United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2003 No. 145—Part II

House of Representatives

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. 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. LAHOOD) 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 of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2030

LIMITATION ON CERTAIN AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3289 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 396, before consideration of any other amendment, except pro forma amendments by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments:

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG; an amendment by Mr. GOODE; an amendment by Mr. KIRK; an amendment by Mr. FILNER; an amendment by Mr. SPRATT; an amendment by Mr. MARKEY; an amendment by Mr. HOLT; an amendment by Mr. WAXMAN; an amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER; an amendment by Mrs. MALONEY; an amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER, an amendment by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

Each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. An amendment may amend a portion of the bill not yet read, except that an amendment proposing to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill must conform to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would simply say to the House, I do not even know what the content of most of these amendments is, but what is going on here is that the staff has been attempting to work out understandings under which a huge number of amendments can be disposed of in the most efficient way possible.

As I understand it, there are approximately 39 pending amendments which are probably in order and about 69 that are not, and those numbers may be off a little bit but they are not bad for government work at 8:30 in the middle of a Red Sox game. But having said that, what this represents is that the sponsors of these amendments have agreed—all but two of these amendments as I understand it are in order, and those amendments, the sponsors have agreed to a severe time limit in order to have them considered. And in the case of the two amendments offered by persons who did not have germane amendments, my understanding is that those Members have agreed to drop all of their other amendments in return for a 5-minute consideration for their amendment before the point of order is lodged.

I think that is roughly what it is that we are agreeing to, if this is, in fact, agreed to by the body. So it is simply an attempt to try to take a huge universe of amendments and to create some smaller, manageable universes so that we can move the process along.

Let me say that, without even knowing the content of these amendments, I have strong feelings about the fact that Members are being reduced to having important issues on something like this considered in such a reduced time frame, but that is the choice we have under the rule that we have been given, and so we can either try to extend Members opportunities as much as possible or not, and that is what we have been trying to do.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as usual the gentleman understands the process well and has explained it well, and that is certainly our intent, to offer every Member every legitimate amendment.

For those that are subject to a point of order, we will raise the point of order, but we believe that Members should have the opportunity to debate the important issues, and at the same time, we would like to get finished sometime this week so that we can go to conference with the other body as soon as possible.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, first I would inform the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is the Yankees as well as the Red Sox game.

Secondly, I would ask the distinguished gentleman, the distinguished chairman, there are a number of Members who desire at some point tonight to strike the last word, and if we agree to this unanimous consent request, would that preclude an opportunity at

Printed on recycled paper.

some point tonight of striking the last word?

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 2037

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Number 1, an amendment by Mr. SHADEGG;

Number 2, an amendment by Mr. GOODE;

Number 3, an amendment by Mr. KIRK;

Number 4, an amendment by Mr. FILNER;

Number 5, an amendment by Mr. SPRATT;

Number 6, an amendment by Mr. MARKEY;

Number 7, an amendment by Mr. HOLT;

Number 8, an amendment by Mr. WAXMAN;

Number 9, an amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER;

Number 10, an amendment by Mrs. MALONEY;

Number 11, an amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER; and

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

Each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated or a designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2045

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

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

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

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I thank the Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KIRK:

In section 2202(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), strike ''(other than paragraph (2))''.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, sole-source contracting should be part of our country's past and not its future. While sole-source contracting has had some limited utility, it more often leads to questions of integrity that discredit our Federal Government. I believe that this bill should have no sole-source contracting allowed, but the base text says differently.

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

□ 2100

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

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

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

I would urge that the House adopt this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I hold in my hand a letter from Citizens Against Government Waste. While they had a number of negative opinions on several amendments here, the one amendment that Citizens Against Government Waste endorsed on this bill is my amendment, which would prevent no notice sole-source contracting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER:

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

TITLE IA—DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been reserved.

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

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

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

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, we have talked about the lack of accountability of this administration, the poor wisdom of unilateral action, and the lack of a plan on the part of this administration, but I want to spend the few minutes that is allotted to me on priorities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. FILNER. I would, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will suspend.

Mr. FILNER. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will suspend.

Mr. FILNER. * * *

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

Mr. FILNER. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

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

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODE:

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

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

□ 2115

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

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

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

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

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

I also fear that the $100 million for Sudan and Liberia will not be utilized in a way that will be to the best interest of the United States. I am fearful that in the end that will not bring the peace and the hope for a good Liberia and good Sudan. So I hope it would be the pleasure of this body to adopt my amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Today we have an opportunity and obligation to Liberia.

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY:

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

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

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

Strike section 1101.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2130

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just must respond to the comments made about the necessity to leave maximum flexibility with the Pentagon. I would simply observe that we did that with the last $60 billion that we gave them, and that is, I guess, how we came up with 40,000 troops that still did not have the Kevlar linings for their body armor; that flexibility is how we came up with an inadequate number of jammers so that our soldiers are still dying and being maimed by remotely detonated bombs; I guess that is why some of the Humvees over there still are not protected with Kevlar blankets; and I guess that is how we came up with the recommendation from the Pentagon that still leaves 80 percent of our troops in Iraq without drinkable water.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLT:

Page 30, lines 1 and 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $900,000,000)''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

second greatest oil reserves in the world?

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

I ask for support of my amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MALONEY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SHADEGG:

Page 28, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $245,000,000)''.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2145

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

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

The funds for Liberia that are in the legislation as it cleared committee were not sought by the President and were not a part of his effort. Indeed, he made it very clear that his legislation was seeking funding for Iraq and Afghanistan, and those two only. Those funds could be sought elsewhere. They could and should be a part of the normal 2004 appropriations process. They could be a part of the CJS appropriations bill, the foreign operations bill, or one of the omnibus bills that we will deal with in the future. Moreover, the U.N. mission in Liberia has yet to even request these funds or to proffer a budget for that effort.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, why is the cost of this contract exploding? A report released today by my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), sheds some troubling light on Halliburton's practices. I would note that the General Accounting Office has found that contracts entered into in secret, outside the framework of standard Federal contracting processes, rarely are the best buy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This amendment, as the gentlewoman from New York has described, modifies our competition and contracting provisions and adds some additional reporting items. This one, unlike the one we debated earlier, is not opposed by the Committee on Government Reform.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRATT:

In chapter 1 of title I of the bill—

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

''Part A'';

(2) strike section 1104; and

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

Part B

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) $55,100,000 is for ''Military Personnel, Army'';

(2) $57,000,000 is for ''Military Personnel, Navy'';

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

(4) $60,800,000 is for ''Military Personnel, Air Force''.

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

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

(1) for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $3,900,000;

(2) for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $42,000,000; and

(3) for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $2,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) $54,200,000 is for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'';

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

(3) $3,200,000 is for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) $42,500,000 is for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'';

(2) $5,000,000 is for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps''; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term ''small business concern'' has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and relevant regulations promulgated thereunder, except that if the Administrator determines it to be necessary or appropriate, the Administrator may waive any size standard established under such section with respect to a business concern that does not exceed 150 percent of each size standard applicable to such concern.

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

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

SEC. 1134. VOCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR QUALIFIED RESERVISTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2200

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I guess this is a parliamentary inquiry. I, frankly, would like to be able yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) a minute of my time before I express my reservation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This amendment provides $50 million to enhance DOD–VA transition programs for disabled service members. At an Armed Services Committee hearing a couple of months ago, General Jack Keane, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, talked of a serviceman blinded and badly injured in Iraq. He told our committee that the Army was going to take care of the young man, but he was more specific than that. He spoke of mentoring him, of helping him go to college, and providing him with training so that he could reintegrate into civilian life. This is the right thing to do, but it will not be easy or free. My amendment provides resources to help make General Keane's vision a reality for our disabled veterans.

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

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

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

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

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

* * * * *

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

Page 29, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

My amendment addresses this issue by doubling to over $34 million the funding available for security requirements that would directly support personnel who would be implementing the assistance. The amendment would increase administrative capacity by $20 million. Simple little things like giving these people a fixed-wing aircraft that could have six to 12 people flying around Afghanistan could dramatically increase their productivity. It is an outrage that we do not do it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2215

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge Members to vote against the Sanchez amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Garrett (NJ)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—224

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

NOT VOTING—13

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2245

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—20

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

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2253

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 550]

AYES—146

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

Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Solis
Spratt
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—279

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Manzullo
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McNulty
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2301

Mr. BAIRD changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 256, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

AYES—169

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—256

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Manzullo
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Stearns

Stenholm
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2309

Mr. BALLANCE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 295, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—128

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Case
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Doggett
Duncan
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Solis
Strickland
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—295

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Manzullo
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McNulty
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

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

□ 2323

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, last spring Congress approved a $673 billion supplemental appropriation for our troops in Iraq. I voted for that appropriation because I felt that, regardless of whether or not we should have invaded Iraq, the fact is that we are there now, and we cannot afford to allow Iraq to slide into civil war and disorder. That is what happened in Afghanistan after the defeat of the Soviet Union. The failure of the world community to rebuild that country allowed it to become an extremist theocracy and a haven for al Qaeda with catastrophic results.

But we have not received an accounting of the use of those funds. We have discovered that American soldiers have died because, despite the funds we voted, the administration did not supply all our troops with Kevlar plates for their body armor or armor plates for their Humvees. We have learned of no-bid contracts for Halliburton and a $15 million contract for cement factories that the Iraqis can build for $80,000. We have not learned of realistic plans to share the costs and the burdens with other countries and to prevent the nationalist guerrilla war against us by demonstrating to the Iraqi people that we are running an international reconstruction, not an American occupation.

