

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1233

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, with the knowledge that there are over some 120 amendments, my understanding is that there will be an announcement that the committee now rise and a proposed rule.

My inquiry is, is this the end of the Committee of the Whole, and does this mean that the amendments of Democrats who wanted to impact on the \$87 billion, over 100 amendments will now be denied and issues dealing with our troops in Iraq, will not be able to be responded to by these amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is about to entertain a simple motion to rise. The Chair is not able to respond to the gentlewoman's inquiry with respect to future events that may take place in the House.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction for Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that we have called for the committee to rise and we are now in the full House under H.R. 3289.

My inquiry is, are we about to enter into a discussion on a rule that will supersede the submitting, if you will, of amendments by Members of this body? My understanding is that we passed an open rule, and we had at least 100 or more amendments offered by Members from both sides of the aisle, many of them dealing with the quality-of-life issues of our troops, many of them dealing with the mental health issues with respect to the huge numbers of suicides, many of them dealing with

bulletproof vests, but focusing on the intent of H.R. 3289, which is a supplemental that funds the actions in Iraq with respect to our troops, but also deals with the Iraqi reconstruction.

My concern is whether or not debate is now going to cease because of this newly presented rule and the basis upon which the House now moves to implement a rule that supersedes the original rule that allowed us to have the opportunity to present our amendments.

I believe the American people deserve an answer, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot give an advisory opinion on a hypothetical situation which may arise. The gentlewoman raises a proper question for debate during the debate on the rule.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. May I inquire as to the next step of the proceedings of this House with respect to H.R. 3289? Are we about to enter into a discussion on a rule eliminating debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to recognize a member of the Committee on Rules to call up a rule.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would appreciate very much if we would be able to get an answer. Is the Chair yielding to the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to recognize a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will we get an answer at that point whether debate will cease?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a proper question for debate on the rule.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. And we will get a proper answer as to whether debate will cease and desist? But the intent of the rule is to cease and desist our debate and to cut off debate on these amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a proper question for the debate on the rule.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 401 ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 401

Resolved, That, during 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 in the Committee of the Whole, the bill shall be considered as read and no further motion or amendment shall be in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 401 provides that H.R. 3289, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, shall be considered as read, and that no further motion or amendment shall be in order.

Mr. Speaker, the House began debate 3 days ago on this emergency appropriations bill that provides for the needs and protection of our troops in Iraq. The unanimous consent agreement provided for 5 hours of general debate that began on Wednesday. The House resumed debate yesterday morning with discussion and consideration of amendments lasting well into last night. The House began a third day of debate this morning with consideration of 13 amendments.

After hours and days of debate, delay of a final vote on the emergency supplemental bill means a delay in getting the men and women in our military the resources and the equipment that they need. This rule, H. Res. 401, would end the delay and give our troops the funding they require and the support that they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, this rule is a travesty, but certainly no surprise. In the years since the Republican Party took control of this body, their leadership has made a concerted effort to strip away the rights of Members of the House of Representatives, bit by bit by bit. This rule is just more of the same, and every Member of this House who believes in the small "d" democratic process should vote to defeat it.

The Republican Party's leadership has been nothing short of disingenuous about the debate on this supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, this has been anything but an open process. There have been some very important discussions on the floor, but those discussions have been truncated. Over 120 amendments were noticed to this bill, yet, despite the fact that there is obviously so much interest on the part of Members of the House in this \$87 billion bill, the Republican leadership is now cutting off the last opportunity to bring over half of those amendments to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of the resolution authorizing the President's action in Iraq. I still believe my vote was the right vote to take. But, if I recall correctly, one of the many reasons the President and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State gave the American people about why we should take military action against the regime of Saddam Hussein was to bring democracy to the Iraqi people.

Quite frankly, I think it is time we bring democracy back to the United States House of Representatives. The way the Republican Party runs this House makes a mockery of the President's laudable goal of bringing democracy to Iraq and its people.

Mr. Speaker, in September the President requested \$87.5 billion in emergency funding for the continuing military operations in Iraq as well as to fund reconstruction projects in that country. He made the request and expected the Congress to rush it back to him ready to be signed into law.

We have no authorization for legislation for these funds. In fact, the committees with jurisdiction over the programs funded here have not even been given the chance to add their views to the bill.

On Wednesday, the Committee on Rules reported a so-called open rule, but I have to point out that the Republican Party's version of an open rule is one that does not allow Members the right to amend this bill in a way that affects the policies it moves forward. In fact, the chairman of the Committee on Rules told the committee that an open rule could and should waive all points of order against the committee bill, but not against Member amendments. And why? Why can legislative language offered by other Members be made in order? Because, Mr. Speaker, as the chairman said, "We are considering this in the same manner which the Democrats did before 1995."

Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. In fact, if we just take the emergency supplemental for fiscal year 1994, the Committee on Rules, controlled by the Democrats, reported a rule for that supplemental that waived all points of order against two Republican amendments. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) expressed his opposition to the rule at that time because two other Republican amendments were not allowed to be considered under the rule. We may have cut off those two amendments during the consideration of that supplemental, but we did waive points of order against other Republican amendments because, as my chairman so ably pointed out on Wednesday evening, "We are the Committee on Rules. We do have the authority to do that." So I have to ask, why did the Republican Party's leadership not grant waivers to at least some of the thoughtful and constructive policy amendments brought to the Committee on Rules on Wednesday?

As reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the funds for reconstruc-

tion in Iraq are \$1.4 billion more than were contained in the entire foreign operations appropriation passed by the House and \$500 million more than the Senate's foreign operations bill. That represents every single foreign assistance program this country participates in for the entire fiscal year. Yet the Committee on International Relations was not given an opportunity to consider the President's request in a legislative forum and amendments that sought to impose policy in this bill were denied the opportunity to be voted on during this debate.

The Committee on Appropriations has reported funds for the military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan that amount to 56 percent of the funds for all operations and maintenance in the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004.

□ 1245

I strongly support this funding, but certainly the Committee on Armed Services should have been given an opportunity to fully examine the request and report legislation that would set some policy about how this money is to be spent. Perhaps amendments offered by the members of that committee who have great expertise in these matters might have added substantive policy limits to ensure that these funds are going to be used in the best interests of the men and women in uniform who are on the front lines in Iraq and Afghanistan right now.

Yesterday I heard far too many Members on the other side of the aisle come to the floor and impugn the motives and perhaps the patriotism of Members who sought to reprioritize the funds in this bill. Mr. Speaker, those kinds of remarks are a shameful blemish on this institution. Every Member of this body is entitled to hold his own opinions. We are not elected to march in lockstep with the dictates of the Republican Party's leadership.

No, indeed, Mr. Speaker. We are all here to do what we think is best for the United States of America and its citizens. I hold a different view on going to war in Iraq than do many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I cannot and I do not hold them in any less regard for holding views that differ from mine. I believe that a vibrant and vital democracy requires that all of these views be heard, not hidden or muffled to escape the withering attacks of ideologues. I also believe that these views should be brought to this floor and discussed in a civil atmosphere, not subjected to the partisan pot shots that have been lobbed by the other side of the Chamber during this debate.

