch (reported at 655 F. Supp. 2d 205), rejected a challenge to Colorado’s regulations that allocated to Coloradoans 90% of the available permits for hunting big-bore sheep and mountain goats. But a recent Court of Appeals decision marked a change—something that definitely is new.

In United States v. Force v. Manning, 301 F.3d 985; 9th Cir. 2002), the Federal appeals court for the 9th Circuit held that Arizona’s 10% cap on nonresident hunting of bull elk throughout the State and of antlered deer north of the Colorado River had enough of an effect on interstate commerce that it could run afoul of what lawyers and judges call the “dormant commerce clause” of the Constitution.

Hearing that conclusion, the appeals court indicated that the States must provide Congress with a report that identifies language directing the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Federal courts have upheld the right of the States to make such distinctions. For example, in 1987 the Federal district court for Colorado, in the case of Terk v. Ruch (reported at 655 F. Supp. 2d 205), rejected a challenge to Colorado’s regulations that allocated to Coloradoans 90% of the available permits for hunting big-bore sheep and mountain goats. But a recent Court of Appeals decision marked a change—something that definitely is new.

In United States v. Force v. Manning, 301 F.3d 985; 9th Cir. 2002), the Federal appeals court for the 9th Circuit held that Arizona’s 10% cap on nonresident hunting of bull elk throughout the State and of antlered deer north of the Colorado River had enough of an effect on interstate commerce that it could run afoul of what lawyers and judges call the “dormant commerce clause” of the Constitution.

Having reached that conclusion, the appeals court indicated that the States must provide Congress with a report that identifies language directing the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Federal court review.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court denied that petition. So, for now, the 9th Circuit’s decision stands. Its immediate effect is on States whose Federal courts are within that circuit—namely those in Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington as well those of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. But it could have an effect on the thinking of Federal courts across the country.

The purpose of this part of the conference report is to forestall that outcome, and so far as possible to return to the state of affairs prevailing before the 9th Circuit’s decision. It is intended to speak directly to the “dormant commerce clause” basis for the 9th Circuit’s decision in Conservation Force v. Manning.

I agree with the approach here. The issue is that lawyers and judges use that term to refer to the judicially established doctrine that the commerce clause is not only a “positive” grant of power to Congress, but also a “negative” constraint upon the States in the absence of any Congressional action—in other words, that it restricts the powers of the States to affect interstate commerce in a situation where Congress has been silent.
Section 6036(b)(1) would end the perceived silence of Congress by affirmatively stating that State regulation of fishing and hunting—including State regulation that treats residents and non-residents differently—is in the public interest. This is intended to preclude future application of national law that conflicts with state law in this “dormant commerce clause”—that is, Congressional inaction—is not to be construed as imposing a commerce-clause barrier to a State’s regulation of fishing or hunting within its borders.

These provisions are neither a Federal mandate for State action nor a Congressional delegation of authority to any State. Instead, they are intended to reaffirm State authority and make clear that the “dormant commerce clause”—that is, Congressional inaction—is not to be construed as an obstacle to a State’s regulating hunting or fishing, even in ways that some might claim adversely affect interstate commerce by treating residents differently from nonresidents.

It is important to note that this part of the conference report is not intended to affect any Federal law already on the books or to limit any authority of any Indian Tribe.

Section 6036(c) is intended to prevent any misunderstanding on these points.

Section 6036(c)(1) specifies that the bill will not “limit the applicability or effect of any Federal law related to the protection or management of fish or wildlife or to the regulation of commerce.”

Thus to take just a few examples for purposes of illustration, this part of the conference report will not affect implementation of the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Lacey Act, the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act, or the provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act dealing with subsistence.

Section 6036(c)(2) similarly provides that the bill is not to be read as limiting the authority of the Federal government to temporarily or permanently prohibit hunting or fishing on any portion of the Federal lands—as has been done by implementing National Park System units and in some other parts of the Federal lands for various reasons, including public safety as well as the protection of fish or wildlife.

And Section 6036(c)(3) explicitly provides that the bill will not alter any of the rights of any Indian Tribe.

These provisions are narrow in scope but of national importance because it addresses a matter of great concern to hunters, anglers, and wildlife managers in many States. I think they deserve broad support.

