

be. It is time for us to lead, and so I am going to vote for this package that is coming to the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make one point, and it was specifically asked that I do so.

When we split, half our group went to Mosul, half went to Kirkuk. We met with the city council and the mayor of Kirkuk. The mayor spoke first, and the first thing he said in a very emotional way, he was a Kurd, he said, I want you to go back to the United States and tell the mothers and fathers of these soldiers that we are deeply grateful to them for the sacrifices their sons and daughters made to liberate us.

I wanted to make sure that I delivered that message. It was repeated by Shiias, Turkimenes and other Kurds who served on the city council. So I just wanted to make sure I made that point.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Again, we heard the same thing, and again I want to say my own personal thanks to all those who have served in the military operation.

I had a chance to go over right before the war with the chairman and then with the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and to go again to see the success of the military operation, but again, I want to emphasize, we have got to continue to work on this security issue, to help protect the young men and women.

Many of us have been to the various hospitals to see the wounded. It makes one's heart break that we did not have some of the equipment necessary at the right time to protect them. Now, we have put the money in the budget. We have beaten on the Defense Department to get it out there, and I think they are doing a much better job, but this was a very revealing trip, and I think we are doing the right thing, but we have got to continue to stay with it, bring in our international allies and get this job done, and if we do it right, it could be a great success.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming the balance of my time, let me say there will be much discussion today about whether we should make a loan or whether this should be a grant, that is, the \$18.5 billion piece of this.

Normally, I would have leaned in the direction of perhaps making a loan, but the difficulty with that is that there is a huge burden of almost \$200 billion on the backs of the people of Iraq, largely due to Saddam Hussein, and in the latter part of this month, there is a meeting in Spain with the donor countries, and we hope to get the likes of France and Germany and others to forgive much of that obligation so we can get this country back on track. If we are in the lending business at this moment,

that donor's conference will become a lender's conference and undermine that capability.

Further, it is very important for us to know that if we are successful in Iraq, it will set a tone for the entire Middle East, expanding the opportunity for freedom and for democratic growth within the region.

This has been a very, very important trip for the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and myself and all of those colleagues who joined us. As I said in the beginning, I have never been more proud than I was on this trip than to watch Democrats and Republicans, American Congressmen, working together on behalf of freedom.

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to myself to explain the procedure of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding under a very unusual circumstance to say the least. We will be having considerable discussion of a bill which is not yet before us but which will be before us tomorrow, assuming that the Committee on Rules brings out a rule that provides for its consideration tomorrow. Meanwhile, we will be having discussions about what the House anticipates will be on the floor tomorrow.

We have just had a half an hour description of a trip taken by one of the congressional delegations to Iraq, and we are now yielding for the next half an hour to other Members of the House who want to express their thoughts on the subject in general, and when we are finished with that half an hour, we will then be proceeding to additional debate, which is provided for on the House floor today through a unanimous consent agreement reached yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the final supplemental package. However, I do rise to express a number of concerns that I have.

This is the largest foreign aid package that any current Member of this Congress has voted for, and I do not believe that it should be left to our children and grandchildren to bear the burden of today's decision.

During the Committee on Appropriations markup of this aid package last week, I voted in favor of an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member. The gentleman from Wis-

consin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment would have transferred \$4.6 billion from the reconstruction of Iraq to the equipment needs of our brave men and women who are still in harm's way. I would again support this amendment if it were allowed to be offered in the House because I strongly believe that it is our duty and our responsibility to first ensure that every American soldier and military personnel in Iraq has the equipment they need to fight and defend themselves; secondly, that our generation should pay for it, not our children.

The gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment would have added additional funds for repairing and replacing equipment used in operations. It would have included funds to allow the Army to increase its number of active-duty troops from the current level of 480,000 to 500,000. These additional troops, enough for one full Army division, after 1 year would help relieve pressure on an already overdeployed active-duty force, but most importantly, the entire \$87 billion package would be paid for by canceling the top tax cut rate of 1 percent. The amendment restores the top tax rate to pre-2001 levels of 39.6 percent. It would have placed us in a position of not borrowing money to fight a war today that our children would have to pay for tomorrow.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

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

This is a very difficult time for me as a Member of this body to come before my colleagues and ask you to seek out, to write, to call, to e-mail and to fax your United States Congressperson, your United States Senator and the President of the United States, letting us know, America, how you feel about \$87 billion being spent on the country of Iraq at this time; \$66 billion of that is for our troops; 18 plus billion of it is for the reconstruction of Iraq.

