

bill. However, Mr. Speaker, it has become hard to understand that in these times of economic hardship why airline industry executives would take millions of dollars in bonuses while each of the companies is laying off large portions of its workforce while mired in billions of dollars of red ink. The airline industry must exercise fiscal restraint. I would hope that all of these companies would tighten their belts especially if we are going to ask the taxpayers of this country to help carry the burden of their business.

SECURITY FOR OUR PORTS

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today, unfortunately, the Democrats will not be allowed to offer an amendment that would dramatically increase the security of this Nation from terrorist activities, and that is an amendment to provide for the nuclear detection of nuclear devices that might be put into containers in ports overseas. We have 6 million containers a year that come to the United States. The CIA has told us, the intelligence agencies have told us that this is one of the prime ways to deliver nuclear material by a terrorist. The Hart-Rudman Commission that warned us of 9-11 prior to 9-11 has warned us that this is the main way in which a terrorist would have an opportunity to deliver a nuclear device. But what do we do? We wait until the containers get to the port of San Francisco, to the port of Oakland, to the port of New Jersey, to the port of Miami to then check them.

□ 1015

It is too late if they get inside of our ports.

If a nuclear device went off in one of our ports, it would not only devastate hundreds of thousands of lives, it would not only devastate the city, it would devastate the world economy.

The Democratic amendment should have been allowed so we can check these containers before they leave Asia, before they leave Europe, before they leave Africa. That is security for the Nation.

RECOGNIZING TEXAS WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY AND THE TEXAS WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME EXHIBIT IN HUBBARD HALL

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Texas Women's University and Chancellor Ann Stuart on the grand opening of the Texas Women's Hall of Fame exhibit in Hubbard Hall in Denton, Texas.

The Texas Governor's Commission for Women created the Texas Women's

Hall of Fame in 1984 to honor the State's most outstanding women. The Hall of Fame recognizes Texas women who have obtained significant personal or professional achievements, including former first ladies, teachers, athletes and astronauts.

There have been 114 women inducted into the Hall of Fame and this exhibit will honor these outstanding ladies and their extraordinary accomplishments. Photographs and biographies of the inductees line the walls of Texas Women's Hall of Fame to inspire future generations in this prestigious group.

One of the original inductees is Dr. Mary Evelyn Blagg Huey, my former neighbor and former Texas Women's University president and the second woman to become president of a State university in Texas. This year's inductees were: Ann Williams, Texas Women's University regent and founder of the Dallas Black Dance Theater; Johnnie Marie Benson, a health care advocate; Karen Hughes, advisor to George W. Bush; and Sister Angela Murdaugh.

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Ann Stuart and this year's inductees for their service to the community and to the fine State of Texas.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1559, EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 172 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 172

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except

one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Last night, the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule to H.R. 1559, the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and open rule for a very important bill. It cannot get any better than that.

The rule allows any Member to offer any amendment to the bill as long as their amendment complies with the normal Rules of the House.

I am very pleased the House is trying to move H.R. 1559 quickly, because I know the importance of this bill to the men and women in our military. I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for resisting most efforts to add extraneous provisions.

This bill is too important for our troops for it to get bogged down with nonappropriations issues.

I agree with the President that the United States has been at war since September 11, 2001. After our Nation was attacked, America made a decision: We will not wait for our enemies to strike before we act against them. We are not going to permit terrorists and terrorist states to plot and plan and grow in strength while we do nothing.

This emergency wartime supplemental appropriations provides the tools and the resources for our military to wage an aggressive war against Saddam Hussein while at the same time preparing our homeland.

Over the past 15 days we have seen the brutal and cruel nature of a dying regime. In areas still under its control, the regime continues its rule by terror. Prisoners of war have been brutalized and executed. Iraqis who refuse to fight for the regime are being murdered. Some in the Iraqi military have pretended to surrender and then opened fire on coalition forces that were willing to show them mercy.

We owe a great deal of gratitude and respect to our servicemen and women who are currently in harm's way. My thoughts and prayers are with them and their families during this time of war, and I want to thank them for their courage and bravery on the battlefield.

This war budget will meet America's needs directly arising from Operation Iraqi Freedom and our ongoing war

against terror, including \$63 billion for military operations. This funding will provide fuel for our ships, for our aircraft and tanks, supplies for our troops in the theater of operations, new high-tech munitions to replace the ones that we have used so far in this war. The supplemental will also provide funds to assist in the reconstruction of Iraq, Mr. Speaker; \$5 billion to help our brave coalition partners.

In order to protect the American homeland in this time of high alert, it also includes \$4 billion for the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security to address the immediate and emerging threats on American soil.

This legislation accomplishes this goal by providing \$2.2 billion for grants to first responders. Within that amount, \$1.5 billion is provided for the Office of Domestic Preparedness, their basic grant program to the States, and \$700 million is provided to address the security requirements in high-threat, high-density urban areas with critical infrastructure like my city of Charlotte.

H.R. 1559 also allocates these funds for several other high priority activities: \$498 million for border and port security, and \$85 million for reimbursements to State and local law enforcement officers and National Guardsmen for increasing security measures at airports and other critical transportation sites.

Our Nation must give our military and our law enforcement officers the weapons that they need to meet future threats. If the war against terror means that we must find terror wherever it exists and pull it out by its roots and bring people to justice, then our military and our law enforcement officers must have the means to achieve it.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying bill. We need to rapidly approve the core funding for the Pentagon so supplies continue to flow to our troops.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just listened to my friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), and she said oh, well, this is a great open rule.

Let us be very clear about what is happening here. This is not an open rule in the true sense. The Republicans waived all the Rules of the House that they could possibly waive: the Budget Act, every rule that they could waive for their own bill, for the committee bill, and then they refused to waive those same rules for the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), to bring up an amendment to the committee bill. So this is not an open process, and let us be serious about what is going on here today.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, the brave men and women of the U.S. military are, once again, proving themselves to

be the finest fighting force in history. On the ground, in the seas, and in the skies over Iraq, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are risking their lives to protect America and the world from the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's murderous regime.