Last October, I voted against authorizing the use of military force in Iraq. I believed that the resolution was far too broad a blank check to the President and that it would send us down a perilous course. We know now, as some suspected then, that the administration misled us when it asserted that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, that it was developing nuclear weapons, that it had cooperated with al Qaeda in the 9/11 attacks, and that it posed an imminent threat to this country.

I believed then, as I believe now, that the war in Iraq has diverted resources and attention away from the deadly, serious war waged against the United States by al Qaeda and other Islamic terrorist groups, a war which poses a very real threat to our safety and security, and to which I do not believe we

are giving sufficient resources or attention.

This bill is another blank check to the President. I cannot support it, given the administration's obvious failure to plan for the realities of postwar Iraq and its refusal to make good faith adequate proposals to share the power and the burden of the reconstruction of Iraq so that our soldiers do not continue to do almost all the dying and our taxpayers almost all the paying for the cost of cleaning up the mess in Iraq.

I cannot support it, given the administration's insistence on increasing the deficit and the debt burden on our children and grandchildren by refusing even to let us vote on paying for this bill by reducing the tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, we need not approve this bill in order to support our troops. The $63 billion we approved last spring will fund the military personnel and operations through at least next April and May.

We should defeat this bill and insist that the President and the Republican leadership of the House come back to us with a proposal that accounts for the public's money, protects our troops and shares the burden with other nations. We have the time and the ability to do this job right.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, today the United Nations passed a resolution. This is another fig leaf. It changes nothing. It does not create a timetable, it does not give up any power by the United States. The situation in Iraq with respect to the United Nations is exactly as it was before.

This is like a sense of the congress resolution that went through the United Nations, offering the opportunity for people to contribute money or offering people the opportunity to contribute soldiers. It does not change the fact that this war is in violation of the United Nations charter, and it does not change that situation.

Now, we have created a situation over there where there is no frontline. Another Vietnam person and myself were sitting in the back, and the worst thing about Vietnam was there was no frontline.

□ 2330

You were never sure. You were never safe. You did not know where they were coming from. And we have that situation going on today.

Mr. Chairman, I will enter into the RECORD an article from The Telegraph, a British newspaper. We would not find it in an American newspaper: ''U.S. Army suicides in Iraq three times the usual rate.'' Our people are killing themselves at three times the rate of any other war we have ever been in.

Now, as a psychiatrist who dealt in Vietnam, I know what some of this is about. I saw this. And if we do not pay attention to this, we simply are ignoring it. We can stand out here and argue about the price of gasoline, whether it is 71 cents or $1.14, or whatever it is in Iraq. That misses the point of what is going on in that country. We are sending troops over there on a regular basis.

Mr. Chairman, I will enter into the RECORD an article from the Oregon Live which talks about the fact that 700 soldiers from Oregon's second battalion, 162nd Infantry, left their homes on Sunday for training and duty in Iraq. These soldiers have the old-style body armor, not the new Kevlar, but the old stuff; and they have hope, they say, because they are relieving a Florida unit which is fully outfitted in modern armor. The arriving Oregon troops hope they can swap vests with the departing Floridians. When asked about why the Floridians have the vests and the Oregonians do not, they said, oh, it is politics. Look where the money comes from.

Mr. Chairman, we are putting people over there on a daily basis in real trouble. And I know we have had delegations go over there and they ride around in Humvees; they never get out in the street. They are not allowed. They do not allow them to get into danger. We cannot have a Congressman shot in Baghdad or in a Humvee that blows up. What kind of a story would that be in the newspaper? We can believe that no Congressman is going to get anywhere near anything close to being bad.

But our kids are. There is a kid I saw up at Walter Reed Hospital this week. I go up there every week. And this kid's name is PFC Kushnow. He said I could use his name, so I am going to name him. He is from Baltimore. PFC Kushnow said, ''You know what I can't understand? I had to pay $1.75 a minute to make a phone call home to my wife, and you are spending millions of dollars putting in a cell phone system for the Iraqis. What is going on? Doesn't anybody care about me talking to my family?''

This is what is going through the minds of our kids, because they can see. They see it on the ground.

Another kid was riding in a Humvee; he is a civil affairs officer from South Dakota. He was a clerk in a store. He gets called up on National Guard duty. So he goes over there, he is riding out in this car to go and talk about setting up a school. The machine blows up and he has no leg.

Now, this is what we are dealing with here, and it is not going to be dealt with by us talking about this. If the military, if the Defense Department, or the war department, really, if they really cared about these kids, there would not be 44,000 of them over there without the Kevlar vests. They could have done something about it. They refused to do it. They were making 3,000 a month, and now they are making 25,000 a month. Where were they when the war started?

[From the Telegraph, Oct. 14, 2003]

U.S. ARMY SUICIDES IN IRAQ THREE TIMES THE USUAL RATE

(By Oliver Poole)

LOS ANGELES.—Suicides among American servicemen in Iraq are running at up to three times the usual rate, the army has revealed.

Since the start of the war 11 have been confirmed and a dozen more deaths are being investigated as suspected suicides. If all are confirmed it would mean an annualised rate of 34 per 100,000 servicemen.

Most have happened after May 1 when ''major combat operations'' were declared over. Since then troops have had to cope with increasing paramilitary attacks with less opportunity to defend themselves.

The usual army suicide rate is 10 to 13 per 100,000, mirroring the figure for the same age group in the general population.

Officials say the unsettled situation in Iraq, combined with long deployments away from home and spartan barrack conditions, can make any symptoms of depression worse.

Accessibility of weapons in a war zone can also quickly turn a passing thought into action. ''It just takes a second to put it to your head and pull the trigger,'' said Lt Col Elspeth Ritchie, a psychiatrist at the army's Uniformed Services University.

The army said it would send doctors to Iraq to try to reduce the problems and improve the identification of soldiers at risk. It has sent 478 home with mental health issues.

One of the latest victims was buried yesterday in the village of East Berlin, Pennsylvania. Corey Small, 20, killed himself after calling home, in front of other troops waiting to use the telephone.

There are no official figures for the number of GI suicides in Vietnam. But when the U.S. pulled out in 1975 it had lost 60,000 troops and according to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American equivalent of the British Legion, 180,000 Vietnam veterans have since committed suicide.

In Britain, more than 260 Falklands veterans have since committed suicide, greater than the number killed in the conflict.

[From Oregon Live, Oct. 15, 2003]

HAND-ME-DOWN BODY ARMOR

The safety of U.S. troops should not rest on their parents, their congressman or their military status.

The best-equipped military in the world should not depend on worried parents to outfit U.S. soldiers in Iraq with body armor strong enough to stop bullets fired by modern assault rifles.

Yet that's what's happening now.

Members of Congress estimate that at least 44,000 U.S. troops are still wearing Vietnam-era vests that will not stand up to the high-velocity weaponry the soldiers are facing on the mean streets of Iraq. So, anxious parents in this country are frantically shopping for modern body armor to send to their sons and daughters in Iraq.

Most of the thinly protected troops are National Guard units. In replies to e-mails, Oregon guardsmen serving in Iraq reported Monday they were still wearing old-style body armor. They said they hope new vests arrive soon.

They shouldn't hold their breath. The Pentagon admits it will be months before all troops have modern ''Interceptor'' vests with tough ceramic plates.

Another 700 soldiers from Oregon's 2nd Battalion, 162nd Infantry, left their homes Sunday for training and duty in Iraq. These soldiers have the old-style body armor, but they may get lucky. They are to relieve a Florida unit fully outfitted in modern armor. The arriving Oregon troops hope to swap vests with the departing Floridians.

Why do all of the Florida guardsmen have the modern vests, and the Oregon soldiers do not? The answer is political clout: Rep. C.W. Bill Young, R–Fla., is the powerful chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

The safety of U.S. troops should not depend on who represents them in Congress or how quickly their parents can acquire hard-to-find body armor. It also should make no difference whether the soldier is on active duty or a year long National Guard commitment.

Only the ceramic body armor can stop bullets such as the 7.62mm rounds fired by Kalashnikov rifles found everywhere in Iraq and Afghanistan. The vests work: Army Sgt. Chris Smith, 24, was shot in the chest during an ambush in Iraq in August. Smith's armor shattered as it was designed to do and he suffered only a bruised chest. He returned fire and killed his attacker.

The Interceptor vests have been in production since 1999, but only now, with Congress and soldiers' parents criticizing the Pentagon, has the pace of manufacturing rapidly increased.

The Pentagon is trying to lay the blame on manufacturers, but that won't wash. A year ago, when the military was preparing for war with Iraq, it was content to hire just three manufacturers producing about 3,000 ceramic plates for Interceptor vests per month. Now that U.S. soldiers are being shot down and the political pressure is on, the Pentagon has scrambled to hire more manufacturers, which are churning out more than 25,000 plates a month.

There should have been a sense of urgency about this long before now. The shortage of body armor among U.S. troops in Iraq is not a matter of money; it is a matter of priorities.

The Bush administration promises that all the U.S. troops in Iraq will have Interceptor vests by December—a ''Merry Christmas'' from the Pentagon. We're guessing a National Guard unit will be the last to get the body armor, and with it the measure of safety the Pentagon should have provided long ago.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. 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. LINDER) 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 of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON CERTAIN AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3289 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 396, before consideration of any other amendment, except pro forma amendments by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments: an amendment by Mr. KIND or Mr. CARDIN; an amendment by Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD; an amendment by Mr. HOEFFEL; an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas; an amendment by Mr. RAMSTAD or Mr. MOORE; an amendment by Mrs. TAUSCHER; an amendment by Mr. STUPAK; an amendment by Mr. REYES; an amendment by Mr. DEFAZIO; an amendment by Mr. WEINER; an amendment by Mr. DEUTSCH; an amendment by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ; and an amendment by Mr. SHERMAN.

