

some point tonight of striking the last word?

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, striking the last word will be in order, but I would urge our colleagues, we had 6 hours of debate under a special ruling of the House. We had another hour of debate on the rule. We had another hour of debate under general debate on the bill itself. We have had a lot of debate. However, if Members feel inclined to prolong the debate even further beyond those many hours already concluded, that would be in order.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that some Members would be interested in doing that after the last vote tonight, but as long as it will be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I might, my question is to the chairman.

What is the status of the other amendments? I appreciate the desire to move forward on this compromise, this unanimous consent. There are other amendments that are equally in order, and what is the position on those amendments?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this unanimous consent that we have propounded at this point, like the one earlier today, would have no prejudice on any other amendment that may be offered following these 11 amendments. So this does not affect anyone's right to offer their amendment that they intend to offer. It is just a matter of trying to get some cohesive organization of how we are going to proceed to conclude this bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, these amendments simply represent negotiations that we have been able to reach with the sponsors of the amendments. Negotiations are still going on with the other sponsors of the other amendments, and as those are resolved, the hope is to have other packages to bring before the House.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his comments.

Since this is a place of speech and debate, I would hope that we take our responsibility seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 396 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3289.

□ 2037

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, before consideration of any other amendment, except pro forma amendments by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments:

Number 1, an amendment by Mr. SHADEGG;

Number 2, an amendment by Mr. GOODE;

Number 3, an amendment by Mr. KIRK;

Number 4, an amendment by Mr. FILLNER;

Number 5, an amendment by Mr. SPRATT;

Number 6, an amendment by Mr. MARKEY;

Number 7, an amendment by Mr. HOLT;

Number 8, an amendment by Mr. WAXMAN;

Number 9, an amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER;

Number 10, an amendment by Mrs. MALONEY;

Number 11, an amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER; and

Number 12, an amendment by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

Each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated or a designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN:

In chapter 2 of title II, under the heading "IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND"—

(1) after the first dollar amount (page 30, line 1) insert "(reduced by \$250,000,000)"; and

(2) after the fifth dollar amount (page 30, line 5) insert "(reduced by \$250,000,000)".

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. Like the Chair, we have not seen copies of the amendments, and so I would be reserving a point of order on each one of them until I see copies.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

This supplemental includes a request by the Bush administration for an additional \$2.1 billion in oil reconstruction funds for Iraq. This request nearly triples the administration's previous estimate for Iraqi oil reconstruction costs.

□ 2045

On September 12, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I wrote to the Office of Management and Budget asking for basic details about this request and for an explanation of the enormous increase. We received no response. More than a month now has passed and the administration has provided absolutely no information to explain this vast increase.

I contacted the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the agency in charge of oil reconstruction, to ask how this request for \$2.1 billion was developed. They told me they could not provide any information because they were not involved in preparing this request; it was done by the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq.

So I contacted the CPA to ask for some basic details about how much the taxpayer has been paying Halliburton for work under the oil reconstruction contract. They said they did not know and told me to talk to the Army Corps, which had already told me they were not involved with the administration's request.

In this morning's New York Times, OMB officials said they do not know about this either. They said they would try to talk to the CPA, but that this was difficult because Baghdad is so many time zones away.

It is an Abbot and Costello "Who's on First" routine, and it might even be funny if it were not going to cost the taxpayers \$250 million in wasted money. The fact is, Halliburton, the company importing gasoline into Iraq, is overcharging U.S. taxpayers. Although gasoline, and you can see this from this chart, costs 71 cents per gallon in the gulf, Halliburton is charging

the taxpayers more than twice as much, \$1.62 to \$1.70 per gallon. This costly gasoline is then sold inside Iraq for as little as a nickel per gallon. As a result, the U.S. taxpayer loses \$1.50 or more every time a gallon of gas is sold in Iraq.

Independent experts have looked at this and have been stunned by the Halliburton inflated prices, calling them outrageously high, a huge ripoff, and highway robbery; but no committee in the House is investigating, no committee is asking Halliburton or the CPA or the Corps or OMB to justify this gouging; and it seems no one in the administration is exercising any oversight.

Enough is enough. Millions of Americans are willing to help the Iraqis, but they do not want to be fleeced. We have to stop turning a blind eye when Halliburton overcharges the taxpayers by millions of dollars. Now, I realize Halliburton is a big campaign contributor and has a special relationship with the Bush administration. I realize it would be easier to look the other way. But this has to end. We owe that to the taxpayer. And at some point everyone in this House is going to have to explain why we are making the taxpayer pay for gasoline at \$1.70 per gallon and then selling the gasoline to Iraqis for a nickel.

Our amendment is a small, but important, step in restoring some sanity to this process. It reduces the amount that will be paid to Halliburton to purchase gasoline by \$250 million. This is a conservative estimate of the amount the taxpayer will be overcharged. I urge my colleagues to end the fleecing of taxpayers and support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the cosponsor of this amendment and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I commend my good friend and colleague. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Listen to what is at stake here. Halliburton buys gas over there at 71 cents a gallon. It sells it to the Federal Government at \$1.62 to \$1.70 a gallon. They make huge sums of money at the expense of the taxpayer. This was done on a very quiet, secret no-bid contract, without anything else other than a GAO audit triggered by my good friend, and which I am happy to have assisted with, which brought this whole sorry mess to light.

In a nutshell, they are buying 190 million gallons of gasoline from Kuwait that is going to be moved into Iraq. Imagine that, the second biggest oil pool in the world is going to be getting gas and gasoline from the United States. It is going to cost something like \$1.59 per gallon. It is going to also be marked up to \$1.62. It goes for 71 cents a gallon in the market over there in the Middle East. That shows what a

fat deal they have gotten. Support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to reduce the appropriation to pay Halliburton to supply gasoline to Iraq.

From the moment Representative WAXMAN and I learned about secret no-bid contracts given to large companies like Halliburton and Bechtel for activities in Iraq we have tried to get the facts on the matter. As a result of our letter to GAO on April 8, the General Accounting Office is looking into the process of those bids.

Among those contracts was a no-bid contract to Halliburton that provided for a variety of activities dealing with oil. At first, the Administration tried to portray the contract as dealing solely with putting out oil fires. We now know it is far more extensive.

When the President sent up his supplemental request before us today, we spotted a request for an additional 2.1 billion dollars for Halliburton under its oil contract. On September 12, we wrote to OMB Director Joshua Bolten to explain the request. To date, we have not received the courtesy of a response.

What we learned is that included in the request is \$900 million to import petroleum products into Iraq. We subsequently learned some interesting facts:

As of September 18, 2003, the United States has paid Halliburton \$300 million to import 190 million gallons of gasoline. That is an average price of \$1.59 per gallon. On top of that Halliburton receives an additional fee, increasing the cost to the taxpayers to \$1.62 to \$1.70 per gallon. This gasoline is being imported from Kuwait.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the average price for gasoline in the Middle East was about 71 cents per gallon. In other words, Halliburton was collecting an additional 91 to 99 cents a gallon from the U.S. government for every gallon of gasoline. When our staffs contacted independent oil experts about such a markup, they said that if those were the prices being charged the government, it was a "huge ripoff" to the taxpayers.

According to interviews conducted by the Minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform, the gasoline is then resold to Iraqis for just 4 to 15 cents a gallon.

This oil contract is just one example of the potential ripoff of the American taxpayer through the granting of no-bid deals to companies like Halliburton. It is also an example of the attitude of this Administration that it owes absolutely no explanation of how these funds are being spent. And it is an example of the lax oversight being conducted by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in examining these deals.

The amendment simply cuts \$250 million from the oil purchase account, in order to provide for the reasonable cost of importing the oil while preventing Halliburton from price gouging the American people.

Whether price gouging occurs here in the United States or in Iraq, we should not allow it. But it is particularly disturbing in this bill, where this gouging comes at the expense of the safety and well-being of our troops in Iraq.

Perhaps in the future when Members of Congress have legitimate questions about the Administration's requests for money, we will receive answers. For now, we must send a signal that we will not pay outrageous and unjustified prices to a no-bid contractor like Halli-

burton, while failing to meet the needs of our troops.

Vote "yes" on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized in opposition to the amendment for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, under reservation of a point of order, let me, if I might, rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would seek to strike, as has been explained by the gentleman from California, would seek to strike \$256 million from the provision that allows Iraq to import petroleum products. Now that, on the surface, seems very odd. This is an oil-exporting country, and a lot of people are going to say why in the world would we be importing oil at all. That is the first question, regardless of the price that is being charged by Halliburton or any of the other contractors there. So the first issue that has to be dealt with is why are we importing oil, and the second question is why is the cost as high as it is once it is delivered at the gas pump, so to speak, in Iraq.

The reason that we have a petroleum shortage in Iraq and that we are importing oil is fourfold: one, Saddam Hussein had completely neglected the infrastructure with chronic underinvestment over the last 30 years, and this has resulted in a tremendous amount of underproduction, which leaves the infrastructure even more susceptible to sabotage and to devastation.

And that is the second point. There is criminal sabotage which is taking place. Some of us remember the pictures of Saddam Hussein releasing 100,000 prisoners last October; kind of our first hint that something big was changing in Iraq. He released 100,000 criminals, and they have been engaged, systematically, for the last several months in sabotage.

Third, there is the political sabotage by the remnants of the Baathist Party and Saddam Hussein's cronies there who continue to sabotage the oil fields in Iraq.

The fourth reason is that Saddam Hussein used the Food for Oil program for his own benefit. He established a comprehensive smuggling ring, which meant a lot of the money that was supposed to be coming and the oil that was supposed to be coming out of that were siphoned off and went elsewhere. We have clamped down on most of this smuggling activity, but it continues to be a problem.

Since the liberation, we have been working to restore the oil production,

and we are now back up to about 1.9 million barrels of oil per day. The Coalition Provisional Authority's goal is to increase that to 3 million barrels a day by December 2004. Meanwhile, the people have urgent needs for petroleum resources. They use it for cooking food, their power plants are completely dependent on oil, and of course all the vehicles in the country depend on it, as well as diesel trucks and most of the industry within Iraq.

The second question, of course, is why is this cost per gallon as expensive as it is. Well, I would challenge anybody that has not been over there to go and see what it is like to get oil in, refined products into Iraq. The main source of that is from Kuwait, refineries in Kuwait producing and shipping this into Iraq. There is a tremendous amount of sabotage and vandalism along the highways with the trucks. There is a premium that is charged for this coming in there. It is an expensive process to bring it into the country.

When we are talking about American firms that are doing this, there is a tremendous cost for security to these American firms that are bringing this oil in, these refined products in, by truck there.