This rule shuts off debate, pure and simple. This rule cuts Members out of the discussion. By denying Members waivers to bring up amendments that address policy in addition to money, Members were shut out of the process in the first rule. But at least there was a chance for Members to bring up those

issues before a point of order would be lodged against them. Now, the autocratic Republican Party leadership, for whatever reason, be it to go home for the weekend or to leave on a CODEL, or perhaps even to cut off debate so that the American people could not find out what the Congress is up to, has brought to the floor a rule that says, That's all, folks. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just wrong.

In one last attempt to try to give the House an opportunity to set policy, it is my intention to oppose the previous question in order to give the House one last chance to discuss a matter that is of grave concern to millions of Americans who are deeply alarmed about using so many American tax dollars to rebuild Iraq. If the previous question is defeated, I would amend this rule to allow the House to vote on an amendment adopted by the Senate, by the other body, yesterday. That amendment, which is similar to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) yesterday in his substitute, is identical to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas, a Republican, and would require half of the reconstruction funds of this bill to be funded through the World Bank. That passed in the United States Senate yesterday on a vote of 51 to 47. Under this rule, we will not even be permitted to vote on that measure on the floor today.

The House should go on record on this language; and if the previous question is defeated, it will have the opportunity to do so. Otherwise, it is, That's all, folks. What a mockery we will make of ourselves.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the majority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule. We have had hours of debate on this legislation. It started 3 days ago. There have been plenty of opportunities to discuss what needs to happen and what this House needs to do. Our appropriators have done a great job. They have asked the hard questions. The gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) in the subcommittee and in the full committee have asked questions. We have not given the President everything he asked for, because part of our job is to put the difficult questions to the administration and try our best to do the right thing.

We all know the right thing here is to continue to work for peace and freedom in Iraq. The international community is beginning to respond. This is exactly the moment when this House should step forward, when our country should step forward and show we have a commitment that will not stop. The

message we send to others in the international community who can help needs to be sent today. The message we send to the donor conference to meet later this month is important that we send and we send it strongly and clearly.

Iraq is not a nation that needs to be saddled down with debt that they cannot deal with. The President has asked us to make a commitment not just to bullets and ammunition, but to the basic services that keep our troops alive. I had someone from St. Louis in my office the other day; and as he was leaving, talking about a totally different topic, he pulled out a picture of his son in his pilot's outfit who is in Iraq and said, all of the money the President asked for will keep my kid alive.

So this is a country where people have not had basic services for 25 or 30 years. But for the last 25 or 30 years when they came up and they were mad in the morning and they got out on the streets, the tyrants that worked for Saddam Hussein just killed them or put them in jail. We do not do that any longer. We can make a commitment to the fundamental infrastructure of this society. We can make a commitment to our troops. We need to do that here today.

Afghanistan and Iraq are now central to the war on terrorism. This is a war that we all knew months ago would not be over in a short period of time. We have to engage the terrorists where they are. We have to show the kind of resolve that the world respects and people in all parts of the world respect.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just the American soldier and sailor, Marine and airman who is a target in Iraq; it is anyone who wants to bring stability to that country. It is policemen in their headquarters. It is Iraqi policemen lined up to get their paychecks. It is a Muslim cleric who sends signals he wants to work with us for peace and stability. We need to do what we can to win this war on terror, and an important part of that is to show our commitment to those who live in the center of this most dangerous part of the world.

The committee has brought a product that allows us to do that. We do not need to continue to debate this for more than 3 days. This debate has gone on for hours. I urge not only support of this rule, but quick and speedy action that sends a message to the world; and that action needs to happen today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

My friend who just spoke and I are going to vote together on final passage of this bill, but my friend and I disagree on the process that we are pursuing to accomplish the objectives of which he speaks. He speaks of the objectives and not the process because he

feels comfortable defending the end result, but obviously not comfortable discussing the process. Why?

This bill that we are considering is larger than 10 of the 13 appropriation bills. As a matter of fact, it is almost 100 times larger than the District of Columbia appropriation bill which we spent in debate in committee and in hearings 10 times longer to consider. Hear me. The District of Columbia bill is 1/100ths of the dollars that we are appropriating in this bill, yet we spent 10 times the time of Congress and Members and allowing the public to have input as we have on this bill.

Now, we passed a bill, I tell the gentleman from Missouri, just a few months ago, almost \$70 billion. It tragically has not made our men and women safe, as the gentleman says this bill will. I hope the gentleman is right. But we have over 100 amendments and a number particularly that are very substantive in nature that ought to be considered on their merits, because it may make the bill better. It may make the men and women in our armed services safer. It may more cheaply accomplish the objective of reconstruction in Iraq that will pursue our progress and make our success more probable.

So I say to my colleagues that we ought to reject this rule, this gag rule that shuts down the consideration on one of the largest bills we will pass this year for just a few more hours to give Members, elected by 600,000 Americans, the opportunity to offer their alternatives.

Now, in committee, we considered some of those alternatives; but that committee is but a portion of the House of Representatives. In particular, I say to my colleagues, the ranking member who would be the chairman of this committee if his party, my party, were in control, so he is not just a back-bencher, has a very substantive alternative that got a lot of votes in committee. And what it says is, yes, we need to take responsibility. And, yes, we need to sacrifice. But guess what? We who are here at home, safe in our sanctuary, ought to make a little sacrifice too, and we ought to pay for this bill and not pass it along to our children and to our grandchildren. That is responsible. That is fair. That is the moral position, in my opinion, we ought to be taking.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin who has that amendment is being precluded from offering that amendment, along with 30 or 40 other Members who have substantive, important proposals to bring before this House, the people's House, the people's representatives, to consider the alternatives available. Is that not sad? Does it not undermine our democracy and our product?

Let us reject this rule. Let us vote against the previous question. Let us consider in full the proposals made by the Members elected to this House by the American public.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. We are talking a lot about a reconstruction of Iraq, our commitment to bring democracy in this area; and all I can see is war, war, war and read about the numbers of Americans that are in harm's way that are losing their lives. All we are saying is that we have the responsibility to share with our constituents why we are making this second down payment on a war which we have no idea as to when, if ever, it is going to conclude, how many lives are going to be lost, where is it going to be spread. Most of us accept the fact that the decision to unilaterally attack Iraq was made before 9-11, but how many other countries are on the list? Where do we go from here?

It just seems to me that somewhere along the line we were looking for Osama bin Laden and then we were looking for Saddam Hussein. God knows how long the President's list is. We should be able to ask these questions. We should not leave here until every Member of this House feels satisfied that they have explored the direction in which our country is going.

It bothers me that what we are talking about today is rebuilding a country that we started bombing. I do not remember coming here to rebuild Iraq, Baghdad, or any other place in the Middle East, and yet we are supposed to feel guilty if we do not fulfill this obligation, as though our mail is coming in from the GIs and the Marines that are overseas saying, for God's sakes, send some money to rebuild Iraq if you love me, because the quicker you rebuild Iraq, the quicker I will be able to get home. That is not my mail. My mail is, I want to come home because, guess what? They started the draft. No, not the draft that I advocated. But if you volunteer to serve this country, either in the active service or in the Reserves or in the National Guard, you are being drafted. Your time is being extended. They are taking you away from your home and your family. And these families are not talking about rebuilding Iraq; they want their lives rebuilt.