Each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated or a designee, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. An amendment may amend a portion of the bill not yet read, except that an amendment proposing to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill must conform to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). 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 Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

There was no objection.

CONCERNS ABOUT EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be in the well this evening to offer an amendment to the pending legislation, the legislation under which the House of Representatives has been asked by the President of the United States to borrow $87 billion to continue to pursue the conflict in Iraq and nearly $20 billion of that will be used to build Iraq. This is not an issue of rebuilding Iraq; it is building Iraq. Many of the things that are included in this legislation will provide Iraq with infrastructure that they could not even have dreamed of before this war: wireless Internet network, a 911 cellular system, new sewer systems, combined cycle turbines for their electricity. These are not things that were destroyed in the war; they are things that were neglected through 30 years of dictatorial rule by Saddam Hussein.

□ 2340

And now we are being told that somehow it is the responsibility of the American people to borrow money to construct these projects generally in an exorbitant price.

I had hoped to offer an amendment to the American Parity Act that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) and I introduced early in the year, that would require that we match dollar for dollar the expenditures in Iraq with similar expenditures in the United States. For instance, under this legislation we are going to invest, the United States of America is going to borrow on behalf of the American people and send $50 million more to Iraq to further improve their port, which is already a fully functioning port in which the American people have already invested $50 million since the war. But I have ports in my district that cannot get a penny for dredging.

Under this legislation, the United States Congress is going to borrow, at the request of the President, on behalf of the American people, and send to Iraq tens of millions of dollars to pay Iraqis for no-show jobs, former members of the regime, former members of the military. They will be paid not to work. Yet the President tells us that we cannot afford to draw down the $20 billion unemployment trust fund here in the United States of America and give extended unemployment benefits to Oregonians and others who have exhausted their benefits and cannot find a job through no fault of their own.

We are going to give them a state-of-the-art energy infrastructure despite the fact that the lights blinked out here in the eastern U.S. this summer, in my part of the country two summers ago. Our whole system is underinvested in, unstable, but the Iraqis have 1960s boilers, and Mr. Bremer is appalled so we are going to purchase them brand new combined-cycle turbines at exorbitant prices to be installed by Halliburton and others to give them a state-of-the-art energy infrastructure with money borrowed from the American people.

The American people are going to borrow money and spend tens of millions of dollars to buy new AK–47s for

the police force of Iraq. We could not even have a buy America provision and give them M–16s or something made in the United States of America. These things are not going to benefit the American people. I do not believe they are going to protect our troops. Our troops need the flak vests, they needed armored Humvees. They need rides all the way home. They need some basic things they are not getting. And none of the billions in this bill are going to that either.

But this amendment that I would have offered, I went to the Committee on Rules, and I asked to have it made in order. I said just allow us a vote. All we want is a simple vote up or down, do the Members of this House think it is at least as important to invest in the economic reconstruction and stimulation of this country, putting people to work, unemployment benefits, roads, bridges, highways, hospitals, schools, health care. That would have been a statement from this Congress where we would have put more than a million people back to work by matching the investment in Iraq.

But I have been shut down by the Republican majority, the majority Committee on Rules. I am not being allowed to offer that amendment. And that is too bad because I think a majority, a large majority of the American people would support such an amendment.

There has been a lot of hypocrisy here tonight. People who said they supported loans instead of grants, but then when they were given finally an opportunity to vote for a loan instead of a grant, those who stood bravely here and said they would support a loan instead of a grant and were denied a vote by the Republican majority, their own party, when they were given a chance to vote on a Democratic amendment for loans versus grants, they voted no. And I hope they are held to account by their constituents.

I hope people are held to account by their constituents for the fact that this House, the people's House, the Republican majority, are refusing to allow us to vote on matching investments, investing in our country, in our people, in our infrastructure, in our economy, at least comparable to that which we are borrowing to invest in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). 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 Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FEENEY 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 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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) on my behalf.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) who just spoke in the well and fully agree with him that we should have been given an opportunity to make the same kind of investments in America that we are prepared now and voting on to make in Iraq. I think we owe it to the American people. We owe it to our economy. We owe it to our families.

Earlier, just a few minutes ago our colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), spoke about the realities of the war taking place in Iraq and the real impact on the young men and women who are there fighting that war, fighting the continued hostilities that rain down on them on a daily basis, many, many times a day.

He has, like so many of us, had the honor and the privilege to visit with some of our soldiers who have returned home in a wounded condition, in many instances in a severely wounded condition. Young men and women who are now amputees, in some cases multiple amputees, who have been received at Walter Reed Hospital for their care.

When you meet these young men and women, you are honored to be in their presence. You are honored by their decision to take part in our Armed Forces. But we have not served them well with the plan that currently exists for postwar Iraq. We did not serve them well in the first days and weeks and the months since this ceasing of hostilities in Iraq with the formal fighting.

And I would like to read a letter from a young man from my district who is part of a military police unit. He sent this letter to me after he talked with me on the phone from Baghdad. And I want to quote part of the letter beginning with, he says, ''Now, I feel it is my duty as an American to point out a few simple facts to the people who depend on me and my compatriots to be strong, reliable soldiers in the National Guard. First of all, often when my military police unit discovers large caches of weapons, 80 millimeter rockets, mortars, and rocket-propelled grenades, we are ordered to leave them where we found them, completely unsecure, waiting to fall in the hands of the enemy. The reason? There are not enough EODs, explosive ordnance disposal teams available. So dangerous weapons that are used to kill Americans are left just to sit there. Imagine how frustrating it is to walk away from the weapon cache as neighborhood children climb and play on it, hoping beyond hope that yours won't be the life taken by something in that pile.

''Secondly, it may surprise you that many of us do not even have bulletproof vests and that everyone in my unit is driving an old first-generation Humvee, and, also, that does not repel bullets. My unit was on the ground in Iraq for a month without vests. Our communications equipment is archaic. Regular Army personnel have all of the up-to-date equipment, National Guard gets the leftovers.

''Our unit is now west of Baghdad living in a disgusting old prison that, among many other things, is an asbestos nightmare. Will there be health care available for those when we come home ill? Probably not since the Veterans Administration budget has already been trimmed by $1 billion. I would be willing to bet that the officials who gave the thumbs up to extending the National Guard tours for 6 months to 1 year wouldn't have done so if they had been in Iraq facing the very dangers that we do every day. Morale has begun to go downhill pretty darn fast and we are likely to crash if the extension stays in effect.''

That is a letter from a young soldier who puts his life in harm's way every day doing his duty as ordered by this country. One of the things he points out is that the National Guard units are now showing up in the theater of combat in Iraq with inferior equipment. Hopefully, tomorrow we will have made in order an amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and myself that will take some of the money from the hunt for weapons of mass destruction because we add 600 million new dollars to continue this quest where we found no weapons, we would take $300 million of that and transfer that to the National Guard so that no longer will we send these young people and these military police units that are from my district and from the West Coast to go into harm's way in a Humvee that is a first generation.

The National Guard, which we are going deeper and deeper into calling up them, and the Army Reserve, ought to be able to go in with the same first-class equipment as the Regular Army. These are not second-class citizens. We are relying on them to do a job in Iraq.

We rely on them to do a job in Afghanistan.

□ 2350

We rely on them to do jobs all over the world for the security of this Nation. They certainly are entitled to the care of this Congress by making sure that they have first-class and the same good equipment as the regular Army. We will have a chance to vote on this tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota 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.)

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

(Mr. HINCHEY 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 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 INTRODUCTION OF THE COMPASSIONATE VISITOR VISA ACT TO FACILITATE THE TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF NONIMMIGRANT ALIENS IN CIRCUMSTANCES OF FAMILY EMERGENCY OF CITIZENS OR PERMANENT RESIDENTS

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

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the compassionate Visitor Visa Act, a bill to facilitate the temporary admission into our country of nonimmigrant aliens, who present no security risk, in times of family emergency for close relatives that are United States citizens or legal permanent residents.

Mr. Speaker, each of us tries to make the best decisions we can on the national and international issues of our day. But each of us is also committed to helping those we serve with their individual concerns, where the rubber of our national policies meets the road of everyday life. And those of us who represent communities of proud immigrants maintaining close ties to their homelands know that a large, growing, and increasingly difficult and frustrating portion of our casework is devoted to immigration.

In my own case, these issues involve citizens and legal residents with ties to the countries of Asia and the Pacific, the Philippines foremost among them (my district has more Filipino-Americans than any other congressional district in our country.) And of the related immigration concerns my constituents have sought my assistance with, none have been more difficult and heartwrenching than those involving the efforts of families to be reunited in time of family emergency.

Consider the following real-life examples from my own district experience:

A U.S. citizen mother was diagnosed with a terminal illness. She wanted to see her daughter, a Philippine citizen, from whom she had been separated for 15 years, one last time. Her daughter had remained in the Philippines by choice with her husband and children when the rest of the family emigrated to the U.S. She had no desire to emigrate and was willing to travel to see her dying mother without her husband and children. Nonetheless, she was denied a temporary nonimmigrant visa to say a final farewell and to attend her mother's funeral because she was not able to demonstrate affirmatively that she would in fact return to the Philippines.

A terminally ill U.S. citizen had not seen any of her siblings for more than 20 years and wanted to see just one of them one last time. Her sister applied for a nonimmigrant visa to be able to visit and care for her sibling in her final days. Similarly, she was going to leave her own husband and young children behind in the Philippines. Her visa application was denied, the reason cited being that because her husband's income was modest and she was not employed, the assumption was the she would not return to the Philippines.