Mr. Speaker, our troops have the strong bipartisan support of this Congress and of the American people. We are all deeply proud of the courage, skill, and professionalism they are displaying under very difficult conditions, and we are committed, Republicans as well as Democrats, to ensuring that our troops have all the resources they need to complete their mission as quickly and as safely as possible.

So I am pleased that this emergency spending bill is on the House floor today. The Committee on Appropriations chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each deserve credit for a bill that is generally quite strong.

This bill supports our troops in the field, it protects the foreign policy prerogatives of the President, and it respects the Congress's constitutional duty to maintain responsibility for the tax dollars of the American people. Additionally, this emergency supplemental includes desperately needed assistance for the struggling airline industry.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. airlines are critical to the American economy, but they were hurt severely by the September 11 attacks and by subsequent security expenses. I know this firsthand because American Airlines, which employs thousands of hardworking people in my north Texas district, has been struggling mightily, and I want to congratulate the employee unions at American for voluntarily agreeing to benefit reductions to help keep the company out of bankruptcy. But they, like the rest of the airline industry, need additional relief from the government. So I am glad that this bill provides it, and I urge the President to support it.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I expect to support this bill.

But make no mistake: This bill as it is currently written still leaves America unnecessarily vulnerable to another terrorist attack. That is because Republicans continue to block critical homeland security resources for key targets like ports and nuclear facilities. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot understand why Republicans refuse to address so many vital homeland defense needs. After all, there is no disputing the importance of these unmet homeland security requirements.

The Coast Guard reports that it needs \$1 billion this year alone to secure America's ports. The U.S. Fire Service found that between one-third and one-half of firefighters lack critical pieces of basic emergency equipment. And each of the armed services has submitted detailed lists of military construction projects required to en-

sure the security of American troops at bases here in the United States.

But while Republicans ignore these vital homeland security needs, they have proven time and again that they are willing to spend money on their priorities. Unfortunately, those priorities too often turn out to be tax breaks for those who need them the least.

Just last month, House Republicans voted to spend nearly \$800 billion on tax breaks, but they refused to spend less than one-half of 1 percent of that amount, \$250 million, for a critical program to protect our ports against terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have repeatedly tried to force Republicans to address America's homeland defense. In the Committee on Rules last night, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offered an amendment to provide \$2.5 billion for homeland security requirements that Republicans have refused to address.

□ 1030

But Republicans on the Committee on Rules blocked the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The Republican leadership is tempted, as we have already heard, to tell us that they did not block the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). They may be tempted to say again that this is an open rule, and the problem is that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin violates the House rules.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Republican leadership does not make that argument again, because that argument is dangerously disingenuous. After all, Republican leaders routinely waive the House rules for their priorities. Just last month, they were willing to waive the Budget Act to provide hundreds of millions of dollars in tax breaks to special interests. In this very rule, the same one that refuses to provide the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) with waivers, Republicans have waived the rules for the underlying bill.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leaders have waived the House rules on 14 of 15 rules this year. In other words, Republicans are happy to waive the House rules for special interest tax breaks and other Republican priorities, but Republican priorities do not seem to include additional money for homeland defense.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just unfair and undemocratic, it is an arrogant abuse of power. Most importantly, it is an abuse of power that leaves Americans more vulnerable to terrorist attacks here at home.

For that reason, Members of the House have only one way to pass the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) today: by defeating the previous question on this rule. Let me be clear: by voting "no" on the previous question, Members will simply be voting to allow the House to

provide critical homeland security resources. They will not delay or defeat the underlying bill.

We will support the troops, and I am sure that this wartime spending bill will pass with an overwhelming bipartisan majority. But by voting "yes" on the previous question, Members will be voting to block critical homeland security resources. There is no way around that fact, so I urge Members not to do it.

Mr. Speaker, protecting America's homeland should not be a bipartisan issue. I hope my Republican friends will join Democrats in opposing the previous question so we can strengthen our defenses here at home while we provide for our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for me personally. Thirty-four years ago today, I was sworn in as a new Member of this body. I was inspired by the idea that this institution was supposed to represent. This institution is supposed to be the people's House. This institution, more than any other, is supposed to reflect the public will. This institution has been known through the years as the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think the rule that is bringing this crucial piece of legislation to the floor today represents a fundamental corruption of the democratic processes of this House and this country. I want to explain why.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a \$70 billion bill to try to pay for the cost of a war which, it is hoped, will bring "democracy" to Iraq. Yet, democracy is being fundamentally denied on this House floor this morning.

Now, we hear all of this meaningless blather about how this is an open rule and we can offer any amendment that is within the rules, but that obscures the truth. The truth is that this bill has been brought to the floor under a rule which allows this bill to avoid the rules of the House, and it does so in three fundamental ways. That enables the majority to bring a bill to the House floor which, among other things, will supplement the process by which our government intends to provide basic health care to 25 million Iraqis; our government plans to provide for the modernization of 6,000 schools in Iraq; and it plans to rebuild 100 hospitals in Iraq.

I begrudge the President none of that in his efforts to win the hearts and minds of that country. However, this rule blocks our effort to provide \$2.5 billion in additional homeland security protection by protecting our ports, giving our first responders more assistance, and doing a variety of other things to keep this country safe from terrorist attack.

The way it does that is that it allows the bill itself, brought by the Repub-

lican majority, to obliterate the normal rules of the House under which bills are considered; but then it requires us to abide by the very rules that the majority party ignores in constructing its bill.

Members may call that democracy; I call it a sham. I call it a shameful sham. I do not for a moment understand why we are even having this disagreement. On a subject like homeland security there should be no "Ds" behind our name, there should be no "Rs" behind our name; there should only be an "A" after our name. In discussing a bill like this, we should not be Democrats or Republicans, we should be Americans.

I would ask every Member of this House whether or not anything that we are trying to propose in this amendment is not worthy of support. We are being blocked today from funding a new program that would enable us to protect America from nuclear material loaded onto ships and brought into American ports. We are being denied the opportunity to install equipment in nine ports around the world so that for at least 50 percent of the cargo which comes into this country we will know it does not have nuclear material which could cause the explosion of dirty bombs in our ports and harbors. We are being denied the right to try to fix that problem.