So give us some time to better understand the President's position, and we might find out where he is going to take us from Baghdad.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the 17 years I have been in Congress, most of that time on the Committee on Rules, that things have changed in such an incredible way, I can hardly recognize it. I remember the times when just the defense budget alone, we

would take testimony from the beginning of the morning until late at night for days at a time, hundreds of amendments. We thought that was just fine. It was wonderful. We wanted everybody to get a chance to talk about what was one of the most important things we do in the country, and certainly one of the most expensive.

But it seems to me lately that because we can only work 2 days a week in Washington, next week I think we are going to be here a day and a half, that we have to condense everything. It is sort of the Reader's Digest version of the House of Representatives.

□ 1300

And so we cut out everybody's rights to speak. We make sure that nobody has a chance to be in any way distasteful by saying something that another person may not like.

We are elected by the people of the country to come down here and speak for them, nobody here, nobody in the gallery, nobody else can get up on this floor and speak except those of us they sent here to do it for them. And yet we are being stifled at every turn. And, believe me, I have never seen anything so egregious to us as what happened last night at about 1 a.m. in the morning when they said that this, the largest bill, the money we pass and what many of us believe is a debacle, and for reconstruction and so much malfeasance going on that it almost rivals Teapot Dome, that we will not be able to discuss it, and we will not be able to do much about it.

I want to close with a quote that is one of my very favorites here. Quote, "I rise in strong opposition to this rule. It is unfair, undemocratic and elitist, disenfranchising nearly every Member of Congress and the voters whom they were elected to represent." This description was from the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) the chairman, of a rule from 1994, and, boy, is it applicable today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. Once again, the Republican leadership that runs this House is attempting to stifle debate. Once again, they are trying to rush important legislation through without adequate deliberation. And, once again, they are wrong. And I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject their tactics.

It saddens me to say this, but the United States House of Representatives has become a place where trivial issues are debated passionately and important ones barely at all. And this is an important issue. We are talking about the war in Iraq. We are talking about an enormous, complicated \$87 billion supplemental appropriations bill. We are talking about providing the resources our soldiers need to do their jobs in Iraq and Afghanistan. And we are talking about the financial health

of our Nation and about the priorities of this Congress.

Now, at least we were talking about those things until the Republican leadership decided just after midnight last night that they did not want to listen anymore. The Committee on Rules is intended to be a place where debate is structured. It can, and it should be, a tool to manage the House. But under this leadership, the Committee on Rules has become a weapon, a weapon that does not manage debate but smothers it.

Now, here is the situation: Yesterday, we passed what the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), and other Republican leaders described as an open rule. In reality, the rule was not all that open since it did not allow us to offer very thoughtful and important amendments. Amendments to pay for the \$87 billion without passing the debt on to our kids, amendments to require the administration to actually come up with a plan for winning the peace in Iraq. Those amendments and so many others, Republican and Democrat, were not made in order. But they said even though we could not vote on our amendments, we could at least talk about them. They called it an open rule. So let us go with that.

Now, we are told by the Republican leadership that the Republican leadership is tired. They do not want to debate. They do not want to vote past 2 or 3 today. They are tired or they have trips to take or planes to catch or somewhere else to be.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, too bad. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider this year, and we need to get it right. Is this the new standard for appropriations bills? You use an open rule that really is not open until you get sleepy, and then you shut off debate and go home? You muzzle Members of Congress and the people they represent?

There has been a lot of rhetoric in this Chamber this week about establishing democracy in Iraq. I want to say to the Republican leadership that you are setting a lousy example for the Iraqi people to follow. We spent one day authorizing this war, one day as legislatures of parliaments from London to Berlin, to Ankara to Santiago spent significant and meaningful time discussing the issue of war and peace. The United States House of Representatives rushed to a war resolution in a single day.

We did not ask the tough questions, we did not get the straight answers. I do not think there is a Member in this House who really believes that we met our responsibilities, and here we go again.

Now, the leadership tells us you have had 3 days. Well, I do not care if it takes 3 weeks. Let us stay here all weekend for the soldiers in Iraq, for their families, for the people we represent, we cannot afford to get this wrong.

Let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of you had important amendments and thoughtful things to say. If this rule passes, you will be silenced. You know this is wrong. Please take a stand. Do not be a cheap date. Vote no. Because if you do not, this is going to happen again and again and again. Reject this rule and let us get back to work.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the other side. Is the other side going to just play rope-a-dope here and not have any speakers? I guess the answer to that is yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. Not only does this second rule prohibit further amendments to the supplemental, but it also shortchanges the substance of debate on a bill that costs \$87 billion: \$200 million per congressional district that will not be used to build schools, provide health care or improve the Nation's infrastructure.

My objection to this rule is as much about substance as it is about process. It is as much about the needs of the American people as it is about the needs of the Iraqi people. It is as much about democracy as it is about tyranny. As we deliberate an \$87 billion supplemental appropriations request from the President, House Republicans are saying that we cannot ask questions. We cannot ask what the money is going to be used for and how we are going to pay for it. We cannot ask because the Republicans do not know. They do not know because the President will not tell them.

Mr. Speaker, if we allow the dictatorial Republican majority to decide what is worthy to debate, then the House will quickly become an insignificant Constitutional trophy sitting on the President's mantle.

Do my colleagues realize that the other body has been debating this bill for 15 days? Some Senators have spoken more, each one, more than all of the Members of the House, while the House has not spent 15 hours, and we have more than four times as many Members.

So I echo what Mr. RUSH said last night: It ain't Christmas, it ain't New Years, and it ain't Easter. Why not work through the weekend and all the Members be heard? American troops will be working this weekend. Why cannot Congress? Our soldiers are fighting and dying, three last night, while Republicans are cutting and running.

When Democrats ask questions about cost, strategy, and accountability, Republicans label us as unpatriotic. As I see it, the only unpatriotic thing about

this debate is the majority's abandonment of the House's Constitutional responsibility to, as Mr. Madison put it, have a will of its own.

As written, H.R. 3289 gives the President carte blanche to spend nearly \$87 billion before he has explained how he spent \$79 billion we appropriated a few months ago. As I said yesterday, we have seen what happens when we relinquish our oversight authority and fail to hold this administration accountable ahead of time for its actions.

Last night, when America was sleeping, Republicans on the Committee on Rules dredged out the familiar formula of pushing their self-serving agenda by oppressing debate, deliberation and dialogue. There is an acronym in the United States Armed Forces that best describes what Republicans are saying to the American people today: The soldiers say BOHICA, B-O-H-I-C-A. Bend over, here it comes again.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I gather in this time of the World Series that my friend on the other side is the designated "sitter."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation before us provides \$87 billion to pay for the consequences of our war against Iraq, and the \$20 billion reconstruction section provides \$872 per capita aid to every single person in Iraq; 872 bucks. That is the size of this package. That ought to merit a lot more debate than we have had.