Madam Speaker, these are compelling stories of a well-intentioned immigration policy gone very wrong.

Let me first say that the problem these stories graphically illustrate and the solution my bill offers have nothing to do with preserving our homeland security. The reason for the rejection of these applicants was in no way related to any assessment of their security risk. They were subject to a security review like other applicants, and nothing in the compassionate Visa Act would alter that. All of that stands as it is and as it should be. (I will comment that resources to process security reviews in a timely and efficient manner are woefully inadequate to meet demand, but that is another discussion.)

The reason lies instead in the application of the presumption clause in current immigration law. In practice, applicants for nonimmigrant visas are presumed to be at risk of defaulting on their visas and remaining in our country illegally unless they can affirmatively prove that they will return to their countries. In the cases above, the applicants provided documentation to overcome this presumption and demonstrate they had every reason to return to their country of origin: they maintained homes, businesses, bank accounts, and would leave other family members, often children, behind, but to no avail.

We can and should have an in-depth debate about whether this policy, in theory and practice, is wise or fair across-the-board as to all nonimmigrant visa applicants, but this bill does not engage in that larger picture. What the Compassionate Visa Act does say, however, is that the presumption clause, as applied to close family members, who are not security risks, of U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents that are seriously ill or who have died, is wrong and should be changed.

Opponents of the bill may argue that the results would be to detract from homeland security and enhance the default rate on nonimmigrant visas. First, for the third time, nothing in this bill changes or compromises procedures designed to identify and weed out security threats, so that cannot be used as an excuse to avoid the focus of this bill. Second, this bill does not say that consular officers cannot consider evidence of applicants' willingness to honor visa terms and return to their countries, but it does say that the deck won't be virtually impossibly stacked against them from the get-go. And third, this bill applies only in the narrow case of an applicant whose close family member has a serious illness or has died or has some other similar family emergency, as demonstrated by proof to the satisfaction of the immigration officers. Frankly, I don't accept that changing the presumption clause will increase the default rate.

Madam Speaker, this is the right thing to do, and we should do it.

SAY NO TO ADDED DEBT FOR OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, this is not a debate about whether or not to fulfill our moral obligation to continue to work in Iraq. It is a debate about how to do it. It does not matter how we got into Iraq. We are there now. Americans of all stripes, those who supported the war and those who oppose it, know in their hearts that we are united in our desire to support our proud troops in the field and to continue our work in Iraq.

I will be joining the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and others in an attempt to increase the pay of those men and women who are making such a sacrifice in Iraq and Afghanistan tomorrow. But we owe these proud Americans in the field more than just that. We owe them a willingness to make some measure of sacrifice at home that is even the smallest fraction of the sacrifice they make overseas.

The bill before us takes the irresponsible road and fails to truly call upon us at home to actually pay for the costs of this war. This bill proposes to avoid any sacrifice at home by stealing every single dollar it spends from the Social Security trust fund to wage this war. Every single dollar proposed to be

spent will deplete the very funds that will be depleted by the forthcoming retirement of the baby boom generation. Every single dollar spent will be new debt foisted upon the shoulders of our children. Every single dollar that will be borrowed could hinder our economic recovery.

Why is this? Why is this short-sighted way being taken? Well, it is the addiction to the credit cards and it is wrong. It is a multi-billion dollar moral wrong to our children who have this debt put on their shoulders. And there is a better way.

We ought to ask for the smallest sacrifice at home to match that of our troops and reduce just a portion of the tax cut that people who earn over $300,000 will otherwise receive to pay for this war.

Do you know anyone who thinks that is unfair? Now, I remember the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) urged us to fight. Well, we will do that, but we cannot just fight the war in Iraq. We have got to fight the war on the Federal deficit too. And this bill will only fight one of those wars. We ought to have the courage to fight both.

If it is important enough for us to ask our troops to pay for this war with their lives, with their limbs, then it ought to be important enough for us to pay for this war without passing the cost on to our children, on to our soldiers' children.

This bill guarantees defeat. It runs up the white flag in the face of the deficit. It cuts and runs from the war on the Federal deficit and we should fight both.

Today there are men and women standing up for us in Iraq and we ought to stand up for them and say yes to supporting our troops and stand up for their children and say no to $87 billion in debt.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2004 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2004 THROUGH FY 2008

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2004 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 501 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through October 15, 2003.

The term ''current level'' refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2008, because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the ''section 302(a)'' allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2008. ''Discretionary action'' refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. A separate allocation for the Medicare program, as established under section 401(a)(3) of the budget resolution, is shown for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2013. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the Committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2004 with the ''section 302(b)'' allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This table also compares the current level of total discretionary appropriations with the section 302(a) allocation for the Appropriations Committee. These comparisons are needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach either the section 302(a) allocation or the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The last table gives the current level for 2005 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 501 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2004 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 95

[Reflecting action completed as of October 15, 2003—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2004	Fiscal years 2004–2008
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,880,555	(1)
Outlays	1,903,502	(1)
Revenues	1,325,452	8,168,933
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,872,765	(1)
Outlays	1,890,048	(1)
Revenues	1,331,108	8,377,091
Current Level over (+)/under (−) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	−7,790	(1)
Outlays	−13,454	(1)
Revenues	5,656	208,158

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2005 through 2008 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2004 in excess of $7,790,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2004 in excess of $13,454,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue reduction for FY 2004 in excess of $5,656,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue for FY 2004 through 2008 in excess of $208,158,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF OCTOBER 15, 2003

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2004		2004–2008 Total		2004–2013 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Armed Services:						
Allocation	70	34	70	70	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	−70	−34	−70	−70	n.a.	n.a.
Education and the Workforce:						
Allocation	39	47	201	245	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	2	1	2	2	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	−37	−46	−199	−243	n.a.	n.a.
Energy and Commerce:						
Allocation	−170	−170	439	439	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	1,502	254	949	1,051	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	1,672	424	510	612	n.a.	n.a.
Financial Services:						
Allocation	0	375	0	1,250	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	−1	−1	−2	−2	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	−1	−376	−2	−1,252	n.a.	n.a.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF OCTOBER 15, 2003—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2004		2004–2008 Total		2004–2013 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Government Reform:						
Allocation	−1	0	−3	−1	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	1	1	16	16	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	2	1	19	17	n.a.	n.a.
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	1	1	3	3	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	1	1	3	3	n.a.	n.a.
International Relations:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Judiciary:						
Allocation	19	19	95	95	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	−19	−19	−95	−95	n.a.	n.a.
Resources:						
Allocation	24	24	522	342	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	−24	−24	−522	−342	n.a.	n.a.
Science:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	9,256	0	41,134	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	6,405	0	6,405	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	−2,851	0	−34,729	0	n.a.	n.a.
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	20,626	20,054	24,079	23,876	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	17,979	17,960	22,810	22,850	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	−2,647	−2,094	−1,269	−1,026	n.a.	n.a.
Medicare:						
Allocation	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	0	0
Current Level	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	0	0
Difference	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	0	0

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of July 22, 2003 (H. Rpt. 108–228)		Current level reflecting action completed as of October 15, 2003		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development	17,005	17,686	18,430	18,244	1,425	558
Commerce, Justice, State	37,914	41,009	38,363	40,626	449	−383
National Defense	368,662	389,221	368,183	388,642	−479	−579
District of Columbia	466	464	509	514	43	50
Energy & Water Development	27,080	27,211	26,206	26,301	−874	−910
Foreign Operations	17,120	20,185	23,709	22,380	6,589	2,195
Homeland Security	29,411	30,506	29,411	30,110	0	−396
Interior	19,627	19,400	20,109	19,345	482	−55
Labor, HHS & Education	138,036	134,766	134,471	133,929	−3,565	−837
Legislative Branch	3,512	3,662	3,548	3,620	36	−42
Military Construction	9,196	10,282	10,777	10,521	1,581	239
Transportation-Treasury	27,502	71,360	28,255	70,345	753	−1,015
VA–HUD–Independent Agencies	90,034	95,590	87,313	92,642	−2,721	−2,948
TOTAL (Section 302(a) Allocation)	785,565	861,342	789,284	857,219	3,719	−4,123

Statement of FY 2005 advance appropriations under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 95 reflecting action completed as of October 15, 2003

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority
Appropriate level	23,158
Current Level:	
Homeland Security Subcommittee	
Bioshield[1]	2,528
Interior Subcommittee	
Elk Hills	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (head start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0
Treasury, General Government Subcommittee	
Payment to Postal Service	0
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee	
Section 8 Renewals	0
Total	2,528
Current Level over (+)/under (−) Appropriate Level	−20,630

[1] This advance appropriation was not on the list of accounts identified for advance appropriations included in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference in the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 95. Still, since the provision has been enacted, it is included as part of the current level for advance appropriations.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 16, 2003.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2004 budget and is current through October 15, 2003. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations

Act, 2003, and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003. These revisions are authorized by sections 421 and 507 of H. Con. Res. 95, respectively.

Since my last letter, dated September 4, 2003, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues for 2004:

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–83);

The Continuing Resolution, 2004 (Public Law 108–84);

The Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87);

The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–88);

An act to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program (Public Law 108–89);

The Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–90);

An act to amend chapter 84 of title 5 of the United States Code (Public Law 108–92); and

An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 108–99).