I stand before my colleagues as an appropriator, one who has sat in two hearings on the \$18 billion of your tax money. At the same time that we are building their electricity, their water, their schools, their hospitals, ours are crumbling. I believe that we should help Iraq, and I think the American people believe that, but we should not be building Iraq better than Iraq was built before the U.S. invaded. I think that is wrong, and I think the American people should speak out on that.

We are in trying times in our own country. Many schools, many hospitals are in dire need. Our judicial system is falling and failing, and yes, we are going to rebuild their judicial system. I think something's wrong with that, and we need to speak out on that, and we need to hear from you, America, on this very question this week. As this supplemental goes this week, today, tomorrow, and probably early Friday

morning, we need to hear from you. It is your money. I am really appalled that it is going through quickly.

I strongly support giving the troops what they need for the next 3 to 6 months. This supplemental is for 15 months. How many hospitals in America will be closing during that time?

□ 1400

How many schools will be crumbling? How many people are out of work? We need investment in America. Yes, we need to help Iraq, after all, we have bombed it, with over 5,000 people killed and two or three of our soldiers being killed every day.

Terrorism is an international problem, and we must address it with leadership and with leaders. So I urge you, America, speak out, let your voices be heard. Fax, call, write or e-mail your Congressperson, U.S. Senator, and President Bush.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to individuals who may be watching these proceedings.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished 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, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for the amendment that hopefully he will be able to offer later in this debate.

It is very clear now to most Americans that the administration was planning more for war than it was for the peace after the war. The administration continued to insist that actions would be quick, easy, and inexpensive. The administration continued to tell Americans this even though they were advised otherwise. They were advised by the Council on Foreign Relations, by the James Baker Institute, the Washington Institute of Near East Policy, and the Center for Strategic International Studies. All warned of the postwar violence and the instability that would come about if we did not internationalize this effort immediately.

They also warned about the inability of the oil fields to pay for this; about the special training that was going to be needed by our troops and by an international police force; about the likelihood of post-war violence and the need, again, for a specially trained police. By now, it must be clear that that advice was not taken by this administration.

As a result, we were ill prepared for postwar Iraq. Soldiers were put needlessly in harm's way due to poor planning and the absence of proper supplies, and a mission for which they were not trained and which was properly not theirs. They were improperly equipped for the threat that they faced.

And that comes on the heels of spending \$79 billion.

The failures and the threats have become even worse, and they continue to grow. The threats are more sophisticated, more dangerous. We now see parties from outside Iraq entering into that. The borders are not secure, and hundreds of American soldiers have been killed and severely wounded.

The administration, in fact, with this first \$79 billion and its planning for postwar Iraq has failed in its duty of care it owed these soldiers and their families. Now they seek another \$87 billion. How will this be different from the first \$79 billion, and how can they justify the additional \$45 billion to \$70 billion they are coming to ask for us next?

This administration has a duty to the soldiers and the taxpayers to explain how is their safety going to be enhanced; how are we going to increase the number of bulletproof vests that are necessary, the bulletproof Humvees that are necessary. And when are we going to stop sending Guard units into this theatre with inferior equipment?

It is clear to all that we simply cannot leave Iraq. It is not good for Iraq, and it is not good for the security of America. But what we must do is insist upon a plan that will bring about real international participation, force security that our soldiers are due, and a fairness to the taxpayer. But that is not this plan, and for that reason I must vote "no."

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our ranking member on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for bringing to the floor this supplemental appropriations bill. This \$86.7 billion supplemental will help improve the quality of life for our servicemembers currently serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

I am pleased that the committee chose to continue to increase the imminent danger pay for those who continue to face danger on the front lines. The supplemental also supports a continued increase in the family separation allowance, which will help separated families cope with the cost increases associated with the deployments.