In conclusion, while this conference report is far from perfect, I think it deserves to pass and I will vote for it.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation demonstrates our commitment to our brave men and women in uniform and acknowledges that they need resources in order to accomplish their mission and return home safely. It also offers support for the families when a loved one pays the ultimate sacrifice in the cause of fighting for freedom.

Along, I’ve been concerned about the lack of progress reports coming from the Pentagon. This bill finally requires the Pentagon to use real performance indicators to report to Congress with our progress in terms of security, economic, and Iraqi security force training goals.

The money that will go directly to help our troops is of course the most important part of this bill. It increases the military death gratuity to $100,000 and increases life insurance benefits from $400,000 to $100,000 and increases life insurance benefits from $400,000 to $100,000 for families of soldiers killed in action. And the list goes on.

How about Uzbekistan?—“suffocation, electric shock, rape, beatings, and boiling prisoners to death.” And the list goes on.

The so-called “diplomatic assurances” that we have received from the torturers that they will not torture those we send them are not credible, and the Administration knows it. CIA Director Porter Goss basically acknowledged as much when he stated: “But of course once they’re out of our control, there’s only so much we can do.” Attorney General Alberto Gonzales confirmed this, when he said “Once someone is rendered, we can’t fully control what that country might do.”

Section 1031 of the conference report would prohibit the use of any funds included in this Supplemental appropriations bill to subject any person in custody or under the control of the United States to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment that is prohibited by the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

While the Conferees approved Senate language that differ from that of the House-passed amendment, I am nevertheless supportive of this language. Support it because I read Section 1031 to clearly prohibit any appropriated funds from being spent to subject any person in U.S. custody or control to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment by transferring, extraditing, or rendering such persons to countries where they are likely to face torture.

This is because such actions clearly would be prohibited under Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture, a treaty signed and ratified by the United States. Article 3 of the Convention clearly states that:

“No State Party shall expel, return (“re-fouls”) or extradite a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture.”

Article 3 of the Convention further states that:

“For the purpose of determining whether there are such grounds, the competent authorities shall take into account all relevant considerations, including, where applicable, the existence in the State concerned of a consistent pattern of gross, flagrant, or mass violations of human rights.”

It would be my expectation that the funding limitation contained in Section 1031 would therefore prohibit funds from being used to transfer persons to any Nation where the person was likely to face torture, and that under Section 1031, funds could not be used for transfers or renditions in situations where the U.S. government had found there to be a consistent pattern of gross, flagrant, or mass violations of human rights.”

And the list goes on.
We take pride that even as our Nation fought for its survival against the Nazis and the Japanese Empire during World War II, that we did not ask our “Greatest Generation” to engage in torture or other war crimes. The legacy of the U.S. then, and now as we prosecute the War on Terror, is that we upheld our commitment to justice—not even in the face of shadows of terror and war. The test of a Na- tion is found as much in how it wages war as in how it promotes the values of peace and democracy. That is what we must do today.

Mr. CONVYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the supplemental appropriations bill and the anti-immigrant legislation it contains.

If we truly believe all the rhetoric we hear about the importance of freedom and liberty from the president and others, we will vote down this bill, which denies so much freedom and liberty to immigrants in our own country.

H.R. 1268 includes numerous provisions limiting the rights of refugees, imposing onerous new driver’s license requirements on the states, making it easier to deport legal immi- grants under federal laws concerning the construction of fences and barriers anywhere within the United States, and denying immi- grants long standing habeas corpus rights.

If enacted into law, this legislation will close America’s doors to religious minorities escaping religious persecution and women fleeing sex trafficking and rape.

We have been down this road of over- reaction in the past. During the Civil War, General Grant sought to expel the Jews from the South. The aftermath of World War I brought about the notorious Red Scare and the anti-immigrant Palmer raids. World War II led to the unconscionable internment of Japa- nese Americans.

In the wake of the 9/11 tragedy, and even after the PATRIOT Act, this legislation would further target immigrants for crimes they have not committed, and sins they are not responsible for. At some point, we have to treat ter- rorism as a problem that requires an intel- ligence response, as opposed to an excuse to scapegoat immigrants.

It is for all these reasons that so many groups strongly oppose this bill, including groups concerned about immigrant rights, civil rights and liberties, privacy rights; Labor rights; the environment; Native-American rights; state rights, and international human rights.