The bill before us got to the floor only because the majority went to the Committee on Rules and made a number of exceptions to the House rules so that this bill could come to the floor. And then the leadership guarantees that they are not going to lose any votes, the Republican leadership, by denying to the alternative to their proposal, those same exceptions to the rule.

That is what you did yesterday. Then yesterday you said any Member who had a germane amendment was given the grand total of 5 minutes to discuss it before the hammer came down. And now today, you are saying that the rest of the Members, who have not yet been able to even offer an amendment for consideration, are going to be denied the opportunity to do so.

Now, this happens in this Chamber, in Washington D.C., the capital of the greatest democracy in the world, supposedly, at the same time we are all supposed to swoon at the thought of how quickly Iraq is going to become a beacon of democracy and the second imitation of New Hampshire on the Presidential primary circuit.

Well, I am sorry, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), what a lousy example you are setting for the Iraqis. You got a rigged game in this House. And any time you see an amendment you cannot beat, you solve it the easy way. You say we cannot even vote on it. Incredible. Where is your fairness? Where

is your guts? If you cannot beat us fair and square, you should not be in this Chamber at all.

Now, last night eight of your Republican colleagues in the Senate voted for a proposal that provided a good portion of this aid in the form of loans. It does not matter whether you agree with that or not, we ought to be able to vote on that same proposition. But you do not think you can beat it, and so you are denying us the opportunity to even vote on it. Where is your guts?

So, Mr. Speaker, the only way we have a chance of a snowball in you know where of getting a vote on an amendment to protect the interest of the taxpayers is for us to vote down this antidemocratic rule so that we have an opportunity to change it. And that is why you need to vote against the previous question on this rule so that while we are prattling on about how much democracy we are going to bring to Iraq, we occasionally provide a little in this Chamber.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker I would inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I gather the other side is not intending to use any time at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because it blocks amendments such as the one I would like to introduce which would increase the pay by \$1,000 a month for anybody who is serving in excess of 6 months in Iraq.

Extended deployment strains all families, especially Reservists and those in the National Guard who have seen their deployments extended to 12 months. USA Today recently reported that one-third of Reservists and National Guard members suffered a cut in pay when called to active duty, especially those called up on short notice, those who have made personal business arrangements for a 6-month leave only to be told later that it is going to be a full year.

The cost of this amendment would be a drop in the bucket. If you figure that a third of those over there will be on extended deployment, that would cost about \$50 million a month, \$600 million a year, less than 1 percent of the cost of this bill.

□ 1315

Moreover, the amendment will not cost anything if the deployments are limited to 6 months, and at the same time it discourages the 12-month deployment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the rule be defeated so that amendments like this can be considered. Defeat the rule and allow other amendments.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules for yielding me time and the fight he and the other members of the Committee on Rules are making in that venue for openness on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn and serious matter that we have before the House today. And the question is what is the best way for us to provide for our troops, help with the reconstruction in Iraq, and accomplish our mission so that we can bring our troops home safely and soon. We know that it is not about cutting and running. We take our responsibilities seriously that we have inherited in Iraq, and it is not about cutting and running. It is about accomplishing our mission. But cutting and running is what is happening here in this House of Representatives.

The debate on these issues relating to the \$87 billion supplemental is just too painful for the Republicans to hear. The fact that there was no plan for postwar Iraq is just too painful for them to listen to.

The amendments that have been thoughtfully considered and presented here by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle point out the shortcomings of this supplemental to begin with. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) had an excellent amendment earlier talking about paying for transportation for our men and women in uniform, that we would pay for that. Why would that not have been in the President's proposal to begin with? Why is it not the law now? The list goes on and on.

We said it over and over again that, without the intervention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the cooperation of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), our troops would still not have funding for Kevlar in their jackets, jammers to stop the detonation of explosive devices, spare parts for their equipment, and armor for their Humvees. They still do not have it. It will hopefully be in this package. But it was not there in the summer after we gave the administration \$63 billion, and it was not in the President's proposal. And that is why these amendments are important, but they again show the concern for the troops was much less than it should be on the part of the administration.

So we come to the floor with this very important matter, a matter relating to war, how we support our troops, how we reconstruct and bring stability to Iraq so that we can accomplish our mission. And we are told that we have an open rule, that the discussion will consider what people propose. And immediately the rule becomes restrictive in terms of what it will allow to be brought to the floor for a vote.

It is beneath the dignity of this House for us to have a debate on the war and not allow the proposal of the Democrats, the Democratic substitute,

to come to this floor. And the main reason it could not come to this floor is because it paid for, it paid for what we would do for the troops and the reconstruction of Iraq. So it is against the rules here to be fiscally responsible to pay for the proposals that we are putting forth.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) put forth some saying that he heard in the Army. I cannot repeat it and I would not repeat it if I could, but I want to go to the Marines. The Marines have an expression, "Proper Preparation Prevents Poor Performance."

Our men and women were properly prepared and they performed their duties excellently, but there was no planning for after the military action, which still continues but which the President declared over May 1. There is no plan. There has been no plan. And to quote General Zinni, "The level of sacrifice has not been met by the level of planning."

How can we ask our troops to make those sacrifices when we are not really willing to have a plan? And if there was a plan, it is a failure. And if there is a plan, nobody knows what it is. And if there is a plan, it did not take into consideration the risks in postwar Iraq and, therefore, properly protect our troops. It misunderstood the conditions in Iraq and the challenges that we would face, again, endangering our troops. And it misrepresented what the cost would be to the American people.

Again, we have heard Secretary Wolfowitz's statement about how quickly Iraq would be able to provide for its own reconstruction. So that is why there is some level of disapproval of what is happening here. It is an open rule except we will restrict what we can hear and besides, we are sick and tired of hearing what is wrong with this policy.

That is cutting and running. We are opposed to it in anything we undertake.

We are professional people. We have the privilege of representing the American people. They have serious questions about this, and we are cutting and running and stifling debate.

So I hope that the opportunity that is presented under this rule, under the consideration of the previous question, will enable this House to vote on what happened in the Senate in a bipartisan way last night, which basically said that the American people should not be taking all the risks as far as their troops are concerned and paying all the bills. And this amendment specifically addresses the bills. It says if those oil fields get gushing, this is what it means, if these oil fields get gushing and Iraq amasses resources, then and only then would they pay back the loan. If they cannot, there is consideration for that. It could not be more fair. It could not be more reasonable. It should be voted upon by this body. But it is really unfortunate because time is what we were sent here to use for the

American people; and if we cut and run, if we cut and run on a matter of this solemnity and this seriousness to the American people, shame on us.

I urge our colleagues to support the motion that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) will be making in regard to the previous question.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have only one concluding speaker, and I would ask if the other side intends to close. If they have any other speakers, do they intend to close after our concluding speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman to use his speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I would offer an amendment to the rule. This will give Members an opportunity to vote on an amendment by the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), which is identical to the bipartisan amendment passed in the other body last night by a vote of 51 to 47. That amendment will require that a portion of the money for reconstruction efforts will be in the form of a loan.

The amendment provides \$5 billion as a grant to rebuild Iraqi security services, and it provides \$5.2 billion as a grant for water, power and other critical infrastructure facilities. Congressional notification would be required for any projects in excess of \$250 million; \$10 million would be considered as a loan but would convert to a grant upon 90 percent forgiveness of prewar debt by other countries.