The bill also continues the authorization of per diem travel funding for family members whose servicemember may be ill or injured as a result of the activity or duty; and it would allow the Department of Defense to provide for a per diem to allow the servicemembers to purchase civilian clothing as well.

The bill would improve the security of our forces in Iraq and in Afghanistan, with \$251 million being provided to purchase additional special armor plates. These special armor plates are

in short supply in Iraq. As a matter of fact, we were told they were 37,000 short. Increased funding has been provided for modern hydration systems, for clearing unexploded ordnance, for spare parts, and other necessary field equipment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, despite these improvements, I believe more could have been done. For instance, the increase in imminent danger pay and family separation allowance increases should be permanent. Next September, servicemembers and their families should not have to wonder again and hope that Congress will do the right thing and extend the increases for another fiscal year.

Additional funds should also have been provided to support the growing number of family assistance centers that are needed, particularly for the Guard and for the Reserve.

In addition, supplemental funding could have been provided to enhance the transitional services for our injured servicemembers for whom continued military service will not be possible.

These are just a few examples of the additional improvements that could have been included in this bill but are not.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for bringing to the floor this supplemental appropriations bill for military and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This \$86.7 billion supplemental will help improve the quality of life for the service members currently serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, as well as for their families. I am pleased that the committee chose to continue the increase in imminent danger pay for those who continue to face danger on the front lines. The supplemental also supports a continued increase in the family separation allowance, which will help separated families cope with the costs increases associated with deployments away from home. Both increases would be effective for the entire 2004 fiscal year.

The bill would also continue the authorization of per diem travel funding for family members whose service member may be ill or injured as a result of service on active duty, and would also allow the Department of Defense to provide a clothing per diem allowance with which service members could purchase civilian clothing while recuperating from their injuries.

The bill would also improve the security of our forces in Iraq and Afghanistan; \$251 million has been provided to purchase additional special armor plate inserts—the armored protective plates that are in such short supply in Iraq. Increased funding has also been provided for modern hydration systems, for clearing unexploded ordnance, for spare parts and for other necessary field equipment.

Despite these improvements, I believe more could be done. For example, the increase in imminent danger pay and family separation allowance increases should be permanent. Next September, service members and their families should not have to wonder and hope that Congress will do the right thing and extend the increases from one fiscal year to the next.

Additional funds also should have been provided to support the growing number of family assistance centers that are needed, particularly for the Guard and Reserves. The majority of National Guard and Reserve families do not live near a military base and has difficulty accessing the family support programs that are provided by the services. Additional funds for family support programs would have been helpful.

In addition, supplemental funding could have been provided to enhance the transitional services for our injured service members for who continued military service will not be possible. Providing more case managers, who provide direct assistance to recovering service members, would help smooth the transition. Creating additional social workers to work with the service member and the Department of Veterans Affairs for follow on health care services and disability compensation would also improve transitional services and help prevent these vulnerable service members from suffering undue hardships.

These are just a few examples of additional improvements that could and should have been included in this bill. While I understand the difficulties the chairman faced in bringing forward a bill that would be acceptable, I believe that the committee should have made a better effort to include the amendment offered by the ranking member, Mr. OBEY, which included a number of these quality of life improvements that I have previously mentioned.

As such, I hope that my colleagues will support those amendments that seek to improve the protection of our troops and the quality of life for themselves and their families.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

The President has requested of the United States Congress, on behalf of the American people, \$87 billion to continue the conflict and build Iraq. I only have three problems with the President's request. Every penny of the \$87 billion will be borrowed, obligating this generation and future generations of working Americans to foot the bill.

It could be paid for; just suspend the tax cuts for those who earn over \$300,000. It is a time of war and conflict and sacrifice. Maybe there could be a little bit of sacrifice at the top.

Eighty-seven billion dollars is excessive. It is rife with the potential for sweetheart deals and war profiteering. There was a cement plant with a \$15 million estimate; done for \$80,000. Feed the Iraqi council, 25 people, \$5,000 a day. They canceled the contract. They think we are nuts. Mr. Al-Barak on the council says, where you spend a billion dollars, we could do the job for \$100 million. So maybe 10 percent of this money is justified.

