

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-136)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2003, to the Federal Register for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the Federal Register on October 18, 2002.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property of interests in property that are in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons and by depriving them of access to the United States market and financial system.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 2003.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCOTTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TROOP/VETERANS AMENDMENTS BLOCKED BY HOUSE LEADERSHIP FOR CONSIDERATION OR DEFEATED ON HOUSE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, well, that was a quite a week's work for the United States Congress. We just managed to add \$87 billion to the debt of the United States of America if this legislation stands in conference with the Senate. \$87 billion will be borrowed to continue the conflict in Iraq and to build a vibrant new economy for Iraq, roads, bridges, highways, telephone systems, 9/11 ports, a lot of things that we could use here in the United States, investment that if it was made in the United States, would put more than a million people to work.

But in the wisdom of the Republican majority in the House, this will be money that will be borrowed and spent in Iraq. They would not allow us to convert it to loans. One gentleman from Indiana famously stood up with an amendment to convert it to loans last night. He knew his amendment was not going to be made in order. He got an hour to debate it and then went away like a sheep when his amendment was not allowed, did not even challenge the ruling of the Chair, did not even try to get a vote. And then when he was offered a chance to vote on a democratic amendment to turn it into a loan because they have \$7 trillion of oil reserves, he voted no.

People like that are going to have to explain that to their constituents. How is it more important that the working people of America assume billions of dollars of debt, that people for three generations are going to repay over the next 30 years for the people of Iraq so they may prosper, so they may better exploit their \$7 trillion of oil reserves, and we cannot ask them to contribute to that process. It is not about war damage. It is about the damage done to their economy by a brutal dictator.

Here are a few things that were not in the bill. Even though we are borrowing \$87 billion, it did not include \$4.6 billion transferred from rebuilding Iraq to quality-of-life enhancements for our troops so they can have potable

water, health and dental screening, postdeployment health care coverage for the Guard and Reserve, prepaid phone cards, transportation home on leave, they would not allow that. It was more important to borrow the money and spend it on Iraq.

An amendment to increase imminent-danger pay for the troops, the American men and women serving over there. And family separation allowance, prepaid phone cards, and \$25 million in loans to Reservists who own small businesses disrupted by this deployment. That was not in the bill because it was more important to borrow and spend the money to rebuild Iraq and to benefit the Iraqi people.

An amendment to add \$1.8 billion for veterans health care was not part of this bill. An amendment to add \$1.8 billion, another, a second one, by reducing the Iraqi construction account for veterans health care was not allowed.

I guess we know where the parties stand. We hear a lot about the Republicans are with the troops. They may be good at wrapping themselves in the flag, but when it comes to putting the money and their vote where the troops are, they are not there. They are AWOL. And they were AWOL on these amendments. They were AWOL on the amendment to add the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act to the bill. It would not have taken any money away from the Iraqi people, but would have given benefits to the people in the Armed Forces here.

An amendment to provide additional compensation to Guard and Reserve members, an amendment to provide Guard and Reserve members medical and dental screening upon being called to active duty, tricare coverage to certain Reserve members. An amendment to increase the basic pay of Reservists by \$1,000 a month.

An amendment, this one was quite an amendment, it was a tie vote, so that means that any person who voted against it on that side of the aisle, and 99 percent of them did, to give a \$1,500 bonus to those serving in Iraq or Afghanistan, and it would have come out of the foreign aid portion, the build-Iraq portion of this budget.

So the Republican majority decided it was more important to give more money to a country with \$7 trillion of oil reserves than it was to give a \$1,500 bonus. I guess they have not talked to their Reservists who have been called up. I have. Many of them have taken huge cuts in pay. They are putting their family businesses at risk, if they have family businesses. Yeah, they may get their jobs back when they return, but they are never going to make up for that income.

This would have just been a fraction of what many of them lost. But, no, they could not do that. It was more important to give \$20 billion to the Iraqi people to build their infrastructure, their roads, their bridges, their health care, their education system, their sewer, their water systems, things that we could use across America.

An amendment to reimburse any servicemember or any family who purchases protective body armor. We voted \$79 billion last April, we borrowed, the House of Representatives, the Senate, the President, borrowed \$79 billion for this war last April, and it did not include the body armor. Well, the money was there, yes. But Rumsfeld did not order it because he said, oh, the troops are not going to be there long enough to need it, and people are going to greet them by waving little tiny American flags. So he just did not order the body armor. It is not that they did not have the money. They did not order it. They did not order the armored Humvees for our troops.