I want to stress that a "no" vote will not prevent us from voting on this supplemental. But a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the identical language that will be included in the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote "no" on the previous question so we can have an opportunity to vote on the Senate loan amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned in different forms earlier in this debate, this is serious business. It is serious business. And I believe knowing that we are engaged in this war on terrorism, which we have been now for over 2 years, we have to respond in a timely manner to those Americans that we put at risk. And I would remind my colleagues that three-fourths

of this bill, or slightly more, goes to support our troops. And we have focused on other parts. Probably that is good for the debate, but we should not lose sight of the fact that three-fourths of this goes directly to our troops.

Now, we have some difference of opinion between the other House with their supplemental budget. The quicker we can get this into conference, the quicker we can get a bill passed; and the quicker we can get the President to sign it to support our troops, frankly, the better off we are.

I would just make one observation that I found rather interesting, because we spent a great deal of time debating before I was here on the Gulf War resolution. I was not here. But I understand that was a debate that was inspiring for the Congress. That really, when we look at that from a historical standpoint, is why we are here today, because of whatever reasons and agreements were made following the Gulf War, Saddam remained in power.

Now we are in a situation where we have to complete that. We had a long debate when we decided to go to war in Iraq this year, properly the right thing to do. And now we have debated this supplemental to support our troops for into the third day.

From a historical standpoint, I would just like to remind Members that sometimes this body moves extremely fast on important issues. Right after December 7, 1941, when we declared war on Japan and Germany, the U.S. House of Representatives allocated 40 minutes for each of those resolutions. I think it is important for us to get this done as quickly as we possibly can. So I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this new rule to recklessly cease debate and eliminate all opportunity for amendments on behalf of the American people. I now will speak to H.R. 3289 before us. The task of stabilizing and reconstructing Iraq may end up being one of the greatest challenges of our generation. Although we are getting rosy reports of progress in Iraq from the administration, the fact that we have 130,000 troops in the area and are now being handed an \$87 billion tab paints a fully different picture. It is now obvious that the administration grossly underestimated the cost and difficulty of stabilizing Iraq, almost to the same extent that they overestimated the threat posed to the American people by Saddam Hussein. Even the so-called "soft costs" of the war and its aftermath are enough to cripple some nations.

This is not revisionist history; at least a hundred of us in Congress, millions of citizens who took to the streets, and even a handful of brave souls in the administration itself, tried to warn the administration of what it was getting into with its pre-emptive strike on Iraq. We were ignored, and those in the administration—the Shinseki's and the Lindsey's have been encouraged to move on. But the problems in Iraq have not gone away so gracefully. We are now at an important crossroads. We can continue to beat this dead horse with the same policies of isolation from our allies around the world and partisanship here in the

United States or, we can start working together—employing the collective wisdom of all of us here and around the Nation with the experience and expertise to be of service in this endeavor—and who are committed to our troops, and to fulfilling the promise the President made to the people of Iraq and Afghanistan and to the world.

As this debate comes to the Halls of Congress, the people who marched us into this war will try to paint this vote as a vote for or against our troops. This is absolutely a false picture. For one thing, our military is extremely well funded. As I just described, including the Iraq supplementals, the Defense budget will be approaching \$500 billion. Furthermore, Iraq is not an indigent nation.

If they wanted to, they could take better care of our troops. Secretary Rumsfeld wants to spend billions of dollars on a Star Wars defense system, while we are getting reports that our soldiers risking their lives in Iraq don't have adequate body armor, or clean water supplies, or basic human necessities like feminine hygiene products for our women soldiers. Six months after this battle started, we still have soldiers without kevlar body armor and water purifiers. What did they do with the first \$79 billion war supplemental? We now have a new request for money, but we still have not heard details of how they spent the first money, what progress has been made, and what challenges remain.

I visited the As-Sayliyah Central Command Base in Doha, Qatar last weekend and heard the concerns of the troops from their own mouths. I heard testimony about how a ground soldier, watched his partner and the operator of a military vehicle get tossed out as the vehicle was thrown airborne by a land mine. "Why did you hit this mine," I asked. "It was just one of those mines that was missed in the sweep . . ." said the soldier. Because there isn't enough personnel or specialists to assign to technical tasks, unskilled or untrained technicians frequently get asked to do jobs that they have not mastered enough to guarantee the lives of those who must traverse the sands of Baghdad. The soldier misses his wife and newborn baby dearly. Because there hasn't been a change in the personnel on the front lines in several months, many reservists and active duty servicemen and women have spent a longer time in Iraq than was promised by the Administration. May 1, 2003 was supposed to have been a day of hope and homecoming; instead, it was a sham. Some of these troops feel like "sitting ducks" out in the foreign terrain. They don't speak Arabic. They don't know Tikrit like they know their hometowns. When I asked them if they have seen any troops of other coalition nations, they responded, "what coalition troops?" They need support and they need continuous relief.

The President and his friends in Leadership in Congress did not listen to the warnings of the Congressional Black Caucus, or our international allies, or hundreds of thousands of like-minded citizens who took to the streets. Some of my Democratic colleagues voted for this war, because they believed in the institution of the Presidency, and thought they had to give this administration the benefit of the doubt. I did not. Regardless, now the President has cut open this patient, and the patient is laying on the surgical table. The President has made a promise to the people of Iraq and to the world that we will leave the patient bet-

ter than we found it—and it is up to our American soldiers and the American taxpayers to fulfill that promise.

Much of the toughest burden will fall on the shoulders of the families of our troops overseas. Therefore, I have submitted amendments that speak to alleviation of this burden. (1) I firmly believe that before any further funds are sent to Iraq to rebuild that country, we need to ensure that our men and women in the armed forces—reservists as well as active servicemen and women are receiving the money and services that they deserve and in a timely fashion. Dr. Jones, who works under Lt. Col. Corbett shared this concern with me during my visit. (2) I also believe that the Pentagon needs to develop a plan to ensure that none of our troops or government employees must remain stationed in Iraq for more than 6 months at a time. (3) Furthermore, the administration must announce a definite and clear exit plan for the troops to give them real hope and a notion that an end to the fighting is truly near. (4) There should also be more trained military policemen and women stationed in Iraq to mitigate the vulnerabilities experienced by these men and women. (5) Similarly, they need proper job allocation so that lives are not lost due to erroneous assignment of duties. (6) Moreover, as to the national guard servicepersons, the scheduled end of deployment should be honored rather than making them continue fighting until their respective units are released. Despite their frustrations, I encouraged them with the following phrase, "you are as much defenders as you are peace-keepers" to let them know that their work truly matters the most for the people of Iraq as well as the people at home in the United States.

I sincerely wish the President had not put us in this situation, but he and his administration did. And now we have to deal with it. If we are going to deal with it, I feel at this point it is critical to take some of the control away from the people who have made horrible misjudgments at every step of the way, who misled the American people and the Congress about the need for war, and who ignored warnings from inside and outside the administration. Either they knew the truth, chose to mislead us, or they did not take the time to adequately assess and plan for the true situation. Either way, senior members of this administration were not doing their jobs.