And it is not to repair war damage; it is to build Iraq, not rebuild Iraq. The President is putting the needs of the Iraqi people first with borrowed funds.

Now, we are going to borrow money to pay Iraqis for no-show jobs, but we cannot get an extension of unemployment benefits out of the Unemploy-

ment Trust Fund. The President says we cannot afford it. We are going to borrow money to build a water system for Basra because, ah, we are appalled, they have an open unlined channel providing water. I have a city in my district in Albany, Oregon, that has an open unlined channel providing water for that city, but they cannot get help from the Federal Government because the President says there is no money. We are providing another \$50 million for the Port of Nasra. We cannot get money to dredge ports in the western United States. The President says there is no money.

Americans at home need economic security, and the young men and women who we have sent over there need their basic needs in equipment and health care and food and shelter met, and this bill fails on all those points. It is \$87 billion that is not going to meet the needs of the American people and the young men and women we have sent into harm's way.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in total support of our troops, yet I cannot deny my lingering concerns about the supplemental spending measure and the administration's priorities.

Last spring, this Congress provided \$79 billion in supplemental funding for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. And like most of my colleagues, I voted in favor of the bill and trusted that the administration's request was the result of a proper assessment of our military's needs. Imagine my shock to hear from my colleagues who visited Iraq that our soldiers and equipment are not equipped with lifesaving devices, such as top-of-the-line Kevlar inserts and armor for our Humvees.

I cannot fathom why the Department of Defense did not put our soldiers' lives as a high enough priority to provide each of them with a Kevlar insert, a lifesaving device that costs only \$517. I applaud our appropriator for making funding available in this second supplemental spending bill to provide our brave men and women this necessary protection.

I also wish to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for raising the important issue of whether these funds should be administered as loans. With more than a \$400 billion deficit and pressing needs here at home, we should be giving serious consideration to loaning these reconstruction funds to Iraq.

Our economy is sputtering along, we are not getting the international financial support we need for Iraq, and our deficit is ballooning. These are all signs that we should be seriously questioning the wisdom of granting Iraq and Afghanistan \$87 billion that could be used wisely here at home.

Mr. Speaker, Texas children are being dropped from the CHIPS rolls

and losing much-needed health insurance, yet we do not have the money to help our States protect them. Our bridges and roads are crumbling here, but we cannot pass a highway spending bill because we do not want to spend the money to put into it, yet we are supposed to have over \$18 billion to simply grant Iraq for its reconstruction. I ask my colleagues, what about this country's reconstruction?

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, our troops have my full and unwavering support. They have served our country with honor and bravery, and I am voting for them in supporting this bill. But I implore my colleagues and the administration to remember the urgent needs we have here at home and always put the needs of our country first.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration of George W. Bush has done more damage to our Nation domestically and internationally in a shorter period of time than any administration in my lifetime. In the last 3 years, this Republican Congress has made at least two grievous mistakes by acting on measures without a full and realistic assessment of the consequences.

The first mistake made over time was to pass huge tax cuts for the rich, which have drained the Treasury and created record deficits. The second was authorizing a war against Iraq based on poor intelligence and the misrepresentation of the intelligence we had.

We cannot afford a third mistake. I believe that approving the supplemental gives us the best chance of managing the consequences of the invasion. This vote is not a vote on the Iraq invasion. That question was decided a year ago. And like 132 others in this Chamber, I voted no to war, but the war was authorized. Today's vote is about where we go from here.

Our primary goals are to remove U.S. troops as quickly as possible and to leave the Iraqis with the ability to govern themselves. The sooner we provide safe and stable conditions that allow for self-government, the sooner our troops will come home. That is why, as hard as it is, we need to approve the military and reconstruction package. The alternative is to leave Iraq in a state of anarchy, a power vacuum likely filled by factional militias and terrorists.

Because of the majority's obsession with tax cuts, we are financing this \$87 billion package with debt that our children will pay in reduced services and higher taxes for decades to come. The generation that made these mistakes should pay this bill, and that is why we should freeze the tax breaks that the President has given away to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

We do not have good choices as we stand here today, but our troops need Kevlar vests and armored Humvees,

and Iraq needs money for reconstruction. They are poor choices, but I believe we need to support the supplemental.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we all support the troops. We all want to see Iraq built, or at least restored. There is only one issue that is in doubt: whether the \$18 billion goes to Iraq as a loan or as a gift.