If you go to neighboring countries, you will find, and this is of course largely because, or partly because of tax structures, but you will find in neighboring countries prices for petroleum countries that are as high or higher than we are talking about here in Iraq where it is very, very expensive. So it is not an unusual thing, even in the Middle East, with all of its capacity for crude petroleum products, to find that when you get the refined products, such as cooking oil, oil for gasoline for automobiles and for industry, that you will find that there is a much higher price for this.

Mr. Chairman, because of these reasons, I would suggest that this amendment is not a wise amendment. In fact, it goes exactly counter to what we want to do. If we want to get the oil production up in a way that Iraq can produce as much of its oil as necessary and refine products, then we better put as much investment as possible into that as quickly as possible, rather than doing the opposite, which is to take the money out of it, as this amendment suggests that we do.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, there are 10 minutes on this amendment. When the amendment is disposed of, the gentleman may move to strike the last word before we begin the next amendment.

Mr. McDERMOTT. When this amendment is disposed of then you can strike?

The CHAIRMAN. As a designee of the managers of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) will be postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. McDERMOTT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, would you clarify for the House what the rules are under which someone can get an additional amount of time to speak on these amendments? You have to be designated by whom?

The CHAIRMAN. When no amendment is pending, Members may rise for pro forma amendments only as the designee of the managers of the bill. In this instance, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG)

Mr. McDERMOTT. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is the only one who can give that recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) as well.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY)?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. McDERMOTT. I thank the Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KIRK:
In section 2202(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), strike "(other than paragraph (2))".

In section 2202(2), strike subparagraph (B).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, sole-source contracting should be part of our country's past and not its future. While sole-source contracting has had some limited utility, it more often leads to questions of integrity that discredit our Federal Government. I believe that

this bill should have no sole-source contracting allowed, but the base text says differently.

The text of this bill requires competitive contracting procedures to be used. But under section 2201 it provides an exception, and that exception says that sole-source contracting can be used, but only if the Congress is notified 7 days in advance.

□ 2100

But the bill goes on to then include a second exception which would allow sole-source contracting with 7 days notice following the award of a contract. Our experience has been that if a contract award is made, it is too late for effective oversight by the Congress. For me, I would hope that we would take up Ambassador Paul Bremer's commitment that none of the funds under this act be used for sole-source contracting. I recognize that in certain, very limited, circumstances we may need that, but only with 7 days prior notice to the Congress.

Let me speak as someone who used to work for the State Department. That prior notification provision will intimidate the bureaucracy so that only true emergency situations are brought for a sole-source contract. But if, on the other hand, we are allowing Congress to be out of the loop and only notified after the award of a sole-source contract, then hundreds of contract authorities now stationed in Baghdad will be able to do a noncompetitive contract.

Let me say very bluntly, I do not think that any of these sole-source contract opportunities will be misused by the Oval Office or the State Department or the Defense Department or the leadership of AID. But I am not so sure of the hundreds of other procurement officials that will be running this program. I fear that sometime next year one of them will embarrass the President, and I do not want our President to be embarrassed. That is why I hope that the House will adopt this amendment, and if it is adopted, we will allow a limited set of sole-source contracting but only after the Congress is notified in advance.

I would urge that the House adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say to my friend that this amendment strikes a very critical provision in this supplemental that provides for congressional notification 7 days before a determination is made under the procurement laws. Understand that we are dealing with a situation in Iraq where there is no electronic inventory system for supplies.

We are basically dealing with carbon paper inventory. Consequently, there is often no warning when supplies are depleted, where we need to act in a very fast manner.

Under the gentleman's amendment, we would not be able to go out and procure something that is needed without going out and finding additional bidders or waiting 7 days. Sometimes the situation does not allow for that.

Recently, it was discovered that the stock of baby formula in the country was gone, and it was not available anywhere in the country. Under the gentleman's provision, we would have had to wait 7 days before we could go out sole source, or we would have had to source it which could take up to a week or an even longer time than that.

In this particular case under the exemption, they would have been allowed to move ahead as they did, a contract was awarded using the exemption to the supplier who could provide immediate delivery. In the meantime, you would go out and source this and compete it for any longer period of time. This would be only for an emergency situation.

We had another situation where 2 days before the scheduled distribution of the new currency was to take effect, it was found there were not enough trucks or security to accomplish the distribution. You ask, how were we faced with that? Again, we are dealing not with an electronic inventory system in the country, but a carbon copy inventory. A contract was awarded very quickly using the urgency exemption to a company that could supply immediately the needed trucks and security guards for a limited, finite period. Only in those most exceptional cases should we allow sole sourcing. That is why we have agreed in our committee to a 7-day preaward notification for Congress in all but the most exceptional circumstances. But I think we are dealing with a wartime situation. There are times when you have to act and do not have time to go out and competitively compete for all the necessities you may need to fight a war. It is only in the most dire situations that we would allow this. The gentleman's amendment strikes even our ability to do that. That is why I oppose the gentleman's amendment, although, in principle, I think we are in agreement.

I think it is critical that the unusual and compelling urgency exemption in current law operate as intended in Iraq of all places where the situation is fraught with danger, and circumstances seem to change by the minute.

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I hold in my hand a letter from Citizens Against Government Waste. While they had a number of negative opinions on several amendments here,

the one amendment that Citizens Against Government Waste endorsed on this bill is my amendment, which would prevent no notice sole-source contracting.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of our committee, for giving her support to this amendment, and I would say to the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform that this amendment would send a message that the administration should use innovative techniques like indefinite quantity contracts to cover unforeseen circumstances. But it would know that in the overwhelming case, it would have to have competitive contracts and would have to go to the scrutiny of the Congress before it did any sole-source contracting.

I think to defend this President and to defend the vital work of our government in Iraq, we should send a message that all contracts should be competed and that the integrity of the process should be defended.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER:

After the appropriating clause (preceding title I), insert the following:

TITLE IA—DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES

SEC. 101. For an additional amount for elimination of the disabled veterans tax (the prohibition on concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans disability compensation), \$4,500,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, we have talked about the lack of accountability

of this administration, the poor wisdom of unilateral action, and the lack of a plan on the part of this administration, but I want to spend the few minutes that is allotted to me on priorities.

Looking at this chart, we have requested \$87 billion this evening for Iraq for a total of \$201 billion. What we spend on veterans benefits this year is less than \$62 billion; on food and nutrition 46; on education 34; on the environment 30; on housing 30. Where are our priorities? We are spending an obscene amount of money on an unwise action. But what about the troops that are coming home after they have been in Iraq? Are we going to provide for them? We have not provided sufficient money for their health care as veterans. We have not provided money for what we call concurrent receipt. My amendment says that there shall be full funding for those military retirees, for their pension and for their disability if they are so disabled. It provides the money for full funding of concurrent receipt.

Why must we do this? Why must we work for our veterans? Why must we make sure that when our young men and women come home, they are provided for? In our budget resolution of this House, we make sure that over 150,000 veterans are still waiting 6 months for their first appointment. Thousands, tens of thousands of veterans are waiting for their disability claims to be adjudicated. We have not provided enough money for their care. And we have levied a tax on our military retirees for their disability. Yes, we have a disability, a veterans disability tax on those retirees. On the one hand, they earned their pension through their service to our Nation. And we have talked a lot about support of our troops tonight, but we are not supporting them when they come home because they have to choose between getting their pension and, if they are disabled, getting their disability. They are actually having to pay for their own disability. We are making them pay for their food in the hospitals right now, except for an amendment by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations, so we are taxing them on their disability.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the priorities for this Nation. This is not the way a grateful Nation treats its young men and women who are so brave in their service whether to our Nation in Korea or Vietnam or in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Chairman, there is rumor today that the Republicans will say they have taken care of concurrent receipt. They have made a deal to cover this. What the Republicans have done, and which I urge all veterans groups to oppose, is to say those veterans with over 50 percent disability, only those will get some money, and we will phase that in over 10 years. So in the first year, they will get one-tenth of one-half of what they deserve. That is not

a way to treat the folks who we are supposed to be supporting with our supplemental today.

Let me tell you under the Republican proposal for concurrent receipt what occurs. A Vietnam retiree who is disabled by an amputation below the knee is not covered by the Republican plan for concurrent receipt. He gets no disability. He continues to pay his veterans disability tax. The Korean vet who has numbness and tissue loss in both feet because he had a cold weather injury in Korea, he gets zero disability under the Republican plan. This is not a way to treat our troops. And if you were in the Persian Gulf and have Persian Gulf War illness, and you can work with less than 50 percent of the efficiency you had before you went to war, you get no disability. The Republican plan gives very little support to those retirees who are on disability. My amendment gives full funding for disability of the retirees. Let us fund concurrent receipt. Let us vote for the Filner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Does the gentleman from Arizona still reserve his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I will make my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. That rule states, in its pertinent part, "an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." This amendment includes an emergency designation under section 502 of House Concurrent Resolution 95 of the 108th Congress and as such constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FILNER. I would, Mr. Chairman.

We have just heard some very arcane rules that are never followed by the other side. They make waivers to legislation on an appropriations bill every day. There must be dozens in this bill today. Yet, you do not want to make the exception for a bill for our military retirees for their disability, their disability payments.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, point of order. The gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. FILNER. Let the Nation know that on a technicality, the Republicans refused to fund concurrent receipt for our veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will suspend.

Mr. FILNER. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will suspend.

Mr. FILNER. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman to heed the gavel and cease his conversation.

Mr. FILNER. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would ask the courtesy of all Members to address their remarks only to the point of order and also to heed the gavel.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

As the Chair ruled on June 19, 2000, with regard to an amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001, the amendment proposes to designate an appropriation as an emergency for purposes of budget enforcement procedures. As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODE

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the aggregate amounts made available for "INTERNATIONAL DISASTER AND FAMINE ASSISTANCE" and for "INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS-CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES" to \$0.

□ 2115

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would eliminate funding for reimbursement to the United Nations for peacekeeping in Liberia and the United States foreign assistance to Liberia and Sudan. Neither account was included in the President's original request; nor, would I submit, are they relevant to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Let me be clear. The main purpose of this supplemental is Iraq, not Liberia; \$245 million for U.N. peacekeeping in Liberia is an item on the State Department's wish list. It should be considered in the course of normal appropriations in fiscal year 2005. It should not be considered here as part of an emergency to the Iraq supplemental.