That is why before any appropriations are sent to rebuild Iraq, the Congress and the American people need to see an independent investigation in progress, looking deeply into several questions: whether U.S. intelligence reports were manipulated in order to misrepresent the threat Saddam Hussein posed to American interests; whether the costs and dangers of invading and occupying Iraq were deliberately understated; whether American officials who offered differing views of Iraq became the victims of inappropriate or illegal retaliation; and whether one or more individuals within the administration is or are responsible for the leak of classified information regarding intelligence reports and the veracity of accusers as to the purchase of "yellowcake" for nuclear weapons production.

If any of these allegations are proved true, those responsible must be held accountable. I am concerned that there has been a methodical and undemocratic effort to mislead and intimidate the American people and the world in order to march us into this war. And now we

are being given an \$87 billion bill to pay for that effort.

As we move forward in Iraq, unfortunately, we have severely limited options. Because people like Secretary Rumsfeld have used reckless speech that has angered and exasperated our allies, many of our most staunch allies are now reluctant to get involved in stabilizing and reconstructing Iraq. While our State Department has been reaching out around the world with a hand of cooperation and partnership, Mr. Rumsfeld has proudly displayed his arrogance and disdain for anyone not walking lockstep with him.

Too much is at stake to distance ourselves from those whose help we need. People from democracies around the world are now being asked to trust this administration with the lives of their sons and daughters in the military, by sending them to fight under a U.S. command whose leaders show them blatant disrespect. They are being encouraged to send their hard-earned money to reconstruct Iraq under the authority of this administration that gives the largest contracts to its political supporters, that seems to have no credible plan for the future, and that ignores the advice of even the most trusted experts on the world stage. It is not surprising that they are not stepping up with money and troops.

I think the problem is basically a lack of trust. I can't blame them. I do not trust this administration to do the right thing in Iraq either. I do not intend to vote to send another dime to Iraq until the President takes some dramatic steps to restore credibility to his Administration:

First, I want to see new faces in top positions, starting with Donald Rumsfeld. We need people who choose integrity over politics and respect over arrogance. Second, I want to see a full accounting of how they spent the first \$79 billion, and exactly how they came up with this \$87 billion figure. Our sources say that the armed services were barely consulted on those numbers—that some critical needs were totally left out, and others grossly exaggerated. We need honest accounting. And third, once we have a true picture of what funds are necessary to support our troops, Congress should be able to vote on that funding alone—separate from the money needed for reconstruction of Iraq. That "bifurcated vote" will allow us to quickly get money to protect our brave soldiers, but will also give us the time we need to thoughtfully craft a plan for reconstruction—a plan that will include our allies, and the World Bank, nongovernment organizations (NGOs), and oil and natural resources from Iraq itself.

Those are the three things I want to see before I can consider giving any more money to this administration for the United States effort in Iraq. This does not mean that I do not want to support our troops. And this does not mean that I want to break the president's promise to the Iraqi people and to the world that he would make things better in Iraq.

Instead, it is a call for action. I want to get the appropriate amount of money to the people who deserve it—but right now I am not confident that \$87 billion is the right amount or that it would be spent in a way that would help our troops, help the Iraqi people, stabilize the region, or prevent terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, there are just too many questions and not enough answers. Why do we need \$950 million for recruiting and training of

police forces in Iraq, when we need more money for police and firefighters in Houston, New York, Washington, DC, and Philadelphia? Why do we need \$209 million for prison and detention facilities, and \$100 million for construction of a new prison in Iraq, when our Federal prisons are overcrowded and severely underfunded. Too many questions, and not enough answers, Mr. Speaker. Do we really need \$100 million for a witness protection program, and \$5.65 billion to repair and rehabilitate the infrastructure in Iraq, when a few months ago the whole Eastern seaboard was without power? Are we really serious?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, are we really serious about supplying Iraq with \$793 million for health care programs, when we still have children without health insurance, elderly without health insurance, and our poor citizens without health insurance. There are just too many questions, and not enough answers.

There will be many thoughtful amendments offered that could ensure that the funds that we do not bankrupt our Treasury, while failing our troops and the people who need our help. I urge all of my colleagues to put politics and pride aside and consider them, so that together we can get our efforts in the Middle East back on track.

I have several amendments that I think will help get our policies back on track.

My first amendment states that none of the funds made available in this act may be obligated or expended until Government personnel policies have been implemented to ensure that no members of the Armed Forces or Government employees are being required to be stationed in Iraq continuously for a period greater than 6 months. The President has stated that the war on terror will be a long and involved one. Therefore we must pace ourselves, and we must ensure that our armed services can continue to recruit good people in the future. This amendment will help ensure that our troops and their families remain mentally fit and rested, and that military tours will remain a reasonable commitment in service to this Nation.

The second states that of the funds made available in this act may be obligated or expended until all Reserve and National Guard personnel are paid in full.

The third amendment requires that none of the funds made available in this act may be obligated or expended until the President has submitted to Congress a report setting forth in detail the strategy and projected timetable for withdrawing U.S. forces in Iraq. Without goals, I am concerned that our efforts in Iraq could drift indefinitely. Congress and the American people must know what lies ahead, so that we can plan appropriately.

The fourth is a sense of the House of Representatives that, before any appropriation under this act is obligated, a special counsel should be appointed to investigate the propriety and legality of actions by the administration in connection with the unauthorized release of classified information. We have a complex mission ahead of us in the Middle East. To succeed we will need to take advantage of every single national security asset at our disposal. Recently, one of our top CIA operatives was "outed" by White House employees, thus compromising her work and even the lives of her sources and acquaintances overseas. If we do not show the appropriate immediate vigorous response, we could

undermine our efforts in the Middle East, by discouraging people to come to American officials with assistance or information.

Finally, I have two amendments that will help refocus some of our energy and resources on Afghanistan. The supplemental continues to shortchange Afghanistan's reconstruction and security, and it does this at the peril of jeopardizing the rights of Afghan women and girls and hopes for a peaceful, democratic Afghanistan. The proposed funding levels neither adequately make up for the small amounts of reconstruction funding thus far nor do they meet the country's needs.

In the last 2 years only 1 percent of Afghanistan's reconstruction needs have been met. The country remains in shambles from two decades of war and lack of development. Most people in the country do not have access to electricity, health care, schools, and sanitation. Not only is the lack of reconstruction depriving people of very basic services, but it is contributing to instability in the country and a lack of confidence in the central government.

The transitional government in Afghanistan estimates that between \$20 to 30 billion is needed over the next five years. In other post-conflict settings, an average of \$250 per person was spent per year in aid. But in Afghanistan, donors spent only \$64 per person in 2002.

The proposed \$800 million Afghanistan reconstruction supplemental spending request represents less than 1 percent of the total \$87 billion Iraq and Afghanistan package. The \$20 billion request for Iraq reconstruction funding is 25 times as large as the Afghanistan request. Yet Afghanistan has approximately the same population size as Iraq and suffered more destruction over 23 years of war.