The effects of these new laws are identified in the enclosed table.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2004 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF OCTOBER 15, 2003

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous session:			
Revenues	0	0	1,466,370
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,089,029	1,061,356	0
Appropriation legislation	0	345,754	0
Offsetting receipts	−366,436	−366,436	0
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	722,593	1,040,674	1,466,370
Enacted this session (excluding emergencies [1]):			
Authorizing Legislation			
American 5-Cent Coin Design Continuity Act of 2003 (P.L. 108–15)	−1	−1	0
Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 2003 (P.L. 108–26)	4,730	4,730	145
Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (P.L. 108–27)	13,312	13,312	−135,370
Welfare Reform Extension Act of 2003 (P.L. 108–40)	99	108	0
Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act (P.L. 108–61)	0	0	−10
Smithsonian Facilities Authorization Act (P.L. 108–72)	1	1	0
An act to amend Title XXI of the Social Security Act (P.L. 108–74)	1,325	100	0
Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 108–77)	0	0	−5
Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 108–78)	0	0	−55
Continuing Resolution, 2004 (P.L. 108–84)	−2,222	1	−2
Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 (P.L. 108–88)	6,405	0	0
An act to extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program (P.L. 108–89)	15	−36	33
An act to amend chapter 84 of title 5 of the United States Code (P.L. 108–92)	1	1	0
An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act (P.L. 108–99)	0	0	2
Total, authorizing legislation	23,665	18,216	−135,262
Appropriation Acts:			
Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (P.L. 108–11)	215	27,349	0
Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–83)	3,548	2,949	0
Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–87)	368,694	251,486	0
Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–90)	30,216	18,192	0
Total, appropriation acts	402,673	299,976	0
Continuing Resolution Authority:			
Continuing Resolution, 2004 (P.L. 108–84)	366,209	193,807	0
Total, enacted this session	792,547	511,999	−135,262
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	357,625	337,375	0
Total Current Level[1, 2]	1,872,765	1,890,048	1,331,108
Total Budget Resolution	1,880,555	1,903,502	1,325,452
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	5,656
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	7,790	13,454	0
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2004–2008:			
House Current Level	0	0	8,377,091
House Budget Resolution	0	0	8,168,933
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	208,158

Notes.—P.L.=Public Law.

[1] Per section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes outlays of $262 million from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act of 2003 (P.L. 108–69), and budget authority of −$9 million and outlays of $573 million from funds provided in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–83).

[2] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include outlays of $508 million from prior appropriations for Social Security administrative expenses. As a result, the current level excludes these items.

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0101

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) at 1 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION 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, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–322) on the resolution (H. Res. 401) providing for 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARSHALL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. PUTNAM (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the birth of his child.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOLBE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, October 17.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1474. An act to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3229. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to transfer to the Public Printer the authority over the individuals responsible for preparing indexes of the Congressional Record, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, October 17, 2003, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4783. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael E. Zettler, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4784. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Raymond P. Huot, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4785. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael L. Dodson, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4786. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Demonstration Programs-Model Demonstrations to Improve the Literacy and Employment Outcomes of Individuals With Disabilities (RIN: 1820–ZA29) received October 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4787. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Charitable Choice Provisions Applicable to Programs Authorized Under the Community Services Block Grant Act (RIN: 0970–AC13) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4788. A letter from the Chief Counsel, WTB/CWD/Policy & Rules Branch, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Public Mobile Services and Personal Communications Services [WT Docket No. 01–108; FCC 02–229 and FCC 02–247] received October 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4789. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Parts 1, 43, and 63 of the Commission's Rules—received October 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4790. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rulemaking to Amend Parts 1, 2, 21, and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Redesignate the 27.5–29.5 GHz Frequency Band, to Reallocate the 29.5–30.0 GHz Frequency Band, to Establish Rules and Policies for Local Multipoint Distribution Service and for Fixed Satellite Services [CC Docket No. 92–297] received October 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4791. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—FWCC Request for Declaratory Ruling on Partial-Band Licensing of Earth Stations in the Fixed-Satellite Service That Share Terrestrial Spectrum [IB Docket No. 00–203 RM–9649] FWCC Petition for Rulemaking to Set Loading Standards for Earth Stations In the Fixed-Satellite Service that Share Terrestrial Spectrum; Onsat Petition for Declaratory Order that Blanket Licensing Pursuant to Rule 25.115 (c) is Available for Very Small Aperture Terminal Satellite Network Operations at C–Band [SAT–PDR–19990910–00091] Onsat Petition for Waiver of Rule 25.212(d) to the Extent Necessary to Permit Routine Licensing of 3.7 Meter Transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4792. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 to Implement the Global Mobile Personal Communications by Satellite (GMPCS) Memorandum of Undersanding and Arrangements [IB Docket No. 99–67] Petition of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to Amend Part 25 of the Commission's Rules to Establish Emission Limits for Mobile and Portable Earth Stations Operating in the 1610–1660.5 MHz Band [RM no. 9165] received October 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4793. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq as consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of2002 (Public Law 107–243); (H. Doc. No. 108—135); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4794. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4795. A letter from the Chief, Coordination and Review Section, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Race, Color, or National Origin in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance; Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance; Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance (RIN: 2105–AC96, et. al.) received September 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4796. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Outer Continental Shelf Facility Security [USCG–2003–14759] (RIN: 1625–AA68) received October 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4797. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Facility Security [USCG–2003–14732] (RIN: 1625–AA43) received October 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4798. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vessel Security [USCG–2003–14749] (RIN: 1625–AA46) received October 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4799. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Area Maritime Security [USCG–2003–14733] (RIN: 1625–AA42) received October 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4800. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Automatic Identification System; Vessel Carriage Requirement [USCG–2003–14757] (RIN: 1625–AA67) received October 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[October 17 (legislative day of October 16), 2003]

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 401. Resolution providing for 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 (Rept. 108–322). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII The Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3214 referred to the Committee of

the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3214. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than October 16, 2003.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 3305. A bill to revise the boundary of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3306. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove from an alien the initial burden of establishing that he or she is entitled to nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(B) of such Act, in the case of certain aliens seeking to enter the United States for a temporary stay occasioned by the serious illness or death of a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHOCOLA (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. RENZI, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. HART, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. OTTER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURNS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3307. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to create the Federal crime of eco-terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY of California (for himself, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. OSE, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FORD, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to convert the dairy forward pricing program into a permanent program of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 3309. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to restore certain provisions relating to the definition of aggravated felony and other provisions as they were before the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 3310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the depreciation recovery period for roof systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COLE, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 3311. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to address the rising cost of postsecondary education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 3312. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to add pears and cherries to the list of fruits and vegetables subject to regulation in a marketing order by grade, size, quality, or maturity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOSTETTLER (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GOODE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit Federal court jurisdiction over questions under the Defense of Marriage Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 3314. A bill to provide criminal penalties for false information about the status of a member of the Armed Forces engaged in armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3315. A bill to curtail the use of high-stakes tests in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3316. A bill to reauthorize the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 3317. A bill to expand the travel and transportation allowances available to members of the Armed Forces granted leave under the Rest and Recuperation Leave program, to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide TRICARE program eligibility for members of the Ready Reserve and financial support for continuation of health insurance for mobilized members of reserve components, and to increase the amount of basic educational assistance for members of the Selected Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. COLE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 3318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income employer contributions to college tuition plans and education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CASE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. JANKLOW):

H.R. 3319. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to permit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to register a Canadian pesticide; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. BERRY):

H.R. 3320. A bill to improve migratory bird management by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3321. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in the Baltimore, Maryland, metropolitan area; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BELL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 3322. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act, the Revised Statutes of the United States, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, and the amendments made by the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act of 1994 to protect consumers from predatory lending practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 3323. A bill to permit States to require insurance companies to disclose insurance information; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3324. A bill to provide compensation to livestock operators who voluntarily relinquish a grazing permit or lease on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SOLIS (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3325. A bill to designate certain public lands as wilderness and certain rivers as wild and scenic rivers in the State of California, and to establish the Ancient Bristlecone Pine Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3326. A bill to extend the King Range National Conservation Area boundary in the State of California to include the Mill Creek, Squaw Creek, and Indian Creek Forests; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3327. A bill to designate certain public lands as wilderness and certain rivers as wild and scenic rivers in the northern portion of the State of California, to designate Salmon Restoration Areas, to establish the Sacramento River National Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 3328. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to establish a program to provide assistance to small communities for use in carrying out projects and activities necessary to achieve or maintain compliance with drinking water standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 3329. A bill to prevent abuse of Government credit cards; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.J. Res. 72. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to obesity in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding oppression by the Government of the People's Republic of China of Falun Gong in the United States and in China; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H. Res. 400. A resolution honoring the 25th anniversary of Pope John Paul II's ascension to the papacy; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HALL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, Mr. HERGER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H. Res. 402. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the urgent need for freedom, democratic reform, and international monitoring of elections, human rights, and religious liberty in the Lao People's Democratic Republic; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. KOLBE):