We are being denied the right to offer additional funds to protect the security of our own nuclear material here at home. We are being denied funds to upgrade the quality of State labs so they can detect what we are hit with if we are hit by a chemical attack. We are being denied \$108 million to protect Federal dams and waterways from terrorist attacks. We are being denied \$75 million so that we can conduct vulnerability assessments for chemical plants in this country. We are being denied several hundred million dollars in additional help that we want to provide to our local first responders, our police, and our firemen.

Additionally, we are being denied an effort to provide additional funds so that our Guard and Reserve forces can see to it that in every State in the Union we have backup units to help first responders respond to chemical and biological attacks. We are being denied the ability to put additional port security requirements into effect in Charleston, Philadelphia, Jacksonville, Baltimore, Honolulu, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Corpus Christi, San Juan, and Wilmington in order to protect this country, again, from deadly material that is brought into our harbors. We are being denied many other things.

So in my view, Mr. Speaker, this rule is a disgrace. We intend to vote against the previous question on the rule, and I would urge Members of the leadership of this House to recognize that on this, above all issues, we ought to be dealing with this in a bipartisan give-and-take manner so we can provide far more pro-

tection to each and every citizen of this country than we are providing to date.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule but in opposition to a legislative process which has allowed a critical wartime supplemental appropriation package to become a vehicle for billions of dollars in nonrelated war spending.

As a veteran of both Vietnam and the Persian Gulf wars, I know all too well how imperative adequate funding is to the success of any modern military campaign. When I hear our President and the Secretary of Defense rally behind a package of funding for military, I do not flinch in offering my sincere and strong support, no matter how great that price may be. Our brave men and women in uniform are making great sacrifices in the deserts of the Middle East every day and they deserve our support and the funding to help them achieve their mission and a victory.

However, when I learn of last-minute deals between Members of Congress and certain special interests which bog down this crucial defense spending package with non-war related gifts at the expense of my constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, I cannot help but question the entire process.

Today the airline industry will get billions more dollars in Federal aid without a full debate on the financial problems still plaguing that critical industry, even after this Congress gave them over \$15 billion in aid in 2001.

Now, tourism in Nevada is the number one industry for us, and I work hard every day to see that certain economic reforms are enacted to benefit the hardworking Nevadans who rely on a healthy travel and tourism industry. However, I strongly disagree that an emergency supplemental spending package intended to fund our Nation's Armed Forces and provide necessary humanitarian aid to the Iraqi people suffering under Saddam Hussein's regime of tyranny is the proper vehicle for another Federal funding crutch for the airline industry without a full debate on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, while I will vote "yes" to support the overall bill, I want to register my strong opposition to the process which creates any delay in the expedient delivery of necessary funding to our Nation's brave servicemen and servicewomen fighting for freedom around the world.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, there is a pattern in this rule. That pattern is to gag approximately 140 million Americans, to not allow their Representatives to offer amendments which the majority has made in order for themselves, but not for the 140 million Americans represented by the minority.

There appears to be no shame in that. It appears to be the arrogant exercise of pure political power. They can laugh if they will; but the American public will, over time, recognize that half of America is being shut out.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) seeks to offer an amendment. That amendment is to invest in homeland security, the safety of our cities, the safety of our ports, the safety of our railroads, the continuing safety of our airlines, and the safety of our neighborhoods.

What this rule says is, we will have points of order. That is esoteric. What does that mean? The American public does not know. Essentially, what it means is we will allow ourselves, we Republicans who are in charge, the ability to offer an amendment like the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY).

Now, somebody on the Committee on Rules is shaking their heads. It is their bill that I refer to. It is their bill that is not consistent with the rules. In the rule, they say it does not matter for them, they can exercise the power to jam it; but we will not give to Democrats the ability to offer an amendment to adequately fund the security of New York City; of Baltimore, Maryland; of each and every community in our country.

I regret that. It is a bad rule, and I join the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in urging Members to vote against the previous question so that we can provide a rule which will allow for fair and full consideration, and let that proposal, if it is deemed by those in the majority not to be consistent with the security of the American public, vote against it; but at least have the courage, have the courage and good sense and consideration for the 140 million people represented by this side of the aisle to allow them to be heard. Allow them to have an amendment to be considered on this floor. That is democracy. That is what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) seeks.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this bill was reported out of the committee 59 to zero. I also wanted to make the point that between 1999 and 2002, States and localities have been awarded over \$492 million in domestic preparedness funding.

□ 1045

And only a third of those funds have been used. And the gentleman mentioned Maryland and New York, and I would just like to say that Maryland was awarded \$9.2 million and they still have \$9.2 million that has not been

spent. New York was awarded \$25.7 million and there is still \$25.7 million in the pipeline that has not been spent, so there is money there currently.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the gentleman's argument. It may be a good argument. Why does your rule not allow us to debate that on the floor?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule that allows anybody to offer an amendment that is within the rules of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's bill is not within the rules. The gentleman waived the rules.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a canard. The charge has been made by the Republicans for the last 3 days that there are \$19 billion in unspent homeland security funds. Let me tell you how they get to that ridiculous statement.

They count all of the money that is proposed for that program for the next fiscal year. We have not even passed that bill out of the Congress yet. That is 34 percent of that so-called \$19 billion in unspent money. This supplemental contains another 10 percent. You cannot spend money in localities the Congress has not yet appropriated. That accounts for another 10 percent. Then the omnibus appropriations bill that was passed in February of this year, that accounts for the other 30 percent of that so-called \$19 billion in unspent money. Only 2 weeks ago, the agency made available to States the ability to apply for that money. The application period has not even been closed. That leaves 26 percent left; and of that 26 percent left, only 4 percent has been unobligated. So let us keep the facts straight.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The simple fact is the rule waives House rules for the majority's bill, but it does not allow for Democratic amendments, and what we are saying is that is unfair. It is just that simple.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is as much about context as it is about content. It is as much about politics as it is about patriotism. In September 2002, I introduced a resolution calling on the President to transmit to Congress a comprehensive plan for the long-term cultural, economic, and political stabilization in a free Iraq. Now, 7 months later and only after the war has begun, has the President presented a war supplemental, albeit still missing a long-

term plan and definite end to the conflict.