House Chairman YOUNG's mark to increase reconstruction funding for Afghanistan by \$400 million is a step in the right direction. But still more must be done. My first Afghanistan amendment will shift \$20 million from the Iraq budget toward Afghanistan to be used for developing electricity-generation and transmission infrastructure. If Afghanistan is ever going to thrive and progress, it will need consistent sources of energy, to power its factories, hospitals and homes. These funds will help.

The other amendment will improve the plight of Afghan women and girls. Women and girls continue to face severe hardship and violations of their rights in Afghanistan. Yet the Afghanistan request does not specify funds for programs to improve the status of women and to remedy the tremendous injustices they faced under the Taliban regime. My amendment proposes designating \$300 million for women's programs in the area of political rights and human rights, health care, education and training, and security, protection and shelters. I also propose earmarks of \$10 million of the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission and \$24 million for the Ministry of Women's Affairs. We must provide direct support to help strengthen those women-led, permanent Afghan institutions whose mission it is to promote women's rights and human rights. These are funds already authorized in the Afghan Freedom Support Act of 2002, but which still for the most part have not been appropriated.

Some girls have gone back to school in Afghanistan, but the majority have not because

there are not enough schools and those that do exist are in very bad shape. The Asian Development Bank estimates that an additional 13,851 primary schools need to be constructed, but the administration request is only for 275 schools. Some 40 percent of schools in Afghanistan were completely destroyed during the war, another 15 percent were heavily damaged, and in many areas of the country there were no schools for girls.

What's more, the advances in girls' education that have been made are under attack. In the past year, fundamentalist extremists have burned down, bombed, and otherwise violently attacked more than 30 girls schools. At most of the sites of these attacks, leaflets have been distributed threatening the families of girls who attend school or the teachers who teach them. Flyers distributed at the site of one of the first attacks read "Stop sending your women to offices and daughters to schools. It spreads indecency and vulgarity. Stand ready for the consequences if you do not heed the advice." Some families are now afraid to send their daughters to school. Our Nation promised to help free Afghan women; we cannot allow the extremists to take back these newly won freedoms.

I hope my colleagues will support these amendments. We must look toward a brighter future in Iraq, and work together to make that vision happen.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, and thank you to my colleague on the Rules Committee for your leadership and for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule to gag the strong, growing, and justified opposition to this \$87 billion blank check bill and to prohibit its amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republican majority had not issued this draconian, unfair rule to prohibit amendments to this wrong, blank check to President Bush, I would have offered a very important amendment that deserves this body's consideration.

My amendment was simple. It would have added \$1 billion to our global AIDS initiative this year, in order to reach the original \$3 billion authorization that this Congress and the President approved in May.

If the President can ask for a blank check of \$87 billion, for the life of me I don't understand why he won't ask for this \$1 billion.

He promised it, he traveled to African and touted his commitment, but in what has become his MO (modus operandi) he has mislead us again.

And in failing to live up to his commitment on AIDS, he is also neglecting a vital matter of national security.

Make no mistake about it, in Sub-Saharan Africa, the region worst hit by AIDS, the disease has contributed to the destabilization of whole communities, tearing at the very fabric of society by killing mothers, fathers, teachers, farmers, health professionals, business-people, and soldiers, and undermining the governing authority and political stability of entire nations. In short, AIDS is creating chaos.

Secretary of State Colin Powell has already described the global AIDS pandemic as something far worse than terrorism. And even our own national intelligence council has already concluded that a wholesale political, social, and economic collapse is very likely to occur in those countries that are already severely affected by AIDS.

Millions of lives are hanging in the balance, and we have the power to save them. We

cannot allow further delay, and AIDS will not wait for us to act. I urge the Republican leadership and the administration to wake up to this reality.

And I urge all members to join me in voting "no" on this rule which denies us the opportunity for continued debate on this and denies members the opportunity to offer important amendments, like the one I would have offered today.

The material previously referred to by Mr. FROST is as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That during 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, in the Committee of the Whole, it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

SEC. . (a) Of the amounts appropriated under the subheading "IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND"—

(1) the \$5,136,000,000 allocated for security, including public safety requirements, national security, and justice shall be used to rebuild Iraq's security services;

(2) \$5,168,000,000 shall be available for the purposes, other than security, set out under such subheading; and

(3) \$10,000,000,000 shall be available to the President to use as loans to Iraq for the purposes, other than security, set out under such subheading until the date on which the President submits the certification described in subsection (c).

(b) The President shall submit a notification to Congress if, of the amounts referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), an amount in excess of \$250,000,000 is used for any single purpose in Iraq.

(c)(1) The certification referred to in subsection (a)(3) is a certification submitted to Congress by the President stating that not less than 90 percent of the total amount of the bilateral debt incurred by the regime of Saddam Hussein has been forgiven by the countries owed such debt.

(2) On the date that the President submits the certification described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the unobligated balance of the \$10,000,000,000 referred to in subsection (a)(3) may be obligated and expended with no requirement that such amount be provided as loans to Iraq; and

(B) the President may waive repayment of any amount made as a loan under subsection (a)(3) prior to such date.

(d) The head of the Coalition Provisional Authority shall ensure that the amounts appropriated under the subheading "IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND", are expended, whether by the United States or by the Governing Counsel in Iraq, for the purposes set out under such subheading and in a manner that the head of the Coalition Provisional Authority does not find objectionable.

(e) It is the sense of Congress that each country that is owed bilateral debt by Iraq that was incurred by the regime of Saddam Hussein should—

(1) forgive such debt; and
(2) provide robust amounts of reconstruction aid to Iraq during the conference of do-

nors scheduled to begin on October 23, 2003, in Madrid, Spain and during other conferences of donors of foreign aid.

(f) In this section:

(1) The term "amounts appropriated under the subheading 'IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'" means the amounts appropriated by chapter 2 of this title under the subheading "IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND" under the heading "OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT".

(2) The term "Coalition Provisional Authority" means the entity charged by the President with directing reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 199, answered "present" 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]
YEAS—221

Aderholt
Alkin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggett
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins

Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Galleghy
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss

Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood

Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence

Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster

Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Tauzin
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clyburn
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley (OR)
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klecza
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud

Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns

| | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| Turner (TX) | Viscosky | Wexler |
| Udall (CO) | Watson | Woolsey |
| Udall (NM) | Watt | Wu |
| Van Hollen | Waxman | Wynn |
| Velazquez | Weiner | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|--------|
| Blunt | Clay | McKeon |
| Boehlert | Conyers | Putnam |
| Brown-Waite, | Johnson, E. B. | Souder |
| Ginny | Jones (OH) | Waters |
| Capps | Marshall | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1346

Messrs. HILL, CARDOZA, RODRIGUEZ, FORD, NEAL of Massachusetts and WEINER and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated again:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall No. 559, because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 201, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