Now, we will have two chances to vote on that issue, at least two. First, the rule will come before this House. A vote for the rule is a vote to say that we will never get an explicit vote on whether this should be a loan or a gift. If you are in favor of an \$18 billion gift out of the hides of the American taxpayer, you have to vote for the rule. If you vote against the rule, that opens it up to having a protected amendment, like one that I and others are proposing, to convert the \$18 billion from a loan to a gift.

The second opportunity will be on the Rohrabacher amendment, and there will be other amendments, when we can strike the \$18 billion. People should understand that does not mean that we do not build Iraq. Instead, that means the administration has to come forward with a loan package. So what is at issue in those votes, the only major issue that is going to be close on this floor, is whether the \$18 billion is a loan or a gift.

Now, what happens if we make it a loan? I have a plan. Step one, renounce the \$100 billion that Saddam Hussein borrowed.

□ 1415

Step two, loan \$18 billion to Iraq. Result: Iraq has \$18 billion of debt. The other approach, is to not renounce the \$100 billion except that portion, that tiny portion, which is voluntarily forgiven. So then they will owe \$60 or \$70 or \$80 billion, none of it to us. Then in 2008, in 2010, and 2012, the vast majority of Saddam's debt will be repaid.

Who gets the money? Twenty-five billion dollars to Saudi Arabia. Seventeen billion dollars to Kuwait. Seventeen to \$30 billion to the other gulf states. That is right. If you go with the plan that is in this bill now, over \$75 billion to rich oil states.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely critical that we fund our troops and the rebuilding effort in Iraq, and I think some very good arguments have been made in support of that, particularly by the gentlemen who took the trip to Iraq to see, on the ground, firsthand, what is going on over there. We have an incredible investment over there that we must see through to the end.

We must follow through on the policy and try to leave Iraq in as good a state as possible when we eventually withdraw. But the problem I have is I think we ought to pay for it. We should not simply add this \$87 billion to the already growing Federal debt. And it is fairly easy to do. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has a suggestion in his amendment to take it out of the existing tax cut but, personally, I would be open to other options that reduce spending elsewhere and cover those costs.

The problem I have with this supplemental is that it simply adds to our debt. And I know it is an incredibly important expenditure. We have had many incredibly important expenditures in the last several years, and we will have many more in the future, but at some point, those expenditures have got to add up to equal the revenue. If not, we are burdening not just future generations, I have heard that, but anyone here who plans on being alive more than 10 years in the future will also have to bear that burden of an incredibly high Federal debt, a debt that is over \$6 trillion in total and a deficit that is going to push towards \$500 billion next year.

Let us do the right thing in Iraq, but let us pay for it. Let us pay for it preferably out of the tax cut, which could easily afford to see an \$87 billion reduction but, as I said, I would have the offer to the colleagues on the other side, if there is some area of government spending that you want to cut specifically to fund it, then that is fine, but we cannot afford to continue to act like the debt does not matter. I think the most scary aspect of the debate on this subject has been the comments coming out of the administration in the last few months that have said just that, that deficits don't matter, that all of a sudden it doesn't matter if you balance your budget. That is wishful thinking and dead wrong. It matters whether or not we balance our budget. Let us start moving in the right direction and do the right thing in Iraq, but pay for it, for once.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, over the next 2 days we will be debating the President's request for \$87 billion in military reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. At the outset, I want to acknowledge the outstanding bravery and dedication shown by our men and women in uniform who are serving overseas. After visiting Iraq in August and visiting Afghanistan a year ago, I could not be more impressed with the young people who are standing in harm's way every day on our behalf. Our first priority, then, in this emergency supplemental must be to meet the needs of our troops and keep them safe. It has been alarming to learn over the past several months that many soldiers lack Kevlar vests, that there are insufficient armored vehicles, that

spare parts and other essential supplies have not reached our troops. This must be corrected immediately. It is also essential that the administration demonstrate it has a well-thought-out plan for Iraq's reconstruction.