I urge a “no” vote. We cannot and should not close ourselves off to the most vulnerable members of our society.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Agreement. I wish to commen- ded the conferees for their work in bringing this important legislation to the House Floor. Not only does this bill provide critical support to our military and the war on terror, but it also funds international humanitarian reconstruction and economic assistance programs provided by the United States Agency for International Development.

As my colleagues know, I have believed for many years that the HIV/AIDS pandemic rep- resents one of the greatest health and moral crises of our time, particularly in Africa. That is why I was especially pleased by the Presi- dent’s announcement of a visionary Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, and have sup- ported grants and other programs funded by USAID that help to reverse the spread of this pandemic. It is thus my strongly held view that USAID should continue to fund existing pro- grams, as well as invest in new programs, that support the President’s HIV/AIDS initiative. In this regard, there are two programs, both di- rected toward South Africa, that I believe de- serve the Agency’s particular attention.

The first is the New African Center for AIDS Management, which has, to date, trained over 800 graduates and is the largest program of its kind worldwide. I understand that USAID has provided only modest funding to support this initiative, while the bulk of the support has come from South African institu- tions. I urge the Administration to provide support from last year’s funds. Last year, USAID during Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006, this program could double in size and provide training for executives and senior managers from government, the provinces, municipalities, and educational institutions, as well as NGOs, corporations, and trade unions. In the man- agement of an expanded capability to detect and treat HIV/AIDS in Africa.

The second program would be a new joint U.S.-South African program to provide tele- medicine-equipped mobile clinics to serve the military in Africa. This program builds on peace- keeping efforts throughout Africa. This pro- gram, which merits both USAID and DOD sup- port, would be run through the South Africa Medical Research Council and provide med- ical services to remote areas to combat HIV/ AIDS and other infections. This mobile clinic system, employing some of the lat- est U.S. telemedicine technologies, would le- verage U.S. military expertise across dis- tances. As this system develops, so would it expand in both its capabilities and its services to the civilian population.

Both of these programs are examples of hu- manitarian initiatives requiring modest invest- ments that USAID is both equipped and fund- ed to support. I applaud the Agency’s past work in this area, and encourage both the continuation of existing efforts and the expan- sion of the new efforts that I have outlined.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1268 and urge all my col- leagues to support it.

In addition to the necessary funding for our troops, tsunami disaster relief, and border se- curity, this conference report also includes im- portant provisions to bring long-overdue, com- mon sense reform to drivers’ licenses and state-issued identification cards, authored last year by the Government Reform Committee in response to a recommendation of the 9-11 Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank the Speaker and Majority Leader for making good on their promise to get this legislation to the floor without delay by the 100th Congress. I also want to thank my colleague from California, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his strong support and for agreeing to include these provisions in H.R. 1268.

Finally, I would like to thank my col- league from Wisconsin for his tireless work in support of this issue. Last year following the passage of the 9-11 Commission Rec- ommendations Implementation Act, he and I made a commitment to work together to en- sure that the most important provisions not ad- dressed in the final bill would be addressed early in the 101st Congress. That commitment is being fulfilled today.

Judging by the basic nature of these re- quirements as well as the actions taken by States that want their drivers’ licenses to be used for federal identification purposes will be required to meet these standards. All of them. If they do not, the citizens of that State will not be able to use their driver’s license to identify themselves for many purposes that they use them for today, such as boarding an airplane.

The bill and the report make clear that the Secretary must determine the uses, in addition to initially given in the bill, for which drivers licenses only from complying states will be ac- cepted. Importantly, the final bill makes clear that the Secretary of Homeland Security will be responsible for ensuring that the certifi- cations represent full compliance. This require- ment assures that the critical information re- quirements of the United States will be protected through enforcement of the requirements of the bill.

States will also be required to confirm the applicant’s proof of legal presence in the United States. Currently, only 11 states lack such a requirement, meaning a majority of states have already recognized the need for tighter standards, but unnecessary and dan- gerous gaps in the system still exist. Impor- tantly, States are still permitted to issue driv- ers licenses to individuals who unlawfully or are unlawfully present in the United States or who cannot provide satisfactory proof of identity. The ability of States to have such a system is cur- rently under challenge in court, and this legis- lation will provide them with express authority.