Repeatedly when asked how long it expects United States forces to remain in Iraq, the administration has answered with a glib, "Not one day longer than we have to."

Well, Mr. Speaker, until the President can provide a plan on how this \$78 billion, the largest supplemental in the history of our country, will be spent, my answer is "Not one dollar more than I have to."

Now, I want to make it very clear, I along with 435 Members of this House of Representatives that can vote, support fully the troops. I supported them when I voted on March 21 for the resolution honoring them, and I will support them again today when I vote for this supplemental.

I have a new resolution, H. Con. Res. 121, that supports our warfighters, contemplates the casualties, looks towards trying to avoid the circumstances of POWS and MIAs. And all of us support the troops. We are patriotic Americans, Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative. But patriotism means stand by your country. It does not mean, as Theodore Roosevelt said, that you must stand by your President.

Mr. Speaker, I stand proudly and patriotically for the American values that cause every one of us to support our troops. But let me make it very clear, I do not stand nor am I required to stand by our President and the misguided policies entrenched in this supplemental. Republican fiscal irresponsibility of the last 2 years has sent the United States' economy into a downward spiral of unemployment and homelessness as the number of uneducated and uninsured increase every day.

Today's supplemental, while funding in part the war and homeland security, does nothing to fix the majority of the emergencies facing this Nation.

What pains me, Mr. Speaker, is that I have cities in my district—Belle Glade, South Bay, and Pahokee—where the unemployment rate is 17 percent and the poverty rate is 3 to 4 times greater than anywhere else in South Florida. Congress can't find the money for rural development in the Glades, yet we have \$2.5 billion to rebuild Iraq and another \$5.5 billion in foreign assistance because the President's diplomatic efforts to shore up support for this war failed.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire about the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, does the gentlewoman have any speakers at this time?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any speakers at this time. I have somebody coming.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

Mr. Speaker, the issues of war in Iraq and homeland security are among the most important issues that Members of this House will ever have to deal with. They are incredibly important to our constituents and, indeed, have implications worldwide. It is vitally important that every Member of this House, Republican and Democrat, freshman and committee chair, have an opportunity to be heard and have an opportunity to play a constructive and positive role in this process.

It is of great frustration to me, for example, that we have not formally debated the war on Iraq since last October when Congress gave the President the authorization to go to war; this, notwithstanding the fact that American men and women are in harm's way and American citizens are paying for the war. I oppose the war and I still have great reservations about our policy, but the decision has been made and the brave men and women of our armed services are now in the field of battle. They deserve our gratitude, our respect, and our support. And whether you are for or against the war, these issues are too important not to be front and center in almost every discussion that we have in this Chamber.

Today we are debating a supplemental appropriations bill to provide support for our troops, some money for reconstruction in Iraq, money for the airline industry, and some money for homeland security. Now, the majority trumpets that this is an open rule and everybody should be happy; but as you have heard, there is a hitch. Things that are important to the Republicans have received protections from points of order. All the Democratic amendments that were offered in the Committee on Rules last night were denied such protections.

The ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), presented a very thoughtful and well-considered amendment to protect ports, provide additional funds to first responders and help our veterans. The priorities he outlined are priorities for all Americans. Yet he was denied the opportunity to offer his amendment in any meaningful way.

Our colleague from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) had an amendment to increase funding for American families just as the supplemental bill increases funding for Iraqi families. He was not urging that we not invest in Iraq, only that we also invest in America as well. He argued that while the supplemental with regard to Iraq provides 13 million people access to basic health care services, one hospital in every major city, and maternity care for 100 percent of the population, the supplemental with regard to America provides not one new dollar for 42 million working uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, these are the types of things we should not only be discussing

and debating, but voting on. And while the supplemental does include some welcome modest funding for first responders, I am sad to say that under this bill you are better off being a police officer in Bogota, Colombia than in Boylston, Massachusetts. Why? Because this bill gives more aid to Colombia than 49 States of the Union receive for first responders.

In my city of Worcester, Massachusetts, 20 firefighters and 20 police officers are about to be laid off. So we can hold all the press conferences we want about how important homeland security is, and we can pose for all the pictures with our first responders, but it is clear our hometown security is being short-changed.

I would say to the leadership on the other side of the aisle that this process should and can be much better. This bill should and can be much better. Because of your unwillingness to listen and debate and vote, it will not be.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this rule is deceptive. It does not allow us to vote on important issues of homeland security. So I would urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question in order to allow this House to vote on important and critical homeland security protections for the American people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me time. I appreciate the time and a chance to speak this morning.

It is now our duty to make sure that we finance the war that presently is waging in Iraq. Many of our young soldiers, men and women, they are facing dangers every day. We have to finance the military operations of these men and these women, but our duty to the soldiers extends beyond the duration of the war in Iraq. Our duty requires us to increase funding to the Veterans Administration for there are veterans in the making right this very moment; and for the current veterans, we have let them down.

It is a terrible statistic to know that nationwide in the year 2002, almost 300,000 veterans were either placed on waiting lists or forced to wait for over 6 months in order to receive an appointment for necessary care. In New York State, 130,000 veterans could be denied the VA benefits or drop out of the system, including 30,000 veterans in western New York which I represent alone.

Now, as we have cut the budget already for the Veterans Administration, as we already have 300,000 veterans a year waiting just to get an appointment, what will happen when the veterans from Iraq come home? What will we say to them? We really appreciate your service. It was wonderful of you to go. I am sorry we have no way to give you medical treatment. Take a number and wait your turn.

We cannot as a Nation forget our obligation to these men and women and our promise always to care for them.