I also fear that the \$100 million for Sudan and Liberia will not be utilized in a way that will be to the best interest of the United States. I am fearful that in the end that will not bring the peace and the hope for a good Liberia

and good Sudan. So I hope it would be the pleasure of this body to adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. There is a peace agreement ready to be signed in Sudan. Osama bin Laden lived in Sudan from 1991 to 1996. The terrorists who attempted to kill Mubarak came out of Sudan. Probably the weapons for Adid that killed our American soldiers in Somalia came out of Sudan. To take this money out of the administration's hands now would be a mistake. There is a civil war going on: 18 years, 2 million people killed. So that part of the amendment would just devastate what the administration is trying to do, and Members on both sides have worked very hard on this for years.

With regard to Liberia, over 250,000 persons have lost their lives in the Liberian conflict. Mass graves, 1.3 million people uprooted, women raped, atrocities under Charles Taylor. The decision to create the peacekeeping force has already been made. The administration decided that using the United Nations would allow us to bring peace and good governance to Liberia. Also, we did not want American soldiers to serve therein, and this was the substitute; so none of the 15,000 will be Americans. The U.S. voted to establish the peacekeeping mission. This is really our idea. It rests with the unanimous Security Council vote. The \$245 million is our share. If the funding in this supplemental is stricken, we will not be able to pay these bills, and we will be in arrears; and it will be a disaster for the people of Sudan and a disaster for the people of Liberia.

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if I thought \$345 million would bring peace for some time to Liberia and Sudan, I would be for it. We poured millions into Iran when the Shah was there, and we said we would have peace forever in Iran. Such did not work out. In Afghanistan we poured in tens of millions of dollars for a number of years, and what resulted? The Taliban. Then back in the 1950s and the 1960s, we poured multimillions of dollars into South Vietnam, proping up Diem, and we said that would bring peace inside Vietnam. All of that money went down the drain. If the Members want to pour more money down the drain, vote against my amendment; and they can pour \$345 million down the drain.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I appreciate what the gentleman just said about our need to oppose this amendment.

I was baffled, a little bit stunned by the gentleman's amendment and cannot understand why he would single out Liberia and Sudan to be excluded. I think it is unwise. I think his motives are questionable, and I would hope that the gentleman from Virginia's (Mr. WOLF) caucus would follow his wise leadership and guidance and not allow an issue like this to create any kind of suspicion about anyone's motives. I know that on this floor we are not supposed to question our colleagues' motives, but this is kind of an unusual amendment that just jumps out at one; and, again, I do not understand why the gentleman is doing it, but I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) thanks for opposing it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) is a good friend of mine, and we have been friends for a long time. I think we just see differences here. I would strongly urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I stand tonight in absolute opposition to the Goode amendment.

Peacekeeping forces in Liberia are critical and we should be increasing funds for these forces, not cutting vital funds.

Mr. Chairman, we watched the bodies mount at the U.S. embassy, the child soldiers take up arms, and water and food become scarce; the United States dragged its feet and produced a short, lackluster peacekeeping effort.

Today, Liberia needs more than temporary military assistance; they need a significant peacekeeping force which will allow the transitional government to take control in an environment of security and opportunity.

The United States must play a role in helping create the conditions for peace, prosperity, and long-term democracy. The Bush administration has pulled out U.S. peacekeeping troops and now is the time to commit financially to the U.N. and Ecomil effort.

Today we have an opportunity and obligation to Liberia.

To foster peace and ensure freedom, we must develop a comprehensive strategy that includes security and peace throughout all of Liberia (not just the capital of Monrovia), support the transitional government and democratic elections in 2005, and finally we must revive our commitment to Africa financially and diplomatically.

Diplomacy is the mechanism to bring about a peace, and playing our part to finance the U.N. peacekeeping mission is the way to preserve it.

I urge a "no" vote on the Goode amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY:

In chapter 1 of title I of the bill, strike paragraph (2) in the text under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide."

In chapter 1 of title I of the bill, strike the first through sixth provisos in the text under the heading "Iraq Freedom Fund".

In chapter 1 of title I of the bill, strike the second through fourth provisos in the text under the heading "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense".

Strike section 1101.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Let me begin by saying that if we pass this bill with the type of blank check transfer authority that it currently contains, we will live to regret it in this House. We will only be furthering the restoration of an unaccountable imperial Presidency, a phenomenon that many of us saw emerge during the Vietnam era, much to our Nation's regret; and we will have handed over one of the principal powers of the Constitution that is granted to this body, the power of the purse.

While there is lots of debate and discussion about President Bush's \$87 billion supplemental request for military operations, there is no discussion about how Secretary Rumsfeld and President Bush can use most of this as a slush fund pretty much any way they want.

Most of the supplemental is pretty straightforward: \$87 billion in total funding, \$64.7 billion in military spending. But buried in the supplemental, there are also a number of provisions which would grant the Bush administration broad authority to transfer billions in funding appropriated in the bill for one purpose to be instead used for a completely different purpose with only minimal congressional oversight. Nearly, listen to this, \$53 billion of the \$87 billion appropriation is subject to one or more of these retransfer or reallocation provisions.

What exactly do these blank check provisions do? Essentially they allow Secretary Rumsfeld and President Bush to create their very own slush funds that they can use for virtually whatever they want to do. Number one, there is \$1.3 billion in defense-wide operations and maintenance funds that can be transferred over for use "for payments to reimburse Pakistan, Jordan, and other key cooperating nations, for logistical and military support provided, or to be provided, to United States military operations."

So here we are essentially letting Secretary Rumsfeld take money appropriated for operations and maintenance and the military and instead using it as walking-around money to pay off countries that he thinks may be helpful to us. He decides who gets the money. He decides how much they get, and he decides whether or not those expenditures are really justified. All we are going to get back here in Congress are quarterly reports as he will tell us who he gave the money to.

Second, there is \$1.98 billion appropriated for the Iraq Freedom Fund that can be transferred over to appropriations for military personnel operations and maintenance; overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic aid. So if the Secretary does not like how the Congress has appropriated for these accounts, he can increase them by \$2 billion. Congress just gets notified about what the Secretary has done, but we have no ability to stop him.

Third, there is \$73 million in drug interdiction and counter-drug activity funds for Afghanistan which can be transferred by Secretary Rumsfeld to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; and research, development. In this section there is not even any requirement for congressional notification. The money just gets shifted out of drug interdiction.

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

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

I must say to my colleagues that I am very appreciative of the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. MARKEY) expression of concern about making sure that we control the funds that flow from us by way of the Department of Defense to a variety of our needs. But let me say to my colleagues that none of these are new authorities. Indeed, many of them were in the supplemental that we passed in April, and many are in the annual appropriations bill that was just signed into law recently.

If I could take a moment to discuss what this provision actually does, it is a provision that would prevent us from reimbursing allies like Pakistan and Jordan as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) suggested, but that was a rather straightforward thing that was discussed out front by the Department. It is money for reimbursement for military activities and support they gave us to our benefit. They were activities that we wanted to accomplish, and reimbursement was understood. It is the kind of activity that we have carried forward from time to time over especially the last couple of years since 9-11.

Among other things, the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. MARKEY) provision would specifically prevent expenditure of \$73 million in efforts to counter drug activities in the area, for example, specific drug activities I am

concerned about in Afghanistan. We are interested in drying up this problem, and we should be in it together; and I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) really means to dry that up, but that is the effect of part of what he is doing here.

It would also prevent DOD from being able to reprogram funds, as he suggests. Those funds provide flexibility for the Department, which they often need, especially in a circumstance like this when we are really in a war setting; but they do that reprogramming after approval from the authorizing in the Committee on Appropriations. It is not an unusual thing. It is a part of our regular activity. It does tend to deny the kind of flexibility that we need for these sorts of military activities, but essentially the gentleman's provision strips out language we carried in provisions of this bill and other bills, language which combines the need to give our forces all the flexibility that is a part of a very difficult region.

I am not sure that he is really getting a handle on what he had hoped to prevent that he thinks happens out there, but this is a relationship between the committees and the Department of Defense, similar to the ones that the gentleman has between his committee and the Energy Department. It is not always perfect, but it works pretty good so far.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The problem with the bill the way it is written is that, for example, the \$73 million, which we all agree should be put in for drug interdiction, could just get shifted out of drug interdiction over to a Defense Department R&D program, a procurement program. We will not have any say over that. We agree on the drug interdiction, but Rumsfeld can put it anywhere he wants.

My amendment does not cut a single nickel out of this entire budget. What it says, though, is if they want to reprogram it, they have got to come back to us. If they have changed their mind on drug interdiction, if they want \$1.3 billion in walking-around money to give to Jordan or any other country, they come back to us. They ask for our permission. This is a war in which we are the elected people of our country. This is where "no taxation without representation" started as a revolution in my district. It was about a war. It was about taxation. It was about proper representation.

I do not believe the American people want to hand over to Donald Rumsfeld and over to Condoleezza Rice and over to Wolfowitz and all of them the authority to make decisions which we, as their elected representatives greeting the body bags coming back to our district, are expected to make on behalf of our constituents.

□ 2130

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

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I have been involved in this sort of providing of flexibility for a long, long time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts was not correct in suggesting that they could reprogram money out of drug control efforts. Indeed, if they want to make some reprogramming from one drug control effort to another, they have to come to us to get our permission before the fact. Indeed, I think the gentleman is chasing after windmills that do not exist in this particular provision.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I think because the Red Sox are ahead, the gentleman has gotten really vigorous here in his opposition. He thinks he is on a roll here.

No, we have tight control over the Pentagon. They do not do anything without coming to us. They ask us for permission for everything. They come to this committee, your Committee on Appropriations, and make sure that they get what they wanted.

Mr. Chairman, we have limited them substantially from what they originally asked, and I would hope Members would oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) will be postponed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that under the unanimous consent request, pro forma amendments by the managers on each side are still allowed, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just must respond to the comments made about the necessity to leave maximum flexibility with the Pentagon. I would simply observe that we did that with the last \$60 billion that we gave them, and that is, I guess, how we came up with 40,000 troops that still did not have the Kevlar linings for their body armor; that flexibility is how we came up with an inadequate number of jammers so that our soldiers are still dying and being maimed by remotely detonated

bombs; I guess that is why some of the Humvees over there still are not protected with Kevlar blankets; and I guess that is how we came up with the recommendation from the Pentagon that still leaves 80 percent of our troops in Iraq without drinkable water.

So I think we ought to keep that in mind when we hear these general discussions about the need for "flexibility." Flexibility for people whose judgment has earned that flexibility is one thing; flexibility for people who have demonstrated an interest in keeping as much information away from the Congress as possible and who have a track record of making as many miscalculations as possible is not something that thrills me very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLT:
Page 30, lines 1 and 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$900,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) will be recognized for 5 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of problems with this legislation; the lack of planning to turn the rebuilding over to Iraqis, the lack of planning to involve other countries, the lack of attention to domestic concerns, such as the health care for our veterans, and the flexibility that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just spoke about that certainly betray a lack of planning in the sense that the Pentagon has to ask for total flexibility in how they might use the money in the future. But I would like to talk about one specific thing that is wrong with this bill.