The bill further provides that these licenses or identification cards must be clearly visually dif- ferentiated from other licenses and contain specific language regarding their validity for federal identification and other official pur- poses.

In conclusion, the legislation will require iden- tity documents to expire at the same time as the expiration of lawful entry status—that will prevent individuals who have illegally entered or are unlawfully present in the United States from having valid identification documents. This loophole was highlighted on September 11th, as Nawaf al al Naif and Hamza Hanjour, the pilots of Flight 77, both obtained licenses and identification cards after the expiration of their visa authorization. We must correct this dangerous problem before we again give indi- viduals who have overstayed their visas the tools they need to integrate into society and carry out criminal and terrorist acts.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that these actions are consistent with actions taken
by individual states to date. For example, Nevada and New Mexico do not accept, as proof of identity, a state-issued driver license or identification card from states that do not meet their own standards. The federal government has been delinquent in dealing with this issue, but we will continue to correct that problem today.

Fraud in identity documents is no longer just a problem of theft. As we continue to strengthen our intelligence function to better identify and track terrorists, those individuals will be forced to find ways to conceal their identity in order to avoid detection. We must be able to establish an identity close to a certainty as well, so that people can be as they say they are, and in order to do so the federal government must have documents that it can trust. In fact, we would not be fulfilling our security role for the American people if we did not.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these important provisions and the passage of this conference report.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental, especially the provision that would restrain reducing the number of Navy aircraft carriers from 12 to 11. Our nation is at war against global terrorism and reducing the number of aircraft carriers would be a huge blow to our nation’s defense at this very critical time.

Since the end of the Cold War, carriers have been kept very busy and have proven their value in numerous operations. In this era of uncertain U.S. access to overseas air bases, the value of carriers as sovereign U.S. bases that can operate in international waters, free from political constraints, is particularly significant.

During the past half century, the carrier force has never dropped below 12 ships, illustrating the enduring need for a force of at least that many ships. After experimenting with a “11 + 1” carrier force in FY1996–FY2000, DOD returned to a force of 12 fully active carriers, suggesting that DOD was dissatisfied with a force of less than 12 fully active carriers.

This provision in the Supplemental would effectively delay the decommissioning of the USS Kennedy until 6 months after the Quadrennial Defense Review is released. The Kennedy is based at the Mayport Naval Station near Jacksonville, Florida. Aside from concerns of this move stoking a blow to national security, the carrier’s retirement would mean an estimated loss of $300 million a year to the local economy.

Furthermore, if the Kennedy were retired, all of the Atlantic Fleet’s carriers would be, for some time at least, home ported in a single location. This, of course, would not be in the best interest of national security.

Decommissioning the Kennedy before the QDR is complete could prove to be a very costly and ill-timed decision. The QDR may conclude that a fleet of 12 aircraft carriers is essential to our nation, thus necessitating that the USS Kennedy be operational. In a time of war, it is unwise to retire an aircraft carrier without knowing whether or not it will be needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of congress to carefully examine the effects that retiring the Kennedy and reducing the number of carriers would not only have on our nation, but the world at large. Please join me in supporting the Supplemental and the provision that keeps the number of carriers in the Navy’s fleet contained therein.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAUROTTURE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in this form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 1226, to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to recommit to the Senate and agree to the highest level of funding within the scope of conference for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for the electronic vote on the question of adopting the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 225, not voting 7, as follows:

[Vote list not included here]

[Roll No. 180]

NAYS—225

[Names of Nays not included here]
Mr. EHLERS and Mr. DELAY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, CONyers, and RYAN of Ohio changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaTOURETTE). The question is on the motion to agree to the further amendment and commit the Conference Report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental War Appropriations Act, 2005.

Motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the passage of the Conference Report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental War Appropriations Act, 2005. I would like to submit this statement for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the roll call vote No. 160 today. Thursday, May 5, 2005, in voting on roll call No. 159, I voted "yea." I would like to submit this statement for the record.

MR. EDELSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to be present for the roll call vote on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental War Appropriations Act, 2005. I would like to submit this statement for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the roll call vote on the Conference Report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental War Appropriations Act, 2005. I would like to submit this statement for the record.