H. Res. 403. A resolution recognizing the 30th anniversary of the founding of the National Foundation for Cancer Research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BELL, Ms. LEE, Mr. WATT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H. Res. 404. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the position of Iraqi Reconstruction Coordinator should be established within the Department of State to be accountable for all reconstruction funding in Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 180: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 290: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 463: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASE, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 486: Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 570: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 571: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 617: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 673: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 718: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 745: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 785: Mr. TURNER of Ohio and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 786: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 792: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 857: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 876: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. BURR.
H.R. 919: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 935: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 936: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 962: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 997: Mr. TURNER of Ohio and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 1046: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1102: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1105: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BELL, and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1121: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1205: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1212: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 1236: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1250: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 1285: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1316: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1322: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1336: Mr. GOSS, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 1421: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1470: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1501: Ms. LEE and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1523: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 1534: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1660: Mr. DEMINT.
H.R. 1695: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1708: Ms. NORTON, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1734: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1742: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1760: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1778: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1784: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 1790: Mr. JANKLOW.
H.R. 1796: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 1819: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1862: Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 1873: Mr. OSBORNE.
H.R. 1886: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1938: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1943: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 1956: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 2045: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2094: Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 2102: Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 2131: Mr. SOUDER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2133: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2166: Mr. HOUGHTON.
H.R. 2217: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2218: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2237: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 2239: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2327: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2347: Mr. KOLBE.
H.R. 2348: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BALLANCE.
H.R. 2437: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2456: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2485: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2491: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2494: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 2711: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ORTIZ, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2719: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2720: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 2727: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 2732: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 2735: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SHAW, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BALLANCE, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2743: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2760: Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 2764: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 2768: Mr. BAKER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 2771: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 2821: Mr. EVANS, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2833: Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 2837: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 2849: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2851: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 2864: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2889: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2897: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2914: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2924: Mr. JANKLOW.
H.R. 2978: Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 3010: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3043: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 3051: Mr. HOLT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3063: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 3066: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SPRATT, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 3078: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3099: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3103: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 3104: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3111: Ms. HARRIS and Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 3112: Mr. UPTON, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 3119: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 3125: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 3129: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 3130: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 3142: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. FARR, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BACA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SABO, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3158: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 3177: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 3190: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 3191: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NEY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3192: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CASE, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 3199: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3203: Mr. TERRY and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 3205: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 3214: Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. DUNN, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DICKS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BELL, Mr. WELLER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BURR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SABO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. REYES, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3220: Mr. CANNON and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 3228: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 3244: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3246: Mr. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. CHOCOLA.

H.R. 3247: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 3251: Mr. EMANUEL and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3257: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 3263: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 3266: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3281: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3295: Mr. PLATTS.

H.J. Res. 65: Mr. KELLER.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 247: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 257: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 269: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 280: Mr. COBLE, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. GERLACH.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WALSH, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FROST, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BELL, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. DEMINT.

H. Res. 42: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H. Res. 144: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 167: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 236: Mr. GOODE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 261: Ms. NORTON and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H. Res. 325: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 373: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 378: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H. Res. 382: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 394: Mr. HAYES.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 39: Page 31, line 5, strike ‘‘, the Department of Defense’’.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 40: Page 29, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ‘‘(increased by $20,000,000)’’.

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 41: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) MODIFICATION OF HIGHEST INCOME TAX RATE.—The table contained in paragraph (2) of section 1(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to reductions in rates after June 30, 2001) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘In the case of taxable years beginning during calendar year:	**The corresponding percentages shall be substituted for the following percentages:**			
	28%	**31%**	**36%**	**39.6%**
2003	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	35.0%
2004, 2005, or 2006	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	39.6%
2007	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	37.0%
2008 and thereafter	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	35.0% ’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

(c) APPLICATION OF EGTRRA SUNSET.—The amendment made by this section shall be subject to title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 to the same extent and in the same manner as the provision of such Act to which such amendment relates.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 30, on each of lines 1 and 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: ‘‘(reduced by $209,000,000)’’.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 43: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), add the following:

SEC. . None of the amounts made available and allocated for oil infrastructure under the heading ‘‘IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND’’ may be used to enter into any contract (except for a contract that is entered into using competitive procedures).

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 44: Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount insert (reduced by $153,000,000)’’.

Page 30, beginning on line 9, strike ‘‘$153,000,000 for private sector development;’’.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount insert (reduced by $2,100,000,000)''.

Page 30, beginning on line 5, strike ''$2,100,000,000 for oil infrastructure;''.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 46: Page 51, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3007. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' may be obligated or expended until the President certifies to Congress that the United States Government has received assurances from the Iraqi Governing Council or other appropriate Iraqi entity that a future Iraqi Government will repay to the United States Government all amounts expended under such heading and that this repayment will take priority over repayment of debts owed by Iraq to other countries.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. TANNER

AMENDMENT NO. 47: Page 51, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3007. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' may be provided in a form other than loans.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. DEUTSCH

AMENDMENT NO. 48: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 3007. None of the funds made available under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' may be provided until September 30, 2004.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. FILNER

AMENDMENT NO. 49: After the appropriating clause (preceding title I), insert the following:

TITLE IA—DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES

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

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 50: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR SECURITY AND STABILIZATION OF IRAQ THROUGH PARTIAL SUSPENSION OF REDUCTIONS IN HIGHEST INCOME TAX RATE FOR INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYERS.—The table contained in paragraph (2) of section 1(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to (relating to reductions in rates after June 30, 2001) is amended to read as follows:

''In the case of taxable years beginning during calendar year:	The corresponding percentages shall be substituted for the following percentages:			
	28%	**31%**	**36%**	**39.6%**
2001	27.5%	30.5%	35.5%	39.1%
2002	27.0%	30.0%	35.0%	38.6%
2003 and 2004	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	35.0%
2005 and thereafter	25.0%	28.0%	33.0%	38.2%''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2004.

(c) APPLICATION OF EGTRRA SUNSET TO THIS SECTION.—The amendment made by this section shall be subject to title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 to the same extent and in the same manner as the provision of such Act to which such amendment relates.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 51: At the end of title II of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____. (a)(1) Of the funds appropriated under chapter 2 of this title under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND''—

(A) not more than $5,000,000,000 may be obligated or expended before April 1, 2004; and

(B) the excess of the total amount so appropriated over $5,000,000,000 may not be obligated or expended after April 1, 2004, unless—

(i) the President submits to Congress in writing the certifications described in subsection (b); and

(ii) Congress enacts an appropriations law (other than this Act) that authorizes the obligation and expenditure of such funds.

(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to the $3,243,000,000 provided under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' for security and law enforcement or the $1,318,000,000 provided under such heading for justice, public safety infrastructure, and civil society (which includes funds for Iraqi border enforcement, enhanced security communications, and the establishment of Iraqi national security forces and the Iraq Defense Corps).

(b) The certifications referred to in subsection (a)(1)(B)(i) are as follows:

(1) A certification that the United Nations Security Council has adopted a resolution (after the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1483 of May 22, 2003, and after the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1500 of August 14, 2003) that authorizes a multinational force under United States leadership for post-Saddam Hussein Iraq, provides for a central role for the United Nations in the political and economic development and reconstruction of Iraq, and will result in substantially increased contributions of military forces and amounts of money by other countries to assist in the restoration of security in Iraq and the reconstruction of Iraq.

(2) A certification that the United States reconstruction activities in Iraq are being successfully implemented in accordance with a detailed plan (which includes fixed timetables and costs), and with a significant commitment of financial assistance from other countries, for—

(A) the establishment of economic and political stability in Iraq, including prompt restoration of basic services, such as water and electricity services;

(B) the adoption of a democratic constitution in Iraq;

(C) the holding of local and national elections in Iraq;

(D) the establishment of a democratically elected government in Iraq that has broad public support; and

(E) the establishment of Iraqi security and armed forces that are fully trained and appropriately equipped and are able to defend Iraq and carry out other security duties without the involvement of the United States Armed Forces.

(c) Not later than March 1, 2004, the President shall submit to Congress a report on United States and foreign country involvement in Iraq that includes the following information:

(1) The number of military personnel from other countries that, as of such date, are supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, together with an estimate of the number of such personnel to be in place in Iraq for that purpose on May 1, 2004.

(2) The total amounts of financial donations pledged and paid by other countries for the reconstruction of Iraq.

(3) A description of the economic, political, and military situation in Iraq, including the number, type, and location of attacks on Coalition, United Nations and Iraqi military, public safety, and civilian personnel in the 60 days preceding the date of the report.

(4) A description of the measures taken to protect United States military personnel serving in Iraq.

(5) A detailed plan, containing fixed timetables and costs, for establishing civil, economic, and political security in Iraq, including restoration of basic services, such as water and electricity services.

(6) An estimate of the total number of United States and foreign military personnel that are necessary in the short term and the long term to bring to Iraq stability and security for its reconstruction, including the prevention of sabotage that impedes the reconstruction efforts.

(7) An estimate of the duration of the United States military presence in Iraq and the levels of United States military personnel strength that will be necessary for that presence for each of the future 6-month periods, together with a rotation plan for combat divisions, combat support units, and combat service support units.

(8) An estimate of the total cost to the United States of the military presence in Iraq that includes—

(A) the estimated incremental costs of the United States active duty forces deployed in Iraq and neighboring countries;

(B) the estimated costs of United States reserve component forces mobilized for service in Iraq and in neighboring countries;

(C) the estimated costs of replacing United States military equipment being used in Iraq; and

(D) the estimated costs of support to be provided by the United States to foreign troops in Iraq.

(9) An estimate of the total financial cost of the reconstruction of Iraq, together with—

(A) an estimate of the percentage of such cost that would be paid by the United States

and a detailed accounting specified for major categories of cost; and

(B) the amounts of contributions pledged and paid by other countries, specified in major categories.

(10) A strategy for securing significant additional international financial support for the reconstruction of Iraq, including a discussion of the progress made in implementing the strategy.

(11) A schedule, including fixed timetables and costs, for the establishment of Iraqi security and armed forces that are fully trained and appropriately equipped and are able to defend Iraq and carry out other security duties without the involvement of the United States Armed Forces.

(12) An estimated schedule for the withdrawal of United States and foreign armed forces from Iraq.

(13) An estimated schedule for—

(A) the adoption of a democratic constitution in Iraq;

(B) the holding of democratic local and national elections in Iraq;

(C) the establishment of a democratically elected government in Iraq that has broad public support; and

(D) the timely withdrawal of United States and foreign armed forces from Iraq.