When I was growing up, we had a phrase called "taking coals to Newcastle." It meant pointless activity, redundant activity.

The chairman might call it taking oranges to Florida, or the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) might call it taking potatoes to Idaho, or the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) might call it taking snow to Alaska.

This legislation before us today creates a new unbelievable expression for America, taking oil to Iraq. My amendment would eliminate the \$900 million of taxpayer money, American taxpayer money, that would be used to import petroleum to Iraq. Think about it. Petroleum to Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, why are we dunning our taxpayers for hundreds of millions of dollars to import petroleum products into the country which has the

second greatest oil reserves in the world?

Yes, I know the gentleman from Arizona or others will say, well, the pipelines break or the refineries are not highly efficient, and others, like the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will point out that this is gouging, that Halliburton Corporation is engaged in blatant price gouging. But I want to put all that aside and just ask, as my constituents have been asking me, does it pass the smell test for us to spend taxpayer money to import oil to Iraq?

I ask for support of my amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey has said this is like carrying coals to Newcastle, but it is not coals to Newcastle at all. We are talking about refined petroleum products. We are talking about kerosene and liquefied natural gas, the very things that will get the Iraqi people through this next winter when it gets cold over there. It seems hard to believe, having been there in August, that it gets cold, but it gets cold in the winter.

To say it is carrying coals to Newcastle is saying that a country like Guinea or Chile would never import any copper. But of course they import copper products, because they may have a lot of raw copper, but they do not necessarily make the refined copper products that may be needed, so the copper goes out and comes back as a refined product.

In this case we are talking about refined petroleum products that are absolutely vital to not just the reconstruction, but to the very lives and the very well-being of the Iraqi citizens.

This is needed by the Coalition Provisional Authority in the same way we provide food and other stocks in other nations. We have all seen examples of countries where there are vast amounts of food, but through a breakdown in communications, through a hurricane, through another natural disaster, there may be a temporary shortage.

That is exactly what we have in Iraq today, a shortage; a shortage that is brought about by a complete neglect of the system, the oil system, the entire oil infrastructure over the last several years; a breakdown that is brought about by the sabotage, the criminal sabotage and the political sabotage that is going on. The result is there are simply not the refined oil products that these people need to cook this winter, in order to keep themselves warm this winter, in order to be able to

keep their children and their infants warm.

What the gentleman is suggesting is that we cut off these stocks, this money that goes for these stocks that provide for the very existence of these people, the very chance for them to survive; not to be comfortable, but to survive during the course of this coming winter.

This is humanitarian assistance that we are talking about. If we want to assure that we are going to have trouble for our forces, if we want to assure there will continue to be attacks on our military men and women in Iraq, this is the way to do it, Mr. Chairman. This is the way to do it. Cut off the kinds of things that are absolutely vital to their very survival, and then we will have attacks on our military forces.

This is a wrong-headed, wrong idea, and we ought not to approve this amendment.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman over dramatizes. It is not as if there are no refineries operating at all. It is not as if there is no opportunity to transport refined products around the country. Sure, there are shortages. Of course, the country is disrupted. But ask the American people if they think it is appropriate to take \$900 million, when we are struggling each year to fund the LIHEAP program here, when we are struggling each year to fund the food programs for Americans, when we are struggling each year to provide basics for Americans, to, yes, take coals to Newcastle. It just seems to me that oil to Iraq says it all.

I challenge the gentleman to go home to his constituents and say, among other things that I did last week in Congress, I voted \$900 million of your money to purchase oil, petroleum products, to take to the country that has the second largest oil reserves in the world. I challenge the gentleman to do that, and I will be interested to hear the reports from back home.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would simply say the gentleman has made my point with his last comments. He concedes there are shortages. He concedes there is not the oil, the refined products, necessary to heat homes. He concedes that it is not there for them to cook, to provide for their families. He concedes that this problem exists. So he reverts instead to the argument that we should go home to our constituents and find out what they think about this.

Mr. Chairman, we are elected to be leaders here, and we have led in this body by allowing the President to implement our foreign policy and take the action he did in Iraq. We have an

obligation to follow through. We have an obligation to see this thing through to the end.

I would say that this is one of the tough ones. Yes, I will go home happily, as a matter of fact, to my constituents and say that I supported what was necessary in order to make sure that reconstruction could go forward, so that we can move as rapidly as possible to turn Iraq back to the Iraqi people and that we can have the Iraqi people provide the security for themselves so that our military forces can come home.

That is what this amendment is about, Mr. Chairman, and this amendment ought to be defeated.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MALONEY:

Page 34, line 5, insert after the colon the following: "Provided further, That \$60,000,000 shall be available for assistance to Afghan women and girls as authorized by section 103(a)(7) of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-327) and \$5,000,000 shall be available for the National Human Rights Commission of Afghanistan as authorized by section 103(a)(7)(B)(ii) of such Act."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I am offering with the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) designates \$60 million of the \$672 million in the supplemental bill before us for accelerated assistance to Afghanistan to help women and girls.

The amendment also directs \$5 million to the National Human Rights Commission of Afghanistan, established by the Bond Agreement, which is doing critical work to monitor, remedy

and create public awareness about rights abuses against women and others.

Without human rights, the Afghan project and the efforts to create a constitution are seriously threatened.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment and take the issues involved to the conference.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for their support.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SHADEGG: Page 28, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$245,000,000)".

Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$245,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant of the order of the House today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment shifts \$245 million from U.N. peacekeeping activities in Liberia to the Iraqi reconstruction account.

□ 2145

I want to make it clear at the outset that following a discussion between myself and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), along with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), it is my intention to both offer this amendment and, at the end of my remarks, to withdraw it out of deference to their concerns.

Let me make it first very clear that I am not opposed to peacekeeping efforts in Liberia. What I do believe, however, Mr. Chairman, is that this legislation, the legislation we are here to debate tonight, should be about Iraq and our efforts to secure a free, democratic, stable, and prosperous Iraq.

The funds for Liberia that are in the legislation as it cleared committee were not sought by the President and were not a part of his effort. Indeed, he made it very clear that his legislation was seeking funding for Iraq and Af-

ghanistan, and those two only. Those funds could be sought elsewhere. They could and should be a part of the normal 2004 appropriations process. They could be a part of the CJS appropriations bill, the foreign operations bill, or one of the omnibus bills that we will deal with in the future. Moreover, the U.N. mission in Liberia has yet to even request these funds or to proffer a budget for that effort.

But I want to make it clear again, this is not about Liberia. This issue tonight that we are debating is about Iraq. For that reason, I will withdraw my amendment at the end of this discussion.

I want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that I was in Iraq in August. I spent 3 days in that country. I am convinced of this, and I urge my colleagues to pay attention. I am convinced that, if anything, if we fund our effort in Iraq at the request level that the President sought, we are underfunding our military effort in Iraq, and we are underfunding our effort to reconstruct that country.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear. For 3 days in Iraq, in multiple cities in Iraq, I met with the troops there, and I met with the leaders of those troops. And they made it clear to me that these funds are essential to rebuild that country and to put the Iraqi people on our side in this struggle.

Whether one supported this war at the outset or opposed it, and I understand there is a legitimate debate on that issue, we should all be in agreement now that we must win, that failure is not an option, that we owe it to the world to establish a free, democratic, stable, and prosperous country in Iraq, both for the Iraqi people and, as well, for all of the people of the Middle East, for all of the good that it will do to end the threat that other nations had in that region of the world as a result of the Iraqi regime. We can only do that, Mr. Chairman, if we have the Iraqi people on our side. And again, I fear we are underfunding our military effort and underfunding our reconstruction effort. I am convinced in the post-Vietnam world, Mr. Chairman, that it is dangerous to engage in half measures. If we as a Nation are committed to the war against terror, then we must win in Iraq; and if we are to win in Iraq, then we must spare no effort.

I would argue, Mr. Chairman, that it is regrettable that the committee decided to reduce the President's funding request level in this legislation by \$1.7 billion. I believe that money could have protected our troops. I believe that money could have made our servicewomen and our servicemen on the ground in Iraq tonight, as we speak, safer. And I believe that because they told me when I was there that they believe this money would make their efforts safer.

Now, we can quibble about whether we should be funding a children's hospital or whether we should be funding

their electricity infrastructure or whether or not we should be funding housing needs or prison beds. But let me make it clear. The authorities on the ground there, the commander of the 101st Airborne, with whom I met, the commander of the 4th Infantry Division, with whom I met, and Ambassador Bremer, with whom I met, made it clear that this money is needed so that our troops can win the battle, can win the battle for the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people, and can defeat international terrorism as we confront it in Iraq.

Yes, terrorists are coming into that country from around the world to take us on; and, yes, we better not underfund that fight.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would have preferred to offer an amendment restoring the entire 1.7, or a little bit less than that, billion dollars that was reduced in this bill. I would note that the Senate legislation does not reduce that. But that amendment would not have been in order. The amendment I did offer to restore \$245 million was in order. But again, I do not oppose funding for Liberia, and I understand that the President made a commitment to assist with Liberia. But this money is needed. I urge my colleagues and I urge our conferees to accede to the President's request and fully support our fight for freedom and democracy in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:

In section 2202(2)(A)(ii), before the semicolon insert ", including the amount of the contract and a brief description of its scope, a discussion of how the executive agency identified and solicited offers from contractors, a list of the contractors solicited, and the justification and approval documents (as required under section 303(f)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 2534(f)(1)) on which was based the determination to use procedures other than competitive procedures".

In section 2202(2)(B)(ii), before the period insert ", including the amount of the contract and a brief description of its scope, a discussion of how the executive agency identified and solicited offers from contractors, a list of the contractors solicited, and the justification and approval documents (as required under section 303(f)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 2534(f)(1)) on which was based the determination to use procedures other than competitive procedures".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), sheds some troubling light on Halliburton's practices. I would note that the General Accounting Office has found that contracts entered into in secret, outside the framework of standard Federal contracting processes, rarely are the best buy.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are seeing a trend where the Pentagon is contracting out services at a higher rate than we have ever seen before. A recent study by the Brookings Institute found that there is one contractor for every 10 soldiers in Iraq. In fact, it has been widely reported that the USA began secretly soliciting bids from a limited pool of contractors even before the war started. Let me say that again. They were secretly soliciting bids from a limited pool of contractors before the war started.