When Ambassador Bremer testified before the Committee on International Relations, I asked him how much of the prewar planning was of use to him in the postwar period. His answer was both candid and astounding. He never read the postwar plan. He never had time to. The lack of adequate postwar planning has hurt our effort significantly. We must insist on far more planning and accountability. Any supplemental appropriation must not be a blank check but should require frequent reporting and consultation with Congress. Americans must also not bear this burden alone. It is in the profound interest of the world community that Iraq be placed on the road to self-governance and that it not be allowed to descend into chaos. The resolution which now appears likely to pass in the United Nations is a positive step forward but those words must be followed by deeds. Other nations must contribute troops and funds toward the security and reconstruction in Iraq. Moreover, private companies must not be allowed to profiteer from the vast sums expended. Open bidding processes should be used whenever possible and greater scrutiny should be applied to any and all contracts awarded. Maximum use of Iraqi labor should be employed to further obtain Iraqi support for reconstruction.

Finally, to the degree we must finance the lion's share of the military reconstruction efforts, this burden must not be allowed to fall to the very soldiers and their children in the future. We should not debt finance this war.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in yielding me time.

Congress will provide the necessary support for our troops, and we will make a significant investment in stabilizing and rebuilding Iraq. But the question before Congress is how best to provide that troop support and how to make the appropriate investment. We have already provided huge sums that were clearly not well spent. We will be approaching \$200 billion of borrowed money with no end in sight, and our troops continue to have unmet needs that were entirely foreseen.

This request has serious problems because the administration has serious credibility problems, not just with this Congress. They have a credibility problem with the American public. The people know that the administration exaggerated threats; they dismissed people who gave accurate estimates of costs and consequences; they strained the evidence, to be charitable, and they ignored or misunderstood the realities.

It was wrong to give this administration a blank check to wage unilateral war, and it is wrong to give them a blank check with vast sums of money for reconstruction. While this proposal has been improved by the Committee on Appropriations, there is still too much spent on the wrong things administered by the wrong people.

There should be a better balance between what we spend in Afghanistan and what we spend in Iraq. The leadership of the Department of Defense who overruled the professionals, who have been unable to get it right, should not be administering reconstruction. It should be done by the Department of State, especially utilizing the USAID network.

I would hope that the administration would stop whistling in the dark that this is all going according to plan, and it is going well. They should not lash out at people who are pointing out the obvious problems and flaws. This is an opportunity to have the administration display some candor, maybe a little humility, to help get everybody on the same page. Congress does no one any favors, not our troops, not our citizens, not the Iraqi people, to continue to fund and support the administration's ill-advised and shortsighted plan.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to insist that accountability is built into the supplemental appropriations. My vote, as a matter of fact, will be contingent on inclusion of an accountability provision.

The history of our Nation has proven that accountability is not only patriotic, it most often determines our greatest successes from our most tragic failures. That is why I support provisions included in the alternative proposal that require reporting on the funding for both the military and the reconstruction components of the bill. By meeting these critical reporting requirements, the administration would ensure the necessary flow of funds to our troops.

Three weeks ago, I introduced legislation that would require similar accountability, and I am pleased that these protections are included in the alternative proposal. We have an opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to regain an oversight voice that has been lost for too long in this House. It is our duty, our duty to the some 40,000 troops who are serving in combat without Kevlar inserts, our duty to their parents who have to send their sons and daughters the most basic of supplies, and it is our duty to the American taxpayers who are footing the bill, a duty to ensure that these funds are being spent in the most effective and in the most efficient way. I urge my colleagues to demand that accountability is part of this measure.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with more than 2,000 young Americans dead and injured in Iraq, we have a constitutional obligation to hold this Administration accountable. We here in Congress need to demonstrate a little more of the type of courage that our young people have shown in Iraq.

We are having this vote now because the Administration has been unwilling to build a genuine international coalition. The price of going it mostly alone is that American taxpayers continue to do most all the paying and our young men and women do most all the dying. Americans must "pay it all" because of the "know-it-all" ideologues who rejected the advice of our leading military experts, of our strongest allies and the experienced weapons inspectors.