The rule passed by the Committee on Rules prohibits any amendments to increase funding for the Veterans Administration. In addition to that, the war has also greatly increased the threat of terrorism here at home. Our cities and towns must be prepared to act immediately should we have another terrorist threat or act. And our local police officers, firefighters, public health officials, medical professionals, and volunteers will be the first to respond. But we have not included sufficient funding for the local governments, the States, and the first responders.

The war has greatly increased the financial burden on local and State governments during a period of economic troubles when local and State governments are challenged by a budget crisis. It is our solemn duty to provide the financial support that these first responders require if we expect them to protect our constituents back home.

It is shameful that first responders and local governments have to beg for funding. The bill provides some funds for first responders but they need so much more than this bill provides, and the rule bars any amendment to increase the funding to the first responders.

Now, as I said, there is some money there, but not nearly enough to protect the ports that are critical to the United States' economy and to provide the necessary level of security in our borders. We must increase the funding of activities at our northern borders. Our friends in Canada are not the threat, Mr. Speaker.

In summary, let me say that this rule leaves a great deal to be desired and certainly does not do very much for the people fighting this war today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Every once in a while you have to connect the dots around here or it gets a little confusing. Let us connect the dots right now.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) wants an amendment to add \$2.5 billion for homeland security. The other side does not want to let the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) add \$2.5 billion for homeland security.

□ 1100

Why is that? That is because the deficit goes up by another \$2.5 billion, and it becomes harder and harder to justify their tax cut for the rich. This is not very complicated. The dots are connected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

I rise in opposition to this rule. While the Republicans will claim that this war supplemental is being offered on an open rule, meaning anyone may amend or improve the bill, parliamentary

trickery proves this not to be the case at all. That is why I recommend a "no" vote on the rule so Democrats have an opportunity to offer an amendment to increase the homeland security portion of this war budget by \$2.5 billion.

What are the Republicans afraid of? Voting against our domestic protection forces, our police and firefighters? Or maybe they stand quietly supportive of remarks of a prominent Republican Member of Congress, an appropriator, who said that the FDNY and the NYPD should work overtime for free. The rules of the House do not allow me to name the individual. Obviously he believes the loss of 23 police officers in New York City and 343 members of the FDNY was not sacrifice enough.

Congress needs to support our first line of defense abroad, our military; and we cannot forget our first line of defense at home, our police and firefighters.

Vote down this rule and allow for a vote on a real aid package to defend Americans right here in America.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding time to me.

I cannot help but say to the House that later in the day I expect that I will have a lot of exchange with my very good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I express my appreciation for the magnificent work that he and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) have done together regarding this bill.

It is a war supplemental for the 2003 year. It is a process that will go forward today in a very, very positive way with both sides of the aisle expressing their support for our troops, both sides of the aisle responding I think positively to the need to make sure that funding goes forward effectively.

I cannot help, however, as I sit and listen to this discussion regarding open rules to share with my colleagues a conversation I had a moment ago with my colleague, the chairman, who was not really wringing his hands but he was saying to me, "I cannot help but remember a decade I spent in the minority in the Florida Senate. I cannot help but remember all the time I spent as a Member of the House." Some, not all, of 40 years in this House, but a very big hunk of time, when the other side controlled, the other side of the aisle. And indeed, they are constantly talking about open rules the way they saw them, and beauty does lie in the eyes of the genuflector around this place.

I was reminded a moment ago of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) in a parade that she participates in regularly, I understand, and as she came down the roadway in that parade that day, one of our fine staffers over here happened to flash up a sign that said "Louise, more open rules, please."

It is fascinating when one majority controls a place for more than 4 decades, and indeed, now comes here to the floor and complains so rather effectively about our learning so much from them, during the years they controlled it with such an iron fist.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. My friend from California, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, who has overseen most of the very important work that is in this package, has really, I think, put it very well.

I listen to the speeches from the other side of the aisle. This is a bipartisan measure that we are moving forward. We know that it passed by a vote of 59 to zero from the Committee on Appropriations. There is going to be strong support from both Democrats and Republicans in this House for this measure.

I do not know how anyone can describe our stating that this is an open rule as chicanery, but we have to live with the rules of this House. Yes, the Committee on Rules does, in fact, have a job of providing waivers, and we have protected the bipartisan, and I keep hearing it described as the majority bill, the bipartisan 59 to zero package. We have, in fact, provided protection for that measure that has been reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

Democrats and Republicans alike realize that it is very important for us to provide the \$74.7 billion to pay for this war and all of the issues that are surrounding that, and I believe that the Committee on Appropriations has done a terrific job on this.

I praise the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); I, of course, praise the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I followed the markup as it proceeded in the Committee on Appropriations, and when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) began talking about article 1, section 7 of the U.S. Constitution and the fact that we had the responsibility to make sure that the power of the purse lies right here, and he also talked about the issue of accountability, and I heard my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in that markup talk about the fact that Democrats and Republicans alike, when they are down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue want to do what they can to place more power in article 2, the executive branch, than in article 1, the first branch of government, the legislative branch, and I totally agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

We have seen that, and that is why I praise his work and the work of the full

committee in ensuring that there will be a greater degree of accountability and that the administration does not get the blank check that some of them may have wanted. That is why I say that this bill, which we are going to proceed with when we pass this rule, is a bipartisan measure. Again, a 59 to zero vote.

Say what you want, I really do not care what it is that they say, this is an open rule. I am going to say it again: this is an open rule. What it means is that members of the majority and members of the minority will have an equal opportunity to offer amendments that comply with the rules of the House.

The only waiver protection that we provided, Mr. Speaker, was protection for the bipartisan 59 to zero, \$74.7 billion supplemental appropriation bill that came forward; and after having provided protection for that unanimously passed package, we proceed with an open rule. That is why this is a very fair measure. It addresses so many important issues.

One thing I am particularly pleased to have been able to play a role in, which I worked on right after September 11 as we looked at that supplemental, was to try and ensure that resources get to our first responders.