Whether one agrees or disagrees, as I do, with this trend, we should all be troubled that many of these contracts are being awarded on a no-bid or sole-source basis. Contracts to repair and rebuild Iraq should not be the spoils of war. The awarding of no-bid or sole-source contracts to companies with known ties to prominent executive branch officials certainly gives that impression.

We should all be concerned that the pool of engineering and construction firms considered for the \$680 million contract to rebuild Iraq's power grid and the water system and airport were limited to seven companies. These contractors collectively contributed \$306 million to Federal election campaigns.

I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations recognized that there needs to be more transparency. They adopted a provision that would require congressional and public notification on future Iraqi reconstruction contracts awarded on a no-bid basis, if there are any more to be awarded. But more needs to be done, and it falls on this body to keep the administration honest. Congress, who should control the purse strings, must be the check on whether the administration abuses its capacity to enter into sole-source, no-bid contracts.

With the cost of rebuilding Iraq estimated at over \$100 billion, we need to ensure that lucrative contracts are not viewed as political favors. The selection of contractors with close ties to the members of the executive branch risks creating that very impression.

Specifically, the fact that the two most prominent beneficiaries who stand to profit from USAID sole-source or limited-source contracts are Halliburton and the Bechtel Group has not gone unnoticed. We should all be concerned about the costs associated with the no-bid contract that USAID entered into with the Houston-based Halliburton in March of 2003. As of September 25, the contract was valued at \$1.2 billion. It is steadily climbing and is projected to reach \$2 billion by the end of the contract term.

Now, why is the cost of this contract exploding? A report released today by my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gen-

tleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), sheds some troubling light on Halliburton's practices. I would note that the General Accounting Office has found that contracts entered into in secret, outside the framework of standard Federal contracting processes, rarely are the best buy.

Now, let us look at the Bechtel Group, which was USAID's choice for overseeing Iraq's entire electrical infrastructure. Recent reports suggest that Bechtel may not be up to the job. In a recent New York Times column, Paul Krugman attributes the frequent blackouts in Iraq to the fact that Bechtel has excluded local experts and institutions from their repair business. In August, Iraqi officials told The Washington Post that Bechtel has not only been slow to undertake repairs, but continues to ignore the pleas by Iraqi engineers for essential spare parts.

What is to become of the contract for the wireless telephone service? The announcement of a sole-source contract recipient was scheduled for September 5, but it keeps being delayed. Recognizing a vacuum in cell service for the Iraqi people, two Middle Eastern firms filled the void to set up a wireless system in July. However, the Coalition, led by the United States Government, promptly shut down the service, waiting for a contractor of their own choosing. I hope the fact that MCI was selected to provide cell service to Paul Bremer does not mean they will have the inside track on the Iraqi contract. Should we really be rewarding a company that perpetrated one of the largest accounting frauds in history?

As good stewards of tax dollars, we, the House of Representatives, have a responsibility to ensure an open, competitive bidding process is utilized on Iraqi reconstruction and, in those rare instances where no big contracts are entered into, a full and timely justification is made to the Congress. We must take concrete steps to reject the no-bid model and bring an end to real or perceived cronyism and war profiteering.

My amendment is a technical correction to the committee's action. It spells out that the administration must disclose to Congress prior to awarding a no-bid contract.

Under this amendment, the administration must notify Congress about the amount of the contract and a brief description of its scope. The justification would have to set forth how the executive agency identified and solicited offers from contractors. A list of the contractors solicited must also be provided.

I hope that this important amendment will pass, Mr. Chairman. I think it will greatly enhance our ability to contain no-bid contracts.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment, as the gentleman from New York has described, modifies our competition and contracting provisions and adds some addi-

tional reporting items. This one, unlike the one we debated earlier, is not opposed by the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRATT:
In chapter 1 of title I of the bill—

(1) after the heading "GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER", insert the following heading:

"Part A";

(2) strike section 1104; and

(3) add at the end of the chapter the following:

Part B

SEC. 1121. INCREASED RATES FOR HOSTILE FIRE AND IMMINENT DANGER SPECIAL PAY AND FOR FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

(a) **HOSTILE FIRE AND IMMINENT DANGER PAY.**—Section 310(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$150" and inserting "\$250".

(b) **FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.**—Section 427(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking "\$100" and inserting "\$250".

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on November 1, 2003.

(d) **FUNDING.**—In addition to other amounts provided in this chapter, there is hereby appropriated \$40,000,000 to carry out the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) during the current fiscal year, of which—

(1) \$34,000,000 is for "Military Personnel, Army";

(2) \$4,000,000 is for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps"; and

(3) \$2,000,000 is for "Military Personnel, Air Force".

SEC. 1122. INCREASE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004 IN RATE FOR HARDSHIP DUTY PAY.

(a) **INCREASE.**—For duty performed during the period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2004, section 305(a) of title 37, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting "\$600" for "\$300".

(b) **FUNDING.**—In addition to other amounts provided in this chapter, there is hereby appropriated \$275,000,000 to carry out subsection (a), of which—

(1) \$233,800,000 is for "Military Personnel, Army";

(2) \$27,500,000 is for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps"; and

(3) \$13,800,000 is for "Military Personnel, Air Force".

SEC. 1123. USE OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING TO ELIMINATE OUT-OF-POCKET HOUSING COSTS FOR MEMBERS.

(a) **POLICY.**—Section 403(b)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "In prescribing the rates of the basic allowance for housing under this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the rates are sufficient to eliminate, not later than January 1, 2004, out-of-pocket housing costs for

members entitled to the allowance to obtain adequate housing in that military housing area.”.

(b) FUNDING.—In addition to other amounts provided in this chapter, there is hereby appropriated \$190,000,000 to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a) during the current fiscal year, of which—

(1) \$55,100,000 is for “Military Personnel, Army”;

(2) \$57,000,000 is for “Military Personnel, Navy”;

(3) \$17,100,000 is for “Military Personnel, Marine Corps”; and

(4) \$60,800,000 is for “Military Personnel, Air Force”.

SEC. 1124. INCREASE IN SUPPORT FOR RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD FAMILY ASSISTANCE CENTERS.

(a) FUNDING.—In addition to other amounts provided in this chapter, there is hereby appropriated—

(1) for “Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve”, \$3,900,000;

(2) for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, \$42,000,000; and

(3) for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, \$2,000,000.

(b) PURPOSE.—Amounts appropriated by subsection (a) are available only for Department of Defense family assistance centers.

SEC. 1125. PERMANENT ELIMINATION OF SUBSISTENCE FEE FOR MEMBERS HOSPITALIZED FOR WOUNDS RECEIVED WHILE IN COMBAT OR TRAINING.

Subsection (c) of section 1075 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 8146(a)(2) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-87)), is repealed.

SEC. 1126. FREE TELEPHONE AND INTERNET SERVICE FOR MEMBERS DEPLOYED TO A COMBAT ZONE.

(a) PREPAID PHONE CARDS.—Beginning on the first day of the first month following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish and carry out a program to provide prepaid phone cards to members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in a combat zone. The value of the benefit shall be at least \$50 per month per person.

(b) TELEPHONE AND INTERNET SERVICE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary should seek to provide free telephone and internet access to members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in a combat zone.

(c) FUNDING.—In addition to other amounts provided in this chapter, there is hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2004 an additional amount of \$63,800,000 to be available for the purposes of this section, of which—

(1) \$54,200,000 is for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”;

(2) \$6,400,000 is for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”; and

(3) \$3,200,000 is for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”.

SEC. 1127. GOVERNMENT-PAID TRAVEL UNDER REST AND RECUPERATION LEAVE PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS SERVING ONE YEAR OR MORE IN-THEATRE.

(a) TRAVEL ALLOWANCES AUTHORIZED.—In the case of a member of the Armed Forces serving outside of the United States for a period of one year or more who is granted rest and recuperative leave, and provided the travel and transportation allowances authorized by section 411c(a) of title 37, United States Code, in connection with that leave, the Secretary of Defense shall also pay the member for transportation, or provide transportation for the member, between—

(1) the locations specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of such section; and

(2) the permanent duty station of the member, the home of record of the member, or other location in the United States or overseas approved by the Secretary.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to travel commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act in connection with rest and recuperative leave described in subsection (a).

(c) FUNDING.—In addition to other amounts provided in this chapter, there is hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2004 an additional amount of \$50,000,000 to be available for the purposes of this section, of which—

(1) \$42,500,000 is for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”;

(2) \$5,000,000 is for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”; and

(3) \$2,500,000 is for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”.

SEC. 1128. MILITARY CAMPAIGN MEDALS TO RECOGNIZE SERVICE IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM AND OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The President shall establish a campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and a separate campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by the President, eligibility for a campaign medal established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be set forth in uniform regulations to be prescribed by the Secretaries of the military departments and approved by the Secretary of Defense or in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 1129. ENHANCED TRANSITION ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED SERVICEMEMBERS RETURNING TO CIVILIAN LIFE.

(a) APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to other amounts provided in this chapter, there is hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2004 an additional amount of \$50,000,000 for “Defense Health Program” to be available for transition assistance for disabled members of the Armed Forces, as provided in subsection (b).

(b) PURPOSE.—The amount appropriated by subsection (a) shall be used

(1) to increase the number of personnel within the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense assigned as case managers and discharge planners with responsibility for managing the case of a member of the Armed Forces who is considered to be very seriously ill, seriously ill, or in a Special Category; and

(2) to provide additional funds to assist service members who are in transition.

SEC. 1130. POLICY ON NOTIFICATION OF UPCOMING MOBILIZATION TO BE PROVIDED TO RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS.

(a) POLICY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a policy and process that provides the maximum amount of notice for members of the reserve components who are being mobilized. The Secretary shall ensure that such notification of mobilization provided to a reserve component member include information on the timing and duration of the mobilization of that member.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of the policy established pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 1131. ABOVE-THE-LINE INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR OVERNIGHT TRAVEL EXPENSES OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE MEMBERS.

(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to certain trade or business expenses) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (p) as subsection (q); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (o) the following new subsection:

“(p) TREATMENT OF EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENT OF ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), in the case of an individual who performs services as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States at any time during the taxable year, such individual shall be deemed to be away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business for any period during which such individual is away from home in connection with such service.”.

(b) DEDUCTION ALLOWED WHETHER OR NOT TAXPAYER ELECTS TO ITEMIZE.—Section 62(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to certain trade and business deductions of employees) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) CERTAIN EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES.—The deductions allowed by section 162 which consist of expenses, determined at a rate not in excess of the rates for travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, paid or incurred by the taxpayer in connection with the performance of services by such taxpayer as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States for any period during which such individual is more than 100 miles away from home in connection with such services.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2002.