What they have not done is incredible, but what they have done is even worse. They have indebted the people of the United States of America for \$87 billion, most of it to benefit the residents of another nation and not here in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DISAGREEING WITH THE PASSAGE OF H.R. 3289

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I think we need to put in perspective what just happened and unfolded on the floor of the House. And I think it is important to share this with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because that is what we are sharing with this afternoon, the journey that we just took and the importance and the monumental statement that we made today.

Just for a slight bit of history and fairness to the debate, might I just say that I opposed the War Resolution of 2002 on the basis of facts. The first question was whether or not the administration made its case on the existence of weapons of mass destruction and whether or not the United States was under imminent attack.

Though I am trained to be polite, and I do not want to say I told you so, clearly this war was not about weapons of mass destruction which have not yet been found, and clearly the United States with the condition of Saddam Hussein and the poorness of his country were not about to be imminently attacked. But the war did occur.

And so I disagree with the majority leader, it is not war. The war against terrorism is our war. And that war had the embrace of the world leaders and nations after 9/11. And we blew up that coalition by going singly, unilaterally without a Constitutional vote in a war against Iraq. We broke the coalition. We broke the friendships and the alliances around the war against terrorism. The war against terrorism is our mutual vote. But there is no suggestion that Iran or Iraq or Korea is anymore engaged in the war against terrorism that would have warranted a preemptive attack against Iraq. But yet our young men and women went forward to the front lines, our neighbors or friends, our sons and daughters, and we rallied around them.

I take issue with the majority leader who would question any Member's patriotism because we refused to go down the rosy path of destruction and foolishness of this administration. How dare you suggest who is unpatriotic and who is not? Yes, I support the troops, and you cannot dare tell me I do not. What have you done?

This past weekend I spent many, many hours with troops in the Middle East, young men and women who did not care whether or not their names were cited. They wanted us to know that there is no exit strategy, that they have been there for 7 and 8 and 9 months and no one will tell them when they can go home, that there are no jobs for them to do there in terms of their particular responsibilities, that the part of their work is over, and yet they still cannot go home, that carpenters and painters and electricians are being used as police officers to knock open doors. Why not the Iraqi police?

When they ask about their pay, Reservists and National Guard, they cannot even get paid proficiently and efficiently. But yet, Madam Speaker, today the majority of this Congress voted \$3.2 billion for security and law enforcement in Iraq, \$1.3 billion for justice public safety and civil society infrastructure, \$5.65 billion for electrical generation, and \$2.1 billion for oil infrastructure, and \$4.3 billion for water resources.

□ 1515

Of course we should help rebuild Iraq; I am not an isolationist. As we should Liberia and Haiti. But it is interesting how you can find little help and little resources for them.

This U.N. Security Council resolution that we are bragging about, it is a paper tiger. There is no commitment of troops. There is no fresh infusion of troops. The RAND Corporation said that if we were going to have the number of troops that we needed, we needed 350,000 troops on the ground. We have barely 130,000. We do not have fresh troops to be able to put in so our other troops can go home. And then on top of that we have a situation where we are not paying our troops.

So my amendments regarding making sure they get paid, not allowed. My amendments saying there should be an exit strategy, not allowed. My amendment to prohibit funds to be used until there is an exit strategy, not allowed. My amendment that would restore back to Condoleezza Rice the right to coordinate the funds to oversee the President's plan, stricken or not allowed. They have language in there that says she cannot control the monies, and she has been put over the plan that should be rebuilding Iraq.

My amendment to separate the vote, meaning vote from the troops separately from the rebuild so that we can collaborate in the Madrid conference, not allowed. None of the serious amendments allowed on the basis of supporting our troops was in order. We were stopped in our tracks.

I am glad to say that most of the American people have enough sense to know that this is a foolish, misdirected, and unfortunate policy of the United States. I hope we will come together on behalf of the troops. And how dare you suggest that any of our patriotism should be questioned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SKELTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MISGUIDED POLICY OF NATION BUILDING IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I want to spend a little bit of time this evening talking about the bill that we spent 3 days debating. That is the \$87 billion appropriations bill that we just voted on and passed, not so much that I want to rehash what we did during these 3 days as much as to make a point that we ought to be debating something other than the technicality of how to spend \$87 billion of the taxpayers' money. And that has to do with overall policy.