Mr. Speaker, we know full well that throughout our Nation's history, when we have talked about men and women in uniform and international conflicts, they are men and women who are like those who are over, moving into Baghdad right now, men and women in the military, but the tragic thing that we found following September 11 is that men and women in uniform, who are firefighters and policemen and -women, those people are now on the front line in an international conflict because of the war on terrorism. We need to make sure that we provide resources directly to them, and we know that some States have made an attempt to keep some of those resources, and that is why the language in here, which requires within 45 days that 80 percent of those resources that are to get to the first responders will, in fact, go there; and I am pleased to have played a role in encouraging that, from my State of California, the State of New York, realizing that there are areas that are really of greater threat than others, and there needs to be a particular emphasis on homeland security in those areas that face the greatest risk and the greatest threat, and we need to get those resources to those first responders.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I believe is important to offer as a caution is the fact that because States and localities are dealing with fiscal crises, just as we are dealing with our fiscal challenges here in Washington, D.C., I find that many States will want to, under the rubric of homeland security, try to address basically every fiscal challenge that they have, and so that is why we again have

the responsibility to, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) puts it so well, deal with the question of accountability as those resources do get out to ensure that we do not, under the name of homeland security, have Governors all over this country claiming that they should have a blank check from Washington, D.C.

We have got, I believe, a very good bipartisan package here, Mr. Speaker. We have a challenge that does need to be addressed, and I hope very much we can move ahead. We can pass this open rule, this open rule, Mr. Speaker, and then move ahead with the important debate to which we will see many, many amendments offered that lots of our colleagues will have, and we will have a good exchange.

I do want to mention one issue since I am here before I sit down and that is the question of Turkey, which I know will come up in the debate itself. Like every American, I was very disappointed when we found the challenge of dealing with Turkey when it came to the issue of stationing our 68,000 troops for a movement through the northern part of Iraq. I was saddened when I saw that vote of 261 to 254 in the Turkish parliament that refused to allow us to station our troops there.

I do know this, Mr. Speaker. I had the chance a few months ago, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), to go and travel throughout Turkey. We met with then-Prime Minister Gul and talked with him about the challenge of our prospect of our going to war with Iraq. We met with men and women who are based at Incirlik, our air base in the southern part of Turkey; and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have an alliance with Turkey which is very, very important to recognize.

Prime Minister Gul was prime minister at that time. He had not been elected, but he was selected because due to some problems with something that the man who was elected, who is now prime minister, Prime Minister Erdogan, he was unable to be seated at that point. We also know that there was a huge turnover in the parliament; and for that reason, even though we have strong support from Prime Minister Gul, Prime Minister-now Erdogan, we unfortunately did not have the votes in the parliament.

Why did we not have the votes in the parliament? Mr. Speaker, Turkey has suffered greatly going all the way back 12 years to the liberation of the war of Kuwait. They have suffered because of the economic sanctions and the inability to see the movement of goods and services across borders, a downturn there.

We also found that, of course, because of the Kurdish population in the northern part of Iraq and also in Turkey, it has created a huge upheaval. Those domestic challenges led the parliament by that 261 to 254 vote cast to make a decision to not allow us to station our troops there.

Having said that, we know that Secretary of State Powell has been in Turkey over the last couple of days, and he has been in meetings; and we have just gotten word that has not yet been confirmed this morning that some equipment is moving from Turkey into our operation in northern Iraq.

While I was disappointed at the decision that was made by the parliament, I do know that the leadership there, and I have met on several occasions with the Turkish ambassador here in the United States about this issue, and there has been a desire to try and establish a mechanism that would allow us to deal with our needs in Turkey.

I know some are looking at the prospect of offering an amendment that would cut the assistance that is very important to Turkey. I believe that would be wrong, Mr. Speaker. We need to do what we can to help Turkey stabilize itself economically; and we need to realize again that they have been a very, very important ally, strongly supporting the interests of the United States of America around the world.

I would implore my colleagues as we do move ahead to oppose any attempts that would bring about a reduction there.

I will just say again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for her stellar leadership on the Committee on Rules, her leadership as chairman of the very important Republican Study Committee, and I will encourage Members to support her in her quest to pass this open rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute 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. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad side effects of this unfair rule is that we will not be able to consider the Obey amendment to provide additional money for homeland security, and specifically, we will not be allowed to consider additional money for the protection of our sea ports of this Nation.

□ 1115

According to the CIA, it is more likely for a terrorist to sneak nuclear material into our ports than for a missile to reach our shores.

According to the prestigious task force headed by Senators Rudman and Hart, port security is a critical mandate which needs adequate funding.

And according to Steve Flynn, a highly respected security expert at the Council on Foreign Relations, an explosion from nuclear material smuggled

into any American port would not only inflict devastating casualties, it would bring America to a grinding halt. Our economy would simply shut down.

We cannot check every container that comes to our ports every day, but there is much more that we can do. The Obey amendment would have allowed us to start to put in place security provisions overseas before the containers come to the United States, before they present a risk to our citizens, before they present a risk to our economy, before they present a risk to our national security. But we will not be allowed to consider that amendment because this closed rule would not allow a Democratic debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment will allow Members an opportunity to vote on the Obey homeland security amendment. Yesterday, Republicans on the Committee on Rules blocked this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides desperately needed funding for the many overlooked and severely underfunded areas that threaten our national security. The amendment would add \$2.5 billion, an increase of about 3 percent to the bill. The money would be used for port security, for Coast Guard activities, for infrastructure security, for water and chemical plant security, and for rail tunnel security. It provides funding for State and local response activities, including civil defense, first responders, firefighters and military Guard and Reserves. It also addresses one of our gravest security risks, nuclear security.

My colleagues may remember that the President not only requested no funds for nuclear security but rejected legislation in August of 2002 that would have provided \$260 million for that purpose. It is very disturbing that the Republican leadership of this House would deny Members an opportunity to vote on an amendment to protect this Nation from the risk of terrorism. This should not be a partisan issue, but they have made it that way.