(d) Every 90 days after the submission of the report under subsection (c), the President shall submit to Congress an update of that report. The requirement for updates under the preceding sentence shall terminate upon the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces (other than diplomatic security detachment personnel) from Iraq.

(e) The report under subsection (c) and the updates under subsection (d) shall be submitted in unclassified form.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 52: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ___. (a) STUDY BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study to assess the effect on the Armed Forces, including the reserve components, of the foreign policies of preemption and unilateralism. The study shall include a discussion of the effect of those policies on military deployment capabilities, readiness, recruiting and retention rates, morale, total force structure, and end strength.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2004, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing the findings and conclusions of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 53: Page 19, after line 20, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. (a) Any member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (b) who purchases protective body armor, and any individual who is a family member of such a member of the Armed Forces and purchases protective body armor for that family member, shall be reimbursed for the cost of such purchase. Such reimbursement shall be made directly from the Treasury to the individual to be reimbursed. Such reimbursement shall be made upon presentation of proof of purchase to the Secretary of Treasury and the Secretary's verification from the Secretary of Defense as to the duty status of the individual purchasing or receiving the body armor.

(b) A member of the Armed Forces described in this subsection is a member who—

(1) is serving on active duty and is deployed as part of the global war on terrorism, including Operation Noble Eagle, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Iraqi Freedom; and

(2) as a member of a reserve component, receives activation orders for mobilization and deployment as described in paragraph (1).

(c) The Secretary of Treasury shall take such steps as necessary to begin implementation of subsection (a) not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

AMENDMENT NO. 54: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.——. No funds in this act shall be disbursed for purposes of reconstruction in Iraq unless the President, in coordination with the Governing Council of Iraq or a successor governing authority in Iraq, first establishes an Iraq Reconstruction Finance Authority to obtain financing for the reconstruction of the infrastructure in Iraq by collateralizing the revenue from future sales of oil extracted in Iraq. The Authority shall obtain financing for the reconstruction of the infrastructure in Iraq through—

(1)(A) issuing securities or other financial instruments; or

(B) obtaining loans on the open market from private banks or international financial institutions; and

(2) to the maximum extent possible, securitizing or collateralizing such securities, instruments, or loans with the revenue from the future sales of oil extracted in Iraq.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. HOEFFEL

AMENDMENT NO. 55: In section 2212(b) (relating to report on military operations and reconstruction efforts), strike paragraphs (7) through (9) and insert the following:

(7) A description of progress made toward the establishment of an independent, sovereign, and democratic government for Iraq, including an estimated schedule for the drafting of a constitution and the holding of free and fair elections.

(8) A description of the extent of international participation in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, including the amount and schedule for the provision of financial assistance by other countries and international organizations.

(9) The number of members of the Armed Forces (including national guard and reserve troops) deployed in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, an estimate of the period of time for which such forces will be deployed, and a description of progress made in replacing such forces with international or foreign peacekeeping units.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. WEINER

AMENDMENT NO. 56: Page 51, after line 11, insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 3007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations to Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Iran, Saudi Arabia, or Syria: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, the prohibition on obligations or expenditures shall include direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 57: Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 33, lines 19 and 20, after each dollar amount insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. HINCHEY

AMENDMENT NO. 58: Page 42, lines 2 and 3, strike ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and insert ''October 1, 2002,''

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MS. KILPATRICK

AMENDMENT NO. 59: Page 51, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3007. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' may be provided on a non-repayable basis.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. WEINER

AMENDMENT NO. 60: Page 51, after line 11, insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 3007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations (including direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents) to Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Iran, Saudi Arabia, or Syria.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. WEINER

AMENDMENT NO. 61: Page 51, after line 11, insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR SAUDI ARABIA

SEC. 3007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations (including direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents) to Saudi Arabia.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MR. WEINER

AMENDMENT NO. 62: Page 51, after line 11, insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR SAUDI ARABIA

SEC. 3007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations to Saudi Arabia: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, the prohibition on obligations or expenditures shall include direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents.

H.R. 3289

OFFERED BY: MS. VELAZQUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 63: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund any contract in contravention of section 8(d)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(6)).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2003 No. 145—Part II

Senate

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—*Continued*

AMENDMENT NO. 1868

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 4 minutes equally divided on the motion to table the Lautenberg amendment.

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I offer this amendment to correct the situation that came about as a result of Vice President CHENEY's statement on ''Meet the Press'' a couple of weeks ago. I wish to quickly respond to some things that were said about my amendment and the Vice President's links to Halliburton.

First, Halliburton absolutely had a no-bid contract with the Army Corps for oil-related services in Iraq, and it has billed American taxpayers $1.4 billion so far. No other company was given the opportunity to bid. That contract occasioned a unanimous vote, led by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that we would not allow that kind of contract to appear again. It is stated on the record by Senator WARNER from Virginia.

Halliburton has other contracts that were bid, but the massive oil services contract was not.

Second, I appreciated the reading of the Vice President's comments on ''Meet the Press'' because even CRS agreed that deferred compensation and stock options held by the Vice President are, in fact, financial interests in Halliburton.

Third, the other member of the President's Cabinet who came into service after serving as CEO, John Snow, took his deferred compensation in a lump sum and got rid of his stock options immediately. That is the right thing to do when you are at the top of the executive branch with the direct ability to affect billions of dollars in contracts.

I urge my colleagues to attach some ethical guidelines to the Iraq reconstruction funds. I urge my colleagues to think it through and send a picture out to the American public that says: No, no one is on the inside enough that they can influence what happened and profit from a position that takes us through the reconstruction of Iraq after the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who speaks in opposition?

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, in 2 minutes it is hard to respond the way the Vice President deserves to be defended. I tell every Member this: I am preparing a memo on the statement on ''Meet the Press'' with the Vice President, his relationship with Halliburton, his financial disclosure form, what he did in 1998, what he did in 2000, and what he did in 2002.

Vote however you like. I am going to join sides with most of my Democratic friends in a minute and oppose the Vice President and the President on something very important to them. This amendment is political slander. This amendment has as its basis untruth and is factually incorrect. In 1998, the Vice President chose a deferred compensation package that was irrevocable. He couldn't change his mind. He insured that package with a private insurance policy because the Office of Government Ethics told him that is what everybody does, and he was exempt from going to the Office of Government Ethics.

I will ask unanimous consent to introduce the Vice President's financial disclosure form. He went above and beyond the call of duty. He has no financial interest in Halliburton. You are trying to accuse him of being a liar. Your facts are wrong. This is manipulation. This is politics at its worse. Please, look at what you are doing before you vote here. The Vice President doesn't deserve this, and I am going to send you a memo with what I believe to be the true facts, and we are going to get to the bottom of this.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Ethics Committee, I take seriously any action which raises questions about the integrity of the Federal Government. I believe firmly that the Federal contracting process in Iraq and elsewhere should be transparent and accountable to ensure Federal tax dollars are spent appropriately. Like many of my constituents, I question the circumstances under which Halliburton was awarded a contract in Iraq in a process that did not include soliciting competitive bids from other companies. I believe all aspects of that transaction should be carefully examined and open to public inspection.

While I sympathize with the proponents of the Lautenberg amendment, I do not believe a punitive, absolute statutory prohibition is the correct approach under the circumstances. Instead, I support efforts to ensure Federal contracts in Iraq are awarded through a process that is subject to rigorous Congressional oversight and that applies strict penalties for any unethical or illegal conduct that is uncovered. Additionally, I believe contracts should be awarded through full and fair competition.

As a U.S. Senator, I am ethically bound to conduct my official duties in a manner that avoids even the appearance of impropriety. I fully intend to honor that commitment to my country and my constituents. I also intend to hold the Bush administration to the same standard.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, this is a very curious amendment. It tries to take a stealth approach to the matter, but in fact, its real purpose is pretty obvious. I don't think anyone will be fooled by it because we all know who it is directed against.

Back in my home State of Wyoming, a lot of people who know DICK CHENEY will be surprised to see the Senate using its valuable time in what some might see as a witch hunt against the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

President and Vice President. It's a curious time for such an activity—even if Halloween is rapidly approaching.

Now, I'm not standing here to defend the Vice President because he is from Wyoming. I'm not even defending him because he's a fisherman either—though to accept this amendment at face value you have to swallow hook, line and sinker some pretty misleading information.

In fact, I can tell you, because I've fished with him, that although fishermen sometimes have an unjust and unfair reputation for telling stories, the only thing fishy about this whole affair is the text of this amendment.

First of all, the amendment should be withdrawn because the vice President has gone out of his way to explain his ties to his old company and what they mean to him financially. No matter what happens in the months to come, nothing will benefit him personally. Still, we have some Members who aren't quite satisfied.

Right now a couple of us Senators have blind trusts. It's an interesting thing that this amendment takes such a strong stand against a Vice President who took the same ethical approach to this issue that I did.

This whole situation points out the need for a national energy policy. Halliburton has come under attack because there were fluctuations in oil and gas prices that forced some mega mergers to occur to keep the energy companies competitive. As a result, there were only a few companies that could provide the service that was needed on such short notice. Still, that isn't a good enough explanation for some.

Even if we ignore that piece of the puzzle, however, the important thing to note is the Vice President's decision to donate to charity the after-tax proceeds he would receive from the exercise of his Hallliburton stock options. In other words, even if his options were to increase in value as a result of anything that happened during this time, he still wouldn't receive anything from it.

Who would? you might ask.

According to the Vice President's signed agreement from January 28, 2001, there are three charities named. They are the Capital Partners for Education, the George Washington University Medical Facility Associates and the University of Wyoming.

I believe it is clear that there is no basis for the allegations or concerns that led to the production of this amendment and it clearly should be withdrawn. It goes against the grain of fairness, it can only be defended by misrepresenting the facts on the Vice President's financial interests, and it can't be seen as anything but an unfair commentary on the Vice President's and the President's commitment to ethics.

No serious-minded individual who belongs to any political party, really believes this amendment is necessary or needed. It must be withdrawn and an apology extended to both the Vice President and the President for its promotion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, has all time expired on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic time has expired. There are 30 seconds remaining to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. REID. I advise everyone, this next vote is a 10-minute vote. The prior vote was a 15-minute vote and went about 27, 28 minutes. I hope we can have the 10-minute vote in maybe 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's point is well taken.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, do I have 30 seconds?

If you wonder what he did with the stock options, he assigned them all to charities. Look at the facts before you vote because the facts do not sustain these allegations. The allegations are off base. I promise you, I will send you a memo. Please look before you vote. I move to table.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table has already been made. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. This is a 10-minute vote, under the previous order.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1868. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 386 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Crapo	Lugar
Allard	DeWine	McCain
Allen	Dole	McConnell
Bayh	Domenici	Miller
Bennett	Dorgan	Murkowski
Biden	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Breaux	Frist	Roberts
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Santorum
Bunning	Graham (SC)	Sessions
Burns	Grassley	Shelby
Campbell	Gregg	Smith
Carper	Hagel	Snowe
Chafee	Hatch	Specter
Chambliss	Hutchison	Stevens
Cochran	Inhofe	Sununu
Coleman	Jeffords	Talent
Collins	Kyl	Thomas
Conrad	Landrieu	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lincoln	Warner
Craig	Lott	

NAYS—34

Akaka	Durbin	Kohl
Baucus	Edwards	Lautenberg
Boxer	Feingold	Leahy
Byrd	Feinstein	Levin
Cantwell	Harkin	Mikulski
Clinton	Hollings	Murray
Corzine	Inouye	Pryor
Daschle	Johnson	Reed
Dayton	Kennedy	
Dodd	Kerry	
Reid	Sarbanes	Stabenow
Rockefeller	Schumer	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lieberman

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been carefully listening to this debate for weeks, and I have tried to keep an open mind to the opposition's arguments—insofar as those arguments have been substantive.

I have been dismayed by the deliberate manipulation of statements and arguments that have been made by members of the other party, such as:

Denunciations of the President over the fact that weapons of mass destruction have not been discovered to date, despite the fact that reports issued as late as last week indicate the fact that reports issued as late as last week indicate that Saddam had clandestine plans and activities for systems proscribed by the international community under international law. False assertions that the President claimed an imminent threat on the eve of this decision to remove Saddam Hussein from power, when in fact the President stated in his State of the Union:

> Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come to late.

Some of this rhetoric, we must, regrettably, accept as the level of debate that now occurs. But nothing offends me more than suggestions that members of this administration, particularly my dear friend, the Vice President, have venal motivations attached to the policy decisions they support.

DICK CHENEY is an older friend of mine. He has sacrificed for his country most of his life. He does so today. When the chairman of the Appropriations Committee responds to the amendment by the Senator from New Jersey by calling it a slur, I have to agree. DICK CHENEY has not benefitted from this war, and I find it a profound calumniation that anyone would imply that.

I ask my colleagues that we return to a dignified level of debate, where we try to advance, improve on the grave issues of war and peace before us.

I beg my colleagues that we desist from the politics of imputing venality on those who are serving the public trust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I will send up an amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor? For the information of Senators, Senator INOUYE is here. He is waiting. He has to make a statement. And Senator MCCONNELL has the floor now for his amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the McConnell amendment, the Senator from Hawaii have 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Connecticut and I wanted to enter into a very short colloquy about an unrelated matter. Therefore, if it would be all right with the chairman, I ask to amend the consent to allow for a brief colloquy between Senator DODD and myself on an entirely different matter.

Mr. STEVENS. I have no objection. Just, when Senator MCCONNELL yields the floor, that Senator INOUYE get the floor. I did commit we would set aside some time for him to make a statement. He has not made a statement on the bill yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1874

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments will be set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1874.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SHORT TITLE.

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) That on October 7, 2001, the Armed Forces of the United States and its coalition allies launched military operations in Afghanistan, designated as Operation Enduring Freedom, that quickly caused the collapse of the Taliban regime, the elimination of Afghanistan's terrorist infrastructure and the capture of significant and numerous members of Al Qaeda;

(2) That on March 19, 2003, the Armed Forces of the United States and its coalition allies launched military operations, designated as Operation Iraqi Freedom, that quickly caused the collapse of Saddam Hussein's regime, the elimination of Iraq's terrorist infrastructure, the end of Iraq's illicit and illegal programs to acquire weapons of mass destruction, and the capture of significant international terrorists.

(3) That success in those two campaigns in the Global War on Terrorism would not have been possible without the dedication, courage, and service of the members of the United States Armed Forces and their coalition partners;

(4) That throughout the proud military history of our nation, we have recognized our brave men and women of the Armed Forces by awarding them service medals for personal bravery and other leadership actions and for their service in military operations abroad and for support operations at home and abroad;

(5) That historically the President has relied on senior military officers to recommend the personal and theater campaign medals and that, in keeping with these longstanding traditions, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combatant commanders, including General Tommy Franks, U.S. Army, former Commander of the United States Central Command, recommended the awards described below in recognition of the worldwide nature of the current conflict;

(6) That following the advice of his senior military and civilian defense leaders, President Bush, by Executive Order 13289 on March 12, 2003, established the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal to be awarded to service members who serve in military operations to combat terrorism on or after September 11, 2001, including, but not limited to actions in Operations Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, in such locations as Afghanistan, Iraq, the Republic of the Philippines, and elsewhere in Southwest Asia, in recognition of the sacrifice and contributions military members make in the global war on terrorism;

(7) That eligibility for the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal is predicated on deployment abroad for 30 days or more in support of Global War on Terrorism operations on or after September 11, 2001;

(8) That by the same Executive Order, the President established the Global War on Terrorism Service Medical recognizing duty in Operation Noble Eagle and the homeland defense mission against further terrorist attacks, and which recognizes duty in support of military operations performed in areas that do not qualify for the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; and

(9) That implementing regulations for eligibility have not been issued by the Secretary of Defense.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE AWARD OF CAMPAIGN MEDAL.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should, on an expedited basis, issue the necessary regulations to implement these awards and ensure that any person who renders qualifying service with the Armed Forces in those phases of the Global War on Terrorism including Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle should promptly receive these awards.

HELP AMERICA TO VOTE ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut and I wanted to address the Senate just for a few moments on another matter. I yield the floor and suggest the recognition of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kentucky.

Very briefly, I had intended to offer an amendment at an appropriate time, most reluctantly, because it is unrelated to the subject matter at hand. But all my colleagues can relate to this frustration from time to time. When there is something you want to get done and you have few opportunities to get it done, you pick any vehicle coming along which might help you get it done. Recognizing that this was going to be one of the last funding measures to move along this year, I had intended at the appropriate time to offer an amendment that would have provided additional resources for the Help America Vote Act, on which my friend from Kentucky and Senator BOND and many others played a very critical role almost a year ago when it became the law of the Nation. In fact, October 29, 2003, will mark the 1-year anniversary of the day the President signed the legislation into law.

I am hopeful we can get the level of funding up to full in a timely manner. As all my colleagues must know, almost every Secretary of State, local election official, and legislative officer around the country are anxious for Congress to meet our obligations. The states can then get their election administration and technology up and running in the years 2004–2006 in a way that will be in compliance with the efforts made to pass the Help America Vote Act in the first place.

But my colleague from Kentucky, as he has done on numerous occasions, has persuaded me there may be a better opportunity and a better place to get this job done. So I wanted to take a moment out to express my appreciation. I thank him for his willingness to help me try to achieve these results in the coming weeks if at all possible.

To reiterate, I was prepared to offer an amendment to fully fund the Help America Vote Act, HAVA. Senators CORZINE, JOHNSON, and DURBIN had asked to cosponsor that amendment.

Why? Because now is the time to make our rhetoric a reality to live up to our promise of just 1 year ago to fully fund the new Federal requirements we imposed on the States for conducting Federal elections.

The President has recognized that Iraq and Afghanistan have many emergency needs, including the ability of those nations to establish democracies by conducting free and fair elections.

As a result, the administration request for the fiscal year 2004 Supplemental Appropriations for Iraq, Afghanistan and the Global War on Terrorism earmarked at least $35 million for voter registration and elections in Afghanistan.

I accept that priority. All countries must have the resources to establish and maintain their democracies and to administer and conduct elections for their citizens. The voice of the people, exercised at the polls, secures the future of any democracy, whether abroad or at home. And while I remain unconvinced that all of the funding in this bill is truly an emergency—such as for $3,000 computers or $50,000 dump trucks—when it comes to election funding, I will agree with the President. Funding to ensure the system by which a nation establishes and preserves a democracy is an emergency.

But if it is an emergency in Afghanistan, it can be no less of an emergency in America. The basic premise of a democracy is that every citizen must have an equal voice in the determination of its government. In this Nation, that voice is expressed through the equal opportunity to cast a vote and have that vote counted. If America is to be the example for emerging democracies, whether in Afghanistan, or Iraq or any other part of the world, then our system of giving our citizens an equal voice—our system of elections—must meet this test.

But what we learned in the elections of 2000 was that not all American citizens enjoyed an equal voice. In fact,

some citizens were denied a voice at all because of malfunctioning or