AYES—221

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Cantor | Flake |
| Akin | Capito | Fletcher |
| Bachus | Carter | Foley |
| Baker | Castle | Forbes |
| Ballenger | Chabot | Fossella |
| Barrett (SC) | Chocola | Franks (AZ) |
| Bartlett (MD) | Coble | Frelinghuysen |
| Barton (TX) | Cole | Gallely |
| Bass | Collins | Garrett (NJ) |
| Beauprez | Cox | Gerlach |
| Bereuter | Crane | Gibbons |
| Biggert | Crenshaw | Gilchrest |
| Bilirakis | Cubin | Gillmor |
| Bishop (UT) | Culberson | Gingrey |
| Blackburn | Cunningham | Goode |
| Blunt | Davis, Jo Ann | Goodlatte |
| Boehner | Davis, Tom | Goss |
| Bonilla | Deal (GA) | Granger |
| Bonner | DeLay | Graves |
| Bono | DeMint | Green (WI) |
| Boozman | Diaz-Balart, L. | Greenwood |
| Bradley (NH) | Diaz-Balart, M. | Gutknecht |
| Brady (TX) | Doolittle | Harris |
| Brown (SC) | Dreier | Hart |
| Burgess | Duncan | Hastings (WA) |
| Burns | Dunn | Hayes |
| Burr | Ehlers | Hayworth |
| Burton (IN) | Emerson | Hefley |
| Buyer | English | Hensarling |
| Calvert | Everett | Hergert |
| Camp | Feeney | Hobson |
| Cannon | Ferguson | Hoekstra |

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Hostettler | Murphy | Sensenbrenner |
| Houghton | Murtha | Sessions |
| Hulshof | Musgrave | Shadegg |
| Hunter | Myrick | Shaw |
| Hyde | Nethercutt | Shays |
| Isakson | Neugebauer | Sherwood |
| Issa | Ney | Shimkus |
| Istook | Northup | Shuster |
| Janklow | Norwood | Simmons |
| Jenkins | Nunes | Simpson |
| Johnson (IL) | Nussle | Smith (MI) |
| Johnson, Sam | Osborne | Smith (NJ) |
| Jones (NC) | Ose | Smith (TX) |
| Keller | Otter | Stearns |
| Kelly | Oxley | Sullivan |
| Kennedy (MN) | Pearce | Sweeney |
| King (IA) | Pence | Tancredo |
| King (NY) | Peterson (PA) | Tauzin |
| Kingston | Petri | Taylor (NC) |
| Kirk | Pickering | Terry |
| Kline | Pitts | Thomas |
| Knollenberg | Platts | Thornberry |
| Kolbe | Pombo | Tiahrt |
| LaHood | Porter | Tiberi |
| Latham | Portman | Toomey |
| LaTourette | Quinn | Turner (OH) |
| Leach | Radanovich | Upton |
| Lewis (CA) | Ramstad | Vitter |
| Lewis (KY) | Regula | Walden (OR) |
| Linder | Rehberg | Walsh |
| LoBiondo | Renzi | Wamp |
| Lucas (OK) | Reynolds | Weldon (FL) |
| Manzullo | Rogers (AL) | Weldon (PA) |
| McCotter | Rogers (KY) | Weller |
| McCrery | Rogers (MI) | Whitfield |
| McHugh | Rohrabacher | Wicker |
| McInnis | Ros-Lehtinen | Wilson (NM) |
| Mica | Royce | Wilson (SC) |
| Miller (FL) | Ryan (WI) | Wolf |
| Miller (MI) | Ryun (KS) | Young (AK) |
| Miller, Gary | Saxton | Young (FL) |
| Moran (KS) | Schrock | |

NOES—201

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Abercrombie | Etheridge | Majette |
| Ackerman | Evans | Maloney |
| Alexander | Farr | Markey |
| Allen | Fattah | Matheson |
| Andrews | Filner | Matsui |
| Baca | Ford | McCarthy (MO) |
| Baird | Frank (MA) | McCarthy (NY) |
| Baldwin | Frost | McCollum |
| Ballance | Gephardt | McDermott |
| Becerra | Gonzalez | McGovern |
| Bell | Gordon | McIntyre |
| Berkley | Green (TX) | McNulty |
| Berman | Grijalva | Meehan |
| Berry | Gutierrez | Meek (FL) |
| Bishop (GA) | Hall | Meeks (NY) |
| Bishop (NY) | Harman | Menendez |
| Blumenauer | Hastings (FL) | Hastings |
| Boswell | Hill | Millender- |
| Boucher | Hinchey | McDonald |
| Boyd | Hinojosa | Miller (NC) |
| Brady (PA) | Hoeffel | Miller, George |
| Brown (OH) | Holden | Mollohan |
| Brown, Corrine | Holt | Moore |
| Capuano | Honda | Moran (VA) |
| Cardin | Hooley (OR) | Nadler |
| Cardoza | Hoyer | Napolitano |
| Carson (IN) | Insole | Neal (MA) |
| Carson (OK) | Israel | Oberstar |
| Case | Jackson (IL) | Obey |
| Clyburn | Jackson-Lee | Olver |
| Conyers | (TX) | Ortiz |
| Cooper | Jefferson | Owens |
| Costello | John | Pallone |
| Cramer | Johnson, E. B. | Pascarell |
| Crowley | Kanjorski | Pastor |
| Cummings | Kaptur | Paul |
| Davis (AL) | Kennedy (RI) | Payne |
| Davis (CA) | Kildee | Pelosi |
| Davis (FL) | Kilpatrick | Peterson (MN) |
| Davis (IL) | Kind | Pomeroy |
| Davis (TN) | Kleczka | Price (NC) |
| DeFazio | Kucinich | Rahall |
| DeGette | Lampson | Rangel |
| Delahunt | Langevin | Reyes |
| DeLauro | Lantos | Rodriguez |
| Deutsch | Larsen (WA) | Ross |
| Dicks | Larson (CT) | Rothman |
| Dingell | Lee | Roybal-Allard |
| Doggett | Levin | Ruppersberger |
| Dooley (CA) | Lewis (GA) | Rush |
| Doyle | Lipinski | Ryan (OH) |
| Edwards | Lofgren | Sabo |
| Emanuel | Lowey | Sanchez, Linda |
| Engel | Lucas (KY) | T. |
| Eshoo | Lynch | Sanchez, Loretta |

| | | |
|------------|---------------|------------|
| Sanders | Spratt | Udall (CO) |
| Sandlin | Stark | Udall (NM) |
| Schakowsky | Stenholm | Van Hollen |
| Schiff | Strickland | Velazquez |
| Scott (GA) | Stupak | Viscosky |
| Scott (VA) | Tanner | Waters |
| Serrano | Tauscher | Watson |
| Sherman | Taylor (MS) | Watt |
| Skelton | Thompson (CA) | Waxman |
| Slaughter | Thompson (MS) | Weiner |
| Smith (WA) | Tierney | Wexler |
| Snyder | Towns | Woolsey |
| Solis | Turner (TX) | Wu |

NOT VOTING—12

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------|
| Boehlert | Johnson (CT) | Putnam |
| Brown-Waite, | Jones (OH) | Souder |
| Ginny | Marshall | Wynn |
| Capps | McKeon | |
| Clay | Pryce (OH) | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1354

Mr. DICKS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

□ 1355

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 New York (Mr. WEINER) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 2, line 2.

Pursuant to House Resolution 401, the bill is considered read for amendment and no further motion or amendment is in order.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

TITLE I—NATIONAL SECURITY
CHAPTER 1
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY PERSONNEL
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY
For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$12,188,870,000: *Provided,*