Vote "no" on the previous question so we can have an opportunity to vote on the Obey amendment. A "no" vote will not prevent us from voting on the wartime supplemental, but it will allow us to vote to protect our Nation and our citizens here and abroad. A "yes" vote on the previous question will block critical homeland security resources.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the unfair rule for the FY-03 Supplemental Appropriations bill because it blocks members on my side from offering the Democratic Homeland Security Amendment to add \$2.5 billion in needed, additional investments in homeland security to the supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, about half of the funds in the Democratic Homeland Security amendment go

to improving first response. This includes \$300 million in additional funding for First Responders Grants. These funds would be used to pay for such important needs as training for police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel, as well as, purchasing protective gear. The Democratic amendment also includes \$197 million to protect military facilities; \$241 million for nuclear security; and \$722 million for port and infrastructure security.

As a member of the Select Homeland Committee on Homeland Security, I am keenly aware of the deficiencies that exist in funding for First Responders. Indeed, the bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors a week ago released a report which showed that cities would have to pay more than \$21.4 million per week in additional security costs to close the \$2 billion over 6 months during the increased security alert status brought on by the war with Iraq.

In my own area, the Virgin Islands, the local government frankly can't afford to contribute any additional dollars to strengthen our security because local economy continues to spiral downward. Moreover, we have additional needs in port security defense, as well as, training and equipment for our police and firefighters.

I urge my colleagues to this unfair rule and give our local communities a chance to receive the first responder funding that they badly need.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and a description of the amendment immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION STATEMENT H.RES. 172—
RULE FOR H.R. 1559 FY03 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution, which may be offered only by Representative Obey or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment are waived. During consideration of the bill

for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

In chapter 1 of title I, insert at the end the following:

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For additional amount for "Food Safety and Inspection Service", \$13,000,000, to remain available until expended, for activities authorized under section 332 of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Response Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-188).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In chapter 3 of title I, under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE", in the item relating to "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD" insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$160,200,000)".

In chapter 3 of title I, under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE", insert at the end the following:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", \$66,000,000.

In title I, after chapter 3, insert the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 3A

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operations and Maintenance, General" for safeguards and security activities, \$108,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Water and Related Resources" for safeguards and security activities, \$24,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

SCIENCE

For an additional amount for "Science" to support additional safeguards and security activities, \$7,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY

ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Weapons Activities" to support additional safeguards and security activities, \$68,200,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For an additional amount for "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" for various domestic and international nonproliferation activities, \$175,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management" to support additional safeguards and security activities, \$11,300,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Other Defense Activities" to support increased Office of Intelligence mission requirements resulting from the conflict in Iraq, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING

SEC. 1351. (a) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, "sensitive material" means nuclear weapons or components thereof, nuclear materials, radioactive materials, and related technology and sources that pose a risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(b) INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS, PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy may expand the International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting program outside the Russian Federation, and the independent states of the former Soviet Union. The program may include, but is not limited to, assisting countries to—

(1) reduce the risk of theft of sensitive material or of diversion of sensitive material to terrorists or terrorist organizations;

(2) store securely sensitive material;

(3) establish procedures, such as inspections, audits, and systematic background checks, to improve the security of the use, transportation, and storage of sensitive material; and

(4) improve their domestic export control and border security programs for sensitive material.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall only apply with respect to amounts appropriated by this Act and any previous appropriations Act enacted before the date of enactment of this Act.

In title I, after chapter 4, insert the following new chapter:

Chapter 4A

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$18,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, for extraordinary costs to provide for the security of departmental facilities: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may transfer such funds to other accounts of the Department of the Interior, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, for use by the agencies or bureaus of the Department to offset such homeland security costs.

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY", in the item relating to "OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS", insert after the

first and second dollar amounts the following: "(increased by \$300,000,000)".

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY", insert at the end the following:

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Firefighter Assistance Grants" for programs as authorized by section 33 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), \$150,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Emergency Management Planning and Assistance" for grants for interoperable communications equipment, \$350,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY, ADMINISTRATION MARITIME AND LAND SECURITY

For an additional amount for "Maritime and Land Security", \$250,000,000, for making port security grants to be distributed under the same term and conditions as provided for under Public Law 107-117, to remain until December 31, 2003.

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "Coast Guard", in the item relating to "OPERATING EXPENSES", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "COAST GUARD", insert at the end the following:

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements", \$90,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

In chapter 6 of title I, in the item relating to "PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND", insert at the end the following:

For an additional amount for "Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund", for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to be used to improve Federal, State, and local preparedness against potential chemical terrorism, \$75,000,000.

In chapter 8 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION", in the item relating to "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$92,579,300)".

In chapter 8 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION", in the item relating to "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$28,160,000)".

In chapter 8 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION", insert at the end the following:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army", \$65,340,000, to remain available until expended.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Air National Guard", \$8,800,000, to remain available until expended.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army Reserve", \$2,200,000, to remain available until expended.

In the Transportation and Treasury chapter of title I, insert after the chapter heading the following:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION
For necessary life/safety capital improvements of the National Railroad Passenger

Corporation as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 24101(a), \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In the VA-HUD chapter of title I, insert after the heading for "DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS" the following:

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical Care", for enhancement of emergency preparedness, \$70,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

In the VA-HUD chapter of title I, insert at the end the following:

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For an additional amount for "Science and Technology," \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$25,000,000 is for water systems vulnerability analysis and \$75,000,000 is for chemical plant vulnerability assessments.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES SUPERFUND (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Hazardous Substances Superfund", \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended, for carrying out homeland security activities authorized by law related to the agency's counter-terrorism programs including radiological, biological, and chemical attacks: *Provided*, That these activities include, but are not limited to, (1) support of State and local responders to plan for emergencies, (2) coordination with federal partners, (3) training of first responders, and (4) providing resources including federal personnel in the event of any attack: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may transfer such portion of these funds as she deems appropriate to other agencies of the Federal government with expertise in radiological, biological, chemical attack related counter-terrorism programs: *Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized to make grants to states for radiological, biological, and chemical attack related to counter-terrorism.

Democrats are strongly urged to vote "no" on the Previous Question on the Rule to allow the consideration of the Obey Amendment that would increase funding by \$2.5 billion to Homeland Security programs.