SEC. 1132. EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME OF CERTAIN DEATH GRATUITY PAYMENTS TO MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 134(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to certain military benefits) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) EXCEPTION FOR DEATH GRATUITY INCREASE.—Subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting ‘December 31, 1991’ for ‘September 9, 1986’ in the case of a death gratuity payable under chapter 75 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to a death occurring after September 10, 2001.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 134(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid with respect to deaths occurring after September 10, 2001.

SEC. 1133. LOANS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY QUALIFIED RESERVISTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may make loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) to small business concerns owned and controlled by qualified reservists.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636), the following special rules apply to loans described in subsection (a):

(1) PURPOSE OF LOANS.—The Administrator may make such loans for any business purpose, including the refinancing of any outstanding business debt.

(2) DEFERRAL OF PAYMENTS WITHOUT INTEREST.—No payment of principal on any such loan shall be due or payable before December 31, 2004. Any interest payable with respect to

such loan for any period ending before January 1, 2005, shall be paid by the Administration.

(3) AMOUNT OF LOANS.—Any such loan may be made if the total amount outstanding and committed to the borrower under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) would not exceed \$3,000,000.

(4) GUARANTEED LOANS.—In the case of an agreement to participate on a deferred basis in any such loan—

(A) PARTICIPATION.—Such participation by the Administration shall be equal to 50 percent of the balance of the financing outstanding at the time of disbursement of the loan.

(B) GUARANTEE FEES.—The Administrator shall collect (except in the case of a loan that is repayable in 1 year or less) a guarantee fee, which shall be payable by the participating lender, and may be charged to the borrower as follows:

(i) A guarantee fee equal to 0.5 percent of the deferred participation share of a total loan amount that is not more than \$150,000.

(ii) A guarantee fee equal to 1.5 percent of the deferred participation share of a total loan amount that is more than \$150,000, but not more than \$700,000.

(iii) A guarantee fee equal to 2 percent of the deferred participation share of a total loan amount that is more than \$700,000.

(C) ANNUAL FEES.—The annual fee assessed and collected on any such loan shall not exceed an amount equal to 0.15 percent of the outstanding balance of the deferred participation share of the loan.

(5) CREDIT ELSEWHERE.—The Administrator may make such loans without regard to the ability of a small business concern to obtain credit elsewhere.

(6) COLLATERAL.—The Administrator may make such loans without regard to the adequacy or availability of collateral to secure such loans.

(7) LOAN FORGIVENESS.—Upon application by a borrower suffering severe economic hardship, the Administrator may undertake all or part of the small business concern's obligation to make the required payments under such loan, or may forgive all or part of such obligation if the loan was a direct loan made by the Administrator, if, and to the extent that, the Administrator finds that the inability of the qualified reservist to repay such loan is due to his service on active duty.

(C) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY QUALIFIED RESERVISTS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term "small business concern owned and controlled by qualified reservists" means any small business concern if—

(A) at least 51 percent of the concern is owned by one or more qualified reservists or, in the case of any publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of the stock of which is owned by one or more qualified reservists; and

(B) the management and daily business operations of the business are controlled by one or more qualified reservists.

(2) QUALIFIED RESERVIST.—The term "qualified reservist" means any member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who has, at any time, been ordered to report for a period of active duty which is 179 days or longer.

(3) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term "small business concern" has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and relevant regulations promulgated thereunder, except that if the Administrator determines it to be necessary or appropriate, the Administrator may waive any size standard established under such section with respect to a business

concern that does not exceed 150 percent of each size standard applicable to such concern.

(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purpose of this section, the terms "Administrator", "Administration", and "credit elsewhere" have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(e) FUNDING.—There is hereby appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 1134. VOCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR QUALIFIED RESERVISTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In accordance with this section, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall make grants to small business development centers to enable such centers to provide to qualified reservists a program of assistance that includes training in a vocational or technical trade and entrepreneurial assistance in establishing and operating a small business concern that provides services in such trade.

(b) MINIMUM GRANT.—The Administrator shall not make a grant under this section for an amount less than \$500,000.

(c) APPLICATION AND AWARD.—Each small business development center seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form as the Administrator may require. The application shall include information regarding the applicant's goals and objectives for the program of assistance described in subsection (a). In awarding the grants, the Administrator shall consider the needs of the area served by the small business development center, including whether the small business development center is located in the proximity of a United States military installation.

(d) QUALIFIED RESERVIST.—For purposes of this section, the term "qualified reservist" means any member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who has, at any time, been ordered to report for a period of active duty which is 179 days or longer.

(e) COORDINATION WITH SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—Grants made under this section shall not be taken into account for purposes of section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648).

(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(2) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The term "small business development center" means a small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648).

(g) FUNDING.—There is hereby appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, to remain available until expended.

In chapter 2 of title II, in the text under the heading "Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund", insert "(reduced by \$820,000,000)" after the aggregate dollar amount and after the dollar amount specifying funds for the electric sector.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment actually consists of a number of different provisions, all designed to enhance the quality of life of our troops, the men and women in the front lines in Iraq and Afghanistan. I do not believe that these brave Americans should be left out of this supplemental.

Read this \$87 billion bill, however, and we will find there is very little in it for them. We will find every conceivable benefit for Iraq and Iraqis; but we will find very, very little for our own troops, and these are the ones who won the war in 3 weeks. These are the ones who saved Iraq from catastrophe in postwar chaos. These are the ones who right now are carrying out the reconstruction of Iraq, a thankless job in which they take casualties almost every day.

These provisions that I offer in this amendment would lighten their burdens just a bit, both in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and, to some extent, ease their families' burdens back home. These provisions would say thank you. They have not been able to savor victory because of the chaos that followed the war. It would say to them, we appreciate and understand and are grateful for what you are doing.

The cost, the cost is less than 1 percent of this entire package. Surely we can scrub this package down and provide 1 percent as a way of saying thank you to our troops.

What is in it? Hostile fire pay, imminent danger pay, combat pay. The chairman of this subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Defense, last year raised imminent danger pay and raised family separation pay, to his great credit. Let us make it permanent. Let us take imminent danger pay and raise it up to \$250. Add that to family separation pay, and it means every time a father or a mother goes into a field of combat and is faced with shots fired at them every day, if they are in imminent danger, they will get \$500. I do not think that is too much to ask.

The Pentagon wanted the increase in imminent danger pay and family separation pay to revert to its prior level. Once again, the Subcommittee on Defense did not stand for that. The Pentagon then said, let us, instead of paying imminent danger pay, have hardship pay, and requested that it be increased up to \$600 a month. It is discretionary with the commanders; it has to be approved by the Department of Defense. It would have provided this in lieu of family separation pay or at least in lieu of imminent danger pay. It is a bad idea. But I picked up on the basic idea, if the Pentagon thinks that discretionary pay like this for living in abysmal, miserable conditions ought to be raised to \$600 so that the division commander will have at his disposal and use at his discretion with Pentagon approval, then let us do it, and that is what this particular amendment would provide.

Several years ago, provision number three, we set out to say to those enlisted personnel who have families and

live off base, we want you to be able to live off base with your base housing allowance and not have to dig into your own pocket to pay some of the costs. We have gradually, step by step every year, implemented this plan. We simply say here, to ease the burden on the families back home, we are going to implement it all together next year instead of making you wait 2 years.

□ 2200

Family assistance centers. There are lots of Reservists and Guard personnel. You have had them call you. They have called me. They have got problems. They are stressed out. They have businesses they owned and they are finding it hard to operate because a family member has been deployed.

This would provide the family assistance centers who help these folks with money that it is acknowledged they are short of, \$48 million short. This would give them \$48 million to meet the needs of the Guard and Reserve who call on them frequently.

If you have been to Iraq, you know that the troops, when you meet with them, all tell you that the telephone service is pretty spotty. Some feel that they are being scalped. Some feel that they cannot get to telephone or Internet, not nearly easy enough, in any event. We say to this we want DOD to correct that, and we want to give the troops access to a discounted telephone card, at least up to \$50 a month.

Here is one that is really popular. And I think it will probably emerge as part of this bill. But let us say tonight, we give it some recognition on the House floor. I went to Bosnia several years ago, and the biggest complaint I found amongst troops there who had been deployed for longer than they expected was that even though they got R&R in some cases, they would go back to Fort Bragg or somewhere like that, and they would get dropped in and it was on them, it was up to them to get home to El Paso or Fresno, California, wherever it might be.

The proposal is very simple. When we give troops R&R, let us give them a ticket to go all the way and come all the way back. It costs a little money, but it is the least we can do.

We had very affecting testimony before our committee by General Jack Keane, very affecting testimony. He told of going out to Walter Reed and seeing a soldier who was blind and lost one arm. He said we want to provide transition assistance to these soldiers. We provide that transition assistance.

This is a package full of things that have been whittled down. They are good provisions. I know what the gentleman is about to say. I wish I could talk him into accepting this, but if he does not accept it on a point of order, a technicality, I hope he will remember some of these things in conference.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I guess this is a parliamentary inquiry. I, frankly, would like to be able yield to the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) a minute of my time before I express my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentlemen claims the time in opposition to the amendment, the gentleman will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition and am happy to yield a minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). I would like to hear the rest of his statement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I am flattered. I hope this means we are about to close the deal.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, beyond being charming, I agree with most of what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is saying.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I will take a minute or two, if I could.

As I was saying, General Keane came before our committee and said that he had been to Walter Reed and he met there a young soldier who had lost his eyesight and lost a limb, badly injured. You may have heard this story. He said, "We cannot put that soldier back in the Army. We would love to do it, and he would love to come back because he has been a good troop. But I tell you what we can do," he said, "we can give him a mentor to help him every step of the way. We can see that he can learn to read braille. We can help him get a college education. We can reintegrate him into civil society again, into the civilian society again."

But it will cost money to do all of those things. That money is not in this bill. We put \$50 million in there so that Jack Keane's vision can become a reality. Good provision.

There are a number of other provisions in there. There is one in particular that I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, and that is small business loans for Reservists. I am reacting to problems I am hearing from Guard and Reserve people who have left behind small businesses, a dry cleaner in one instance, their wife is trying to run it. They will probably going to need to borrow some money before it is all over with.

Surely, we could put something in the bill somewhere for the SBA to help these folks obtain a loan to keep their business going.

Finally, there is a bill here at the desk which would provide a deduction for Reservists and Guard personnel who travel more than a certain distance to get to their point of duty or for deployment. It is right here at the desk. We ought to take that bill and make those expenses deductible.

Exempts the \$6,000 death gratuity from income taxes. This is another idea with bipartisan support. The death gratuity, modest as it is, should not be subject to federal income taxes. My amendment would ensure that it is not.

This amendment provides \$50 million to enhance DOD-VA transition programs for disabled service members. At an Armed Services Committee hearing a couple of months ago, General Jack Keane, Vice Chief of Staff of the

Army, talked of a serviceman blinded and badly injured in Iraq. He told our committee that the Army was going to take care of the young man, but he was more specific than that. He spoke of mentoring him, of helping him go to college, and providing him with training so that he could reintegrate into civilian life. This is the right thing to do, but it will not be easy or free. My amendment provides resources to help make General Keane's vision a reality for our disabled veterans.

My amendment contains several other provisions, also designed to provide a lift to our troops and their families. Some of these provisions may be subject to points of order, but they are all moves that would directly benefit America's fighting men and women and the families.

My amendment would take the increases (to \$250/month) in committee bill and make that higher level permanent. In so doing, the Congress can address an area of real uncertainty that has brought anxiety to many troops; just ask your state's Adjutant General.

This provision would permanently eliminate the \$8.10 daily subsistence charge imposed on wounded servicemembers who are hospitalized. I want to take Chairman BILL YOUNG's praiseworthy idea to eliminate the daily subsistence fee and make it the law, rather than a temporary, FY 2004-only, fix.

Requires separate campaign medals for service in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. I believe the men and women who risked their lives to depose Saddam's regime deserve recognition that is distinct from the recognition we rightly award to those who successfully fought the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Directs DOD to provide maximum advance notice to mobilized Guard and Reserve personnel on the timing and duration of their duty.

* * * * *

Provides \$25 million for SBA grants for vocational or technical training for reserve-owned small businesses. For the same reason I believe we should offer low-interest loans to distressed Guardsmen and Reservists, my amendment would also fund a modest program of grants to reservists who need them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague's expression of concern here. I must say that this Member feels very strongly about the relationship between authorizing committees and the Committee on Appropriations. He is an able member of the authorizing committee. I certainly do not want to impose appropriators' position on their work. So I encourage him to consider a lot of these things by way of the authorizing process, and then we will talk about it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and continues and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, thus, dealing with the authorizers' business, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states specifically in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if it is changing existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, some parts of this clearly are germane and applicable, even under the rule that prohibits us from legislating on an appropriations bill. I would say to the chairman, who I have great respect for, this bill should have gone, the \$87 billion bill has enough policy in it, enough money in it that it should have gone through the typical two-step process. The authorizing committee should have had a hand in it and we did not. We asked for it and did not have that opportunity.

In light of that, I would ask him to take a broader view of what happens here on the House floor in the appropriations process to acknowledge the fact that we did not get a chance to put it through committee and, therefore, give us a chance to make a little bit of law, which is not very complicated law. Most of this stuff has been around a long time. We whittled down a package of old ideas to deal with inequities and deficiencies and shortcomings in personnel policy. This stuff has been around a long time. It is not complicated. There is no reason we should not be able to add it to an appropriations bill. As my colleague knows from writing many appropriations bills, there are often a lot more complicated authorizations in it than this particular one.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I know it is obvious to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) that I look forward to continuing to work with him.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can accomplish some of this before that bill comes out of committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that this amendment directly amends existing law. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:
Page 29, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$500,000,000)".

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$192,000,000)".

Page 33, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$174,750,000)".

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$17,250,000)".

Page 36, line 22, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$35,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago the United States went back to Afghanistan, a troubled nation we had largely abandoned after the collapse of the former Soviet Union. The conflict in Afghanistan including the war with the Soviet Union has left about 2 million people dead, created 700,000 widows and orphans. While we must help both Iraq and Afghanistan, Afghanistan, in fact, is larger, it has more people, it is poorer, and has been more devastated under decades of unrest and war.

For example, the United Nations estimates that 5 to 7 million unexploded land mines are scattered throughout the country. An estimated 400,000 Afghans have been killed or wounded by land mines producing the highest per capita number of amputees in the world.

One in 12 Afghan women die during childbirth, the highest maternal mortality rate in the world. Over a quarter of these children die before reaching age five. And Afghanistan has the lowest per person caloric intake in the world. I could go on and on.

The fact is that we have a serious problem that remains in Afghanistan. The NATO troops have little control outside the areas of Kabul. Suicide bombings and assassination attempts by the Taliban and al Qaeda remnants have persisted. Even President Karzai's life is in danger every day. The drug and crime rate are on the rise. After the fall of the Taliban, Afghanistan, once again, has become the world's top opium producer.

The Committee on Appropriations, I commend them for recognizing these burdens. I commend my colleagues for adding an additional \$400 million above the administration's request. But it is not enough to meet these huge unmet needs, which could total as high as \$30 billion over the next decade and are wildly disproportionate to what we are putting in Iraq.

There is no shortage of need and the bottom line is that we can do more. Even after the \$500 million that this amendment would remove from Iraqi reconstruction, that nation will still be receiving the most generous aid package in history. We can spend more money this next year. Our efforts in Afghanistan have been largely self-limited, not just by a lack of money in the budget, but we have had a determination to keep a small footprint on the ground for security reasons.

My amendment addresses this issue by doubling to over \$34 million the funding available for security requirements that would directly support personnel who would be implementing the assistance. The amendment would increase administrative capacity by \$20 million. Simple little things like giv-

ing these people a fixed-wing aircraft that could have six to 12 people flying around Afghanistan could dramatically increase their productivity. It is an outrage that we do not do it.

This amendment would address the land mine and unexploded ordnance issue by doubling to \$70 million funding for demining operations.

Overall, this amendment increases aid to Afghanistan by \$247 million, provides the security and operating expense needed for assistance to be granted more efficiently. This is a country still in agony and things can get worse. Our progress is simply too slow after 2 years, and we can do something about it tonight.

Afghanistan is this country where the al Qaeda threat was real and remains. We need to make sure that Afghanistan does not once again spiral out of control.

This amendment increases security, increases our capacity, accelerates process, and saves the taxpayer one-quarter of a billion dollars.

I urge my colleagues to vote to increase aid to perhaps the most damaged nation in the world and vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment, but as I have privately said to my friend from Oregon, we do believe that we are on the same philosophical page. We are just arguing about different dollar amounts.

I am opposed to it, though, for two different reasons, really. Number one, we have increased these accounts, and we have increased it in opposition of what the administration originally requested. So the House did take into account the need, and we did bump things up. For example, USAID, we are increasing it \$40 million. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is at \$60 million.

In terms of the economic support fund, we have increased it \$272 million; he is at \$864. For diplomatic security, we are at \$17 million; he is at \$34 million. As far as the demining account, we have increased it to \$35 million, and I believe the gentleman is at \$70 million.

But we have already taken money out of Iraq and out of the administration's request, and that is in the report outlined on page 22. And we also recognize the need for so many of these projects that the gentleman from Oregon in his amendment is supporting.

For example, we have a major, a major push to finish the road from Kabul to Kandahar. And the gentleman, I think, has been to Afghanistan, as has this committee. And I hope that that road goes all the way to Bagram, eventually. But the road is a top priority of this committee.

Also, we are pushing for private sector development and power generation

is a top priority of the committee. We are also asking for help with infrastructure in Afghanistan and schools and myriad of other things.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) had mentioned also about the need for an airplane. We actually in a different portion of this to instruct USAID to get that aircraft that the gentleman mentioned. That is on page 15 of the report, where we require the use of dedicated, contract air service within Afghanistan.

So many of the things that this amendment supports, the committee is supporting. And also, we have taken the money out of Iraq. We have taken the lower-lying fruit and lower-hanging fruit out of the account.

And that leads me to the second reason why I oppose this amendment. And that is that what we are doing, if we accept this amendment, is we are reducing the money by \$500 million that would go to Iraq's reconstruction. We do not know where that money is coming from, Mr. Chairman. Will it come out of electricity, will it come out of schools, will it come out of roads? Where it will come from? Because what we have already done when we have taken the money out of what the subcommittee recommended is we identified certain areas in Iraq that we thought the money could be shifted to Afghanistan.

But this amendment, while it is very specific on where it should be spent in Afghanistan, it is not specific on where it should not be spent in Iraq.

And because of that, we believe, the subcommittee and the full committee, the bill is already scrubbed fairly well and that, at this point, it would be unwise to accept this amendment.

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

□ 2215

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I will take 15 seconds. I will quickly thank the gentleman for bringing these important issues to our attention, and I know that the chairman of the committee shares the gentleman's views of the importance of the funding for Afghanistan. I hope that we can work with the gentleman as we approach the 2004 conference bill and work together to increase funding and investment in Afghanistan.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate what my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), has said and the work that the subcommittee and the full committee have done. But the fact remains we are investing more than 15 times as much in Iraq as in Afghanistan. We cannot spend all that money in Iraq in the next year. We can put more money on the ground to help this troubled nation. And I look forward to working with the committee to see if we can ad-

vance a little more progress in that troubled country.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying we will continue to work with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). As the gentleman knows, the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), has a particular passion about reconstruction in Afghanistan, and this subcommittee will remain committed to it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude, though, by saying the urgency in Iraq right now to try to get the reconstruction efforts jump-started for the world community, we think, is very important; and we do not want to take money out of it that is not being identified as to where the money will come from. For that reason, we will oppose the amendment, but again want to say to my friend that we will work with him.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

Page 23, beginning on line 13, strike "or the Global War on Terrorism".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very straightforward amendment. It would simply strike the "Global War on Terrorism" segment of section 1301, hence prohibiting the Secretary of Defense the ability to carry out military construction projects in excess of \$1.5 million outside Iraq without the prior notification to Congress.

This emergency supplemental was not intended to broadly fund the global war on terrorism, but to finance emergency defense and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I am deeply concerned with section 1301 of the bill which grants the Secretary of Defense broad authority to carry out up to \$500 million in military construction projects outside the United States without the prior approval of Congress.

The supplemental appropriations bill we are discussing today is not intended to be a slush fund for the Secretary of Defense. And if my amendment is approved, the Secretary of Defense would still, would still be able to use the new temporary authority to make temporary constructions in Iraq for up to \$500 million. The Secretary would also maintain his ability to use the operations and maintenance budget to construct temporary military installations overseas with a cost of up to \$1.5 million.

Let us keep in mind that these are supposed to be temporary structures, according to the bill, "the minimum necessary to meet the temporary operational requirements."

It is my understanding that most of the construction projects we are talking about cost \$250,000 or less. So \$1.5 million is more than a generous ceiling for projects without congressional approval.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to support responsible congressional oversight over our military construction spending overseas.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern about this provision. But I must urge everybody in this Chamber to vote against this amendment. This amendment causes very serious strategic consequences for our military personnel in the field fighting the war on terrorism.

The war on terrorism is not confined to just one area. It could be most anywhere. In essence, the Sanchez amendment prohibits our troops from constructing strategically important projects necessary to fight the war on terrorism until Congress agreed that they were necessary. This level of micromanagement is inappropriate, especially in wartime conditions, when real-time decisions must be made quickly and troops cannot wait for the committee in Congress to agree. Our troops in the field need this flexibility.

Though the amendment excludes Iraq from its effects, it precludes construction projects in Afghanistan and in other areas, that might become part of the global war on terrorism, from moving forward expeditiously. This level of micromanagement is especially awkward if the war on terrorism expands in an unexpected fashion.

In addition, the bill already includes a requirement that DOD notify the Congress four times a year about any projects constructed under this limited authority. I can assure my colleagues in the Chamber that my subcommittee, the MILCON committee, the Subcommittee on Defense, the House Committee on Armed Services will watch very carefully in a very careful manner how DOD uses this authority. And like

the gentlewoman points out, authorizing military construction projects should not be bypassed without extremely good reasons. However, in this case I believe the oversight I have just mentioned gives the oversight over this provision included in the bill to be sufficient to ensure that DOD does not misuse its authority.

I urge Members to vote against the Sanchez amendment.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just remind my colleague that the first \$60 billion we spent on this has been unaccounted for. In fact, we had the Department of Defense before us, and even one of the chairmen from appropriations said he could not tell us where all that \$60 billion, or even some of it really, had been spent.

So we are really talking here about reasonable oversight and accountability, especially notice alone. Notice. That merely gives Congress the prerogative to maintain oversight while funds are being executed. To say that field commanders should not be accountable runs contrary to common sense and historic practice.

Can opponents cite one example of how a notice provision cost lives or undermined a mission? The answer is no. This is about accountability. And the Secretary of Defense still has other funds available, other abilities. We are talking about temporary structures, most of which are under \$250,000.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say in response to the gentlewoman's comments, I can assure the gentlewoman that we know about every penny that is spent in the MILCON bill.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Once again, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to support responsible congressional oversight on our military construction spending overseas.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, proceedings

will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), an amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), an amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), and an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 15-minute vote followed by four 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 224, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—197

Abercrombie	Dicks	Kildee
Ackerman	Dingell	Kilpatrick
Allen	Doggett	Kind
Andrews	Dooley (CA)	Klecza
Baca	Doyle	Kucinich
Baird	Duncan	Lampson
Baldwin	Edwards	Langevin
Ballance	Emanuel	Lantos
Bartlett (MD)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Barton (TX)	Eshoo	Lee
Becerra	Etheridge	Levin
Bell	Evans	Lewis (GA)
Berkley	Farr	Lofgren
Berman	Fattah	Lowey
Berry	Filner	Lucas (KY)
Bishop (GA)	Ford	Lynch
Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Maloney
Blumenauer	Frost	Markey
Boswell	Garrett (NJ)	Matheson
Boucher	Gonzalez	Matsui
Boyd	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)
Brady (PA)	Green (TX)	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (OH)	Grijalva	McCollum
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	McDermott
Capps	Harman	McGovern
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Cardin	Hill	McNulty
Cardoza	Hinchev	Meehan
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Carson (OK)	Hoeffel	Menendez
Case	Holden	Michaud
Clyburn	Holt	Millender-
Conyers	Honda	McDonald
Cooper	Hooley (OR)	Miller (NC)
Costello	Hostettler	Miller, George
Crowley	Hoyer	Mollohan
Cummings	Inslee	Moore
Davis (AL)	Israel	Moran (VA)
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Neal (MA)
Davis (TN)	Jefferson	Oberstar
DeFazio	Jonson, E. B.	Obey
DeGette	Jones (NC)	Olver
DeLahunt	Kanjorski	Ortiz
DeLauro	Kaptur	Otter
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Owens

Pallone	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Pascrell	Sanchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Pastor	T.	Thompson
Paul	Sanchez, Loretta	Towns
Payne	Sanders	Turner (TX)
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Peterson (MN)	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Petri	Scott (GA)	Van Hollen
Pomeroy	Scott (VA)	Velazquez
Price (NC)	Serrano	Visclosky
Rahall	Sherman	Waters
Rangel	Slaughter	Watson
Rodriguez	Smith (WA)	Watt
Rohrabacher	Solis	Waxman
Ross	Spratt	Weiner
Rothman	Strickland	Wexler
Roybal-Allard	Stupak	Woolsey
Ruppersberger	Tanner	Wu
Rush	Tauscher	Wynn
Ryan (OH)	Taylor (MS)	

NOES—224

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

NOT VOTING—13

Clay	Majette	Souder
Culberson	Marshall	Stark
Gephardt	McKeon	Young (AK)
Greenwood	Meek (FL)	
Jones (OH)	Putnam	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2245

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. CASTLE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DICKS and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, let the RECORD show that although I voted "no" on rollcall 548, my intention was to vote "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 20, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—405

Abercrombie	Boehner	Chabot
Ackerman	Bonilla	Chocola
Aderholt	Bonner	Clyburn
Akin	Bono	Coble
Alexander	Boozman	Cole
Allen	Boswell	Collins
Andrews	Boucher	Conyers
Baca	Boyd	Cooper
Bachus	Bradley (NH)	Costello
Baird	Brady (PA)	Cramer
Baker	Brady (TX)	Crane
Baldwin	Brown (OH)	Crenshaw
Ballance	Brown (SC)	Crowley
Ballenger	Brown, Corrine	Culberson
Barrett (SC)	Brown-Waite,	Cummings
Bartlett (MD)	Ginny	Cunningham
Barton (TX)	Burgess	Davis (AL)
Bass	Burns	Davis (CA)
Beauprez	Burr	Davis (FL)
Becerra	Burton (IN)	Davis (IL)
Bell	Buyer	Davis (TN)
Bereuter	Calvert	Davis, Jo Ann
Berkley	Camp	Deal (GA)
Berman	Cannon	DeFazio
Berry	Capito	DeGette
Biggert	Capps	Delahunt
Bilirakis	Capuano	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Cardin	DeMint
Bishop (NY)	Cardoza	Deutsch
Bishop (UT)	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Blackburn	Carson (OK)	Dick
Blumenauer	Case	Dicks
Boehrlert	Castle	Dingell

Doggett	Kennedy (RI)
Dooley (CA)	Kildee
Doollittle	Kilpatrick
Doyle	Kind
Dreier	King (IA)
Duncan	King (NY)
Dunn	Kingston
Edwards	Kirk
Ehlers	Kleczka
Emanuel	Kline
Emerson	Kucinich
Engel	LaHood
English	Lampson
Eshoo	Langevin
Etheridge	Lantos
Everett	Larsen (WA)
Farr	Larson (CT)
Fattah	Latham
Feeney	LaTourette
Ferguson	Leach
Filner	Lee
Flake	Levin
Fletcher	Lewis (CA)
Foley	Lewis (GA)
Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Ford	Linder
Fossella	Lipinski
Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Franks (AZ)	Lofgren
Frelinghuysen	Lowey
Frost	Lucas (KY)
Galleghy	Lucas (OK)
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch
Gerlach	Majette
Gibbons	Maloney
Gilchrist	Manzullo
Gillmor	Markey
Gingrey	Matheson
Gonzalez	Matsui
Goode	McCarthy (MO)
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)
Gordon	McCollum
Goss	McCotter
Granger	McDermott
Graves	McGovern
Green (TX)	McHugh
Green (WI)	McInnis
Greenwood	McIntyre
Grijalva	McNulty
Gutierrez	Meehan
Gutknecht	Meek (FL)
Hall	Meeks (NY)
Harman	Menendez
Harris	Mica
Hart	Michaud
Hastings (FL)	Millender-
Hastings (WA)	McDonald
Hayes	Miller (FL)
Hayworth	Miller (MI)
Hefley	Miller (NC)
Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Hерger	Miller, George
Hill	Mollohan
Hinchev	Moore
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Hobson	Moran (VA)
Hoefel	Murphy
Hoekstra	Murtha
Holden	Musgrave
Holt	Myrick
Honda	Nadler
Hooley (OR)	Napolitano
Hostettler	Neal (MA)
Hoyer	Nethercutt
Hulshof	Neugebauer
Hunter	Ney
Hyde	Northup
Inlee	Norwood
Isakson	Nunes
Israel	Nussle
Issa	Oberstar
Istook	Obey
Jackson (IL)	Olver
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
(TX)	Ose
Janklow	Owens
Jefferson	Oxley
Jenkins	Pallone
John	Pascrell
Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Johnson (IL)	Paul
Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Jones (NC)	Pearce
Kanjorski	Pelosi
Kaptur	Pence
Keller	Peterson (MN)
Kelly	Peterson (PA)
Kennedy (MN)	Petri
	Pickering

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

Weldon (FL)	Wicker	Wu
Weldon (PA)	Wilson (NM)	Wynn
Weller	Wilson (SC)	Young (FL)
Wexler	Wolf	
Whitfield	Woolsey	

NOES—20

Blunt	Houghton	Rehberg
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Carter	Knollenberg	Sessions
Cox	Kolbe	Terry
Cubin	McCrery	Thornberry
Davis, Tom	Osborne	Waxman
DeLay	Otter	

NOT VOTING—9

Clay	Marshall	Souder
Gephardt	McKeon	Stark
Jones (OH)	Putnam	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2253

Mr. LATOURETTE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 279, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

AYES—146

Abercrombie	Dicks	Lampson
Ackerman	Dingell	Langevin
Allen	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Andrews	Emanuel	Larson (CT)
Baird	Eshoo	Leach
Baldwin	Etheridge	Lee
Ballance	Farr	Levin
Becerra	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Bell	Ford	Lofgren
Berkley	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Berman	Gordon	Maloney
Berry	Green (TX)	Markey
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Matsui
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	McCarthy (MO)
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Boucher	Hill	McDermott
Brown (OH)	Hinchev	McGovern
Brown, Corrine	Hinojosa	McIntyre
Capps	Holt	Meehan
Capuano	Honda	Meek (FL)
Cardin	Hoyer	Meeks (NY)
Carson (IN)	Inlee	Menendez
Case	Israel	Millender-
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	McDonald
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Miller (NC)
Crowley	(TX)	Miller, George
Davis (CA)	Jefferson	Moran (VA)
Davis (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Napolitano
Davis (TN)	Kennedy (RI)	Neal (MA)
DeFazio	Kildee	Oberstar
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Obey
Delahunt	Kind	Olver
DeLauro	Kleczka	Owens
Deutsch	Kucinich	Pastor