This is not a problem of too little money, it is a problem of too little thinking and planning.

Throwing more taxpayer money at the problem has nothing to do with "standing by our troops." As the data in this chart demonstrates, if the supplemental is rejected entirely, at its current rate of spending, the Army will still have plenty of money for half a year. But the choice need not be between zero and \$87 billion. If you really want to stand by the troops, then supplement some now and force the Administration to come back no later than January 2004 with a plan to protect our troops and ensure security in Iraq. Do not give the Administration a pass on accountability and a blank check through the next election.

This vote has nothing to do about supplying Kevlar vests to our troops. It is about providing "political Kevlar" to the defenders of a failed policy.

Do not allow the failure of the Administration ideologues in business suits to continue endangering those who so bravely serve us in uniform.

This is an Administration that cannot find Osama bin Laden, cannot find Saddam Hussein, cannot find weapons of mass destruction, cannot even find the person in the White House who was responsible for illegally endangering a woman who put her life on the line working for the CIA. The only thing the Administration can find is the taxpayers' wallet, again and again.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is critically important that we get our military troops all the resources they need to safely complete their mission as soon as possible in Iraq. However, I do not support rubber-stamping this legislation so the Bush administration gets a free ride from Congress and does not have to account for its strategy in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose outright the \$18 billion in reconstruction funds in-

cluded in the supplemental and feel the Bush administration has an obligation to explain to Congress why it downplayed our role in reconstruction prior to the war. Last March, Secretary Rumsfeld told the Senate Appropriations Committee, "I don't believe that the United States has the responsibility for reconstruction. Funds can come from those various sources I mentioned, frozen assets, oil revenues and a variety of other things, including the Oil for Food which has a very substantial number of billions of dollars in it." But then the Secretary changed his mind over the last 6 months, stating last month, "Iraq is in no position to pay its current debt service, let alone take on more additional debt."

Was the administration bending the truth 6 months ago, or have events changed in Iraq to warrant these reconstruction funds? Congress deserves an answer to that question, and I do not believe we have received an adequate explanation yet.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support a supplemental that does not create accountability for the funds Congress appropriates for no-bid contracts to companies like Vice President CHENEY's old employer, Halliburton. I will not support a supplemental that does not turn the reconstruction funds into a loan rather than a grant. And I will not support a supplemental that is not paid for. If these changes were made, then I could support it, but I do not think that is going to happen. I think that this administration has the bill that they want, and so I cannot support the supplemental that is being put forward today. I think it is a mistake. I think we will regret it. I think, most importantly, we need accountability, and we are not getting it.

What about all the money that could be spent that is being spent on Iraq that could be spent here at home for the needs that we have, whether it is infrastructure, like hospitals or sewage treatment plants, or roads or highways, whatever? Instead, we are spending it on Iraq. We do not need to do it. I think it is a mistake.

□ 1430

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

I first want to say that we have for the next several hours, the next 48 hours, a general debate and a final vote on what we will do with \$87 billion of the taxpayers' money that is not paid for. Are we going to saddle our children and grandchildren with this debt? Can some of this be a loan and what is needed right away be sent out forthwith? Those are the kinds of questions, and we hope that some of the amendments will be adopted as we debate the supplemental. Iraq is not a poor country; \$2 trillion of oil reserves now can be used to secure and pay back some of this money.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we get engaged, that we speak to one another, that some of the amendments do

go forth and that we keep America strong, keep our troops healthy and protect them as God would have it.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING
AMERICA'S JEWISH COMMUNITY
ON 350TH ANNIVERSARY, SUP-
PORTING DESIGNATION OF
AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY
MONTH

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) recognizing and honoring America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary, supporting the designation of an "American Jewish History Month," and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 106

Whereas in 1654, Jewish refugees from Brazil arrived on North American shores and formally established North America's first Jewish community in New Amsterdam, now New York City;

Whereas America welcomed Jews among the millions of immigrants that streamed through our Nation's history;

Whereas the waves of Jewish immigrants arriving in America helped shape our Nation;

Whereas the American Jewish community has been intimately involved in our Nation's civic, social, economic, and cultural life;

Whereas the American Jewish community has sought to actualize the broad principles of liberty and justice that are enshrined in the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the American Jewish community is an equal participant in the religious life of our Nation;

Whereas American Jews have fought valiantly for the United States in every one of our Nation's military struggles, from the American Revolution to Operation Enduring Freedom;

Whereas not less than 16 American Jews have received the Medal of Honor;

Whereas 2004 marks the 350th anniversary of the American Jewish community;

Whereas the Library of Congress, the National Archives and Records Administration, the American Jewish Historical Society, and the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives have formed "The Commission for Commemorating 350 Years of American Jewish History" (referred to in this resolution as the "Commission") to mark this historic milestone;

Whereas the Commission will use the combined resources of its participants to promote the celebration of the Jewish experience in the United States throughout 2004; and

Whereas the Commission is designating September 2004 as "American Jewish History Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors and recognizes—

(A) the 350th anniversary of the American Jewish community; and

(B) "The Commission for Commemorating 350 Years of American Jewish History" and its efforts to plan, coordinate, and execute commemorative events celebrating 350 years of American Jewish history;

(2) supports the designation of an "American Jewish History Month"; and

(3) urges all Americans to share in this commemoration so as to have a greater appreciation of the role the American Jewish community has had in helping to defend and further the liberties and freedom of all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 106 recognizes and honors America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary. In 1654, 23 Jewish immigrants from Brazil traveled across the sea and landed in North America at New Amsterdam, which eventually became New York City. Over the next few hundred years, millions more Jews from all over the world migrated to the United States in search of a better life. Our Nation is certainly a better place because they have come here. This resolution acknowledges the contributions of Jewish Americans to this great Nation, and I commend the gentleman from my home State of Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for introducing this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a fitting way for this House to commemorate the influence of Jewish Americans on every aspect of life in our great Nation over the last 350 years. I urge all Members to support passage of House Concurrent Resolution 106.

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

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

American Jewish history commenced in 1492 with the expulsion of Jews from Spain. This action set off a period of intense Jewish migration. Seeking to escape the clutches of the Inquisition, some Jews in the 16th century sought refuge in the young Calvinist republic of the Netherlands. A century later hundreds of their descendants crossed the ocean to settle in the new Dutch colony of Recife in Brazil, where Jew-

ish communal life became possible for the first time in the New World. When Portugal recaptured this colony in 1654, its Jews scattered to the Dutch port of New Amsterdam, now New York City.

Colonial Jews never exceeded 1/10 of 1 percent of the American population; yet they established the patterns of Jewish communal life that persisted for generations. Jews lived in cosmopolitan cities like New York where there were opportunities for commerce and trade and organized synagogue communities. Charleston, Philadelphia, New York, and Newport each had one synagogue that assumed responsibility for the religious and communal needs of all local Jews. Early Jewish Americans explored, wrote poetry, and created industries. Jews have continued to make important contributions to the history and culture of America. During 2004 and 2005, 350 years of Jewish life in America will be commemorated, honored, and celebrated. Jewish immigration to America throughout the last 350 years brought with it legions of notable researchers, lawyers, statesmen, inventors, artists, authors, musicians, doctors, entrepreneurs, spiritual leaders, and Members of Congress.

This resolution honors the life, culture, and contributions of the 6.5 million Jews who live in America and those who came before them. I join the sponsors in supporting this resolution.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the sponsor of the concurrent resolution.

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

I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), who is the chief cosponsor of this concurrent resolution, and we introduced it on March 20 of this year, recognizing the 350th anniversary of Jewish communal life here in North America and encouraging all Americans to celebrate September, 2004, as American Jewish History Month in recognition of the occasion. An identical resolution was introduced in the other body by Senator VOINOVICH and Senator DEWINE.

Since 1654 when Jewish refugees from Brazil established America's first Jewish community in what is now New York City, millions of Jewish immigrants have come to America and have helped shape our American culture. House Concurrent Resolution 106 recognizes the many contributions of the American Jewish community to this great Nation's civic, social, economic, and cultural life. The resolution also notes that American Jews have fought valiantly for the United States in every one of our Nation's military struggles, from the American Revolution to Operation Enduring Freedom.