These increases would include: \$197 million to protect military facilities; \$241 million for nuclear security (nuclear cargo detection, nuclear detection equipment, securing nuclear materials abroad and in the U.S.); \$722 million for port and infrastructure security (Coast Guard personnel, port security grants, dams and bridge security, water and chemical plant security, rail tunnel security); and \$1.2 billion for state and local first responders (state and local civil defense teams, first responder equipment, firefighter grants, state and local bio-chemical response, military guard and reserves).

Office of the Democratic Whip—STENY H. HOYER

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FROST. 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. Evidently a 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 electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]
YEAS—221

Aderholt	Gallegly	Nunes
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Nussle
Bachus	Gerlach	Osborne
Baker	Gibbons	Ose
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Otter
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Oxley
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Goode	Pence
Bass	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Beauprez	Goss	Petri
Bereuter	Granger	Pickering
Biggert	Graves	Pitts
Bilirakis	Green (WI)	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Greenwood	Pombo
Blackburn	Gutknecht	Porter
Blunt	Harris	Portman
Boehlert	Hart	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Bonilla	Hayes	Quinn
Bonner	Hayworth	Radanovich
Bono	Hefley	Ramstad
Boozman	Hensarling	Regula
Bradley (NH)	Herger	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hostettler	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Houghton	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Burns	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Isakson	Royce
Buyer	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Istook	Ryun (KS)
Camp	Janklow	Saxton
Cannon	Jenkins	Schrock
Cantor	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Sessions
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Castle	Keller	Shaw
Chabot	Kelly	Shays
Chocola	Kennedy (MN)	Sherwood
Coble	King (IA)	Shimkus
Cole	King (NY)	Shuster
Collins	Kingston	Simmons
Cox	Kirk	Simpson
Crane	Kline	Smith (MI)
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cubin	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Culberson	LaHood	Souder
Cunningham	Latham	Stearns
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	Leach	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	Linder	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas (OK)	Thornberry
Doolittle	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Dreier	McCotter	Tiberi
Duncan	McCrery	Toomey
Dunn	McHugh	Turner (OH)
Ehlers	McKeon	Upton
Emerson	Mica	Vitter
English	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Everett	Miller (MI)	Wamp
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Ferguson	Moran (KS)	Weller
Flake	Murphy	Whitfield
Fletcher	Musgrave	Wicker
Foley	Myrick	Wilson (NM)
Forbes	Nethercutt	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Ney	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Northup	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Young (FL)

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Andrews	Becerra
Ackerman	Baca	Bell
Alexander	Baird	Berkley
Allen	Baldwin	Berman

Berry	Holden	Ortiz
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Pallone
Blumenauer	Hookey (OR)	Pascrell
Boswell	Hoyer	Pastor
Boucher	Inslee	Payne
Boyd	Israel	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Price (NC)
Capps	Jefferson	Rahall
Capuano	John	Reyes
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Cardoza	Jones (OH)	Ross
Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Rothman
Carson (OK)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Case	Kennedy (RI)	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kildee	Rush
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Kind	Sabo
Cooper	Kleczka	Sanchez, Linda
Costello	Kucinich	T.
Cramer	Lampson	Sanchez, Loretta
Crowley	Langevin	Sanders
Cummings	Lantos	Sandlin
Davis (AL)	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Davis (FL)	Lee	Scott (GA)
Davis (IL)	Levin	Scott (VA)
Davis (TN)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	Lofgren	Skelton
Delahunt	Lowey	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lucas (KY)	Smith (WA)
Deutsch	Lynch	Snyder
Dicks	Majette	Solis
Dingell	Maloney	Spratt
Doggett	Markey	Stark
Dooley (CA)	Marshall	Stenholm
Doyle	Matheson	Strickland
Edwards	Matsui	Stupak
Emanuel	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Engel	McCollum	Tauscher
Eshoo	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Etheridge	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Evans	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Farr	Meehan	Tierney
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Towns
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Turner (TX)
Ford	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Udall (NM)
Frost	Millender-	Van Hollen
Gonzalez	McDonald	Velazquez
Gordon	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Green (TX)	Miller, George	Waters
Grijalva	Mollohan	Watson
Gutierrez	Moore	Watt
Hall	Moran (VA)	Walden (OR)
Harman	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	
Hill	Napolitano	
Hinchee	Neal (MA)	
Hinojosa	Obey	
Hoefel	Olver	

NOT VOTING—13

Ballance	McInnis	Sweeney
Combest	McIntyre	Walden (OR)
Gephardt	Oberstar	Weldon (PA)
Jones (NC)	Paul	
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). The Chair reminds Members that there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1137

Mr. ALEXANDER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WALSH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 898

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 898.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1559, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1559.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1140

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. FOSSELLA (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today H.R. 1559 is before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to pay for the war in Iraq, the liberation of the people of Iraq, the destruction of a regime that threatens its own people, that persecutes its own people, that threatens its neighbors with weapons of mass destruction, that is a vicious, violent regime. We are at war today, and I want to say that American people can be, and I am sure they are, tremendously proud of the members of our Armed Forces.

□ 1145

I was paying tribute to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces for their tremendous dedication and their courage and their commitment and their valor and the tremendous way in which they are carrying out their mission. All Americans are proud of what these young Americans are doing.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the bill with a recorded vote and every Member in the Committee voted yes: number one, to bring the bill to the floor; number two, to show our complete support of our American Armed Forces. And I am very proud of that. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I wanted to thank the members of both parties, on both sides of the political aisle on the Committee on Appropriations who worked together to produce this product that is very similar, Mr. Chairman, to what the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, asked us to do. The major part of the appropriations provided in this bill are for the Department of Defense, and the military services, to pay for much of the activities that have already taken place and to provide additional funding to complete this effort to rid the world of a regime as the one we have seen for the last 20 years headed by Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to reserve the balance of my time at this point because I want the subcommittee chairmen who worked so hard to bring this package together to use a considerable amount of the time to explain the part of the bill on which they worked.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following tabular and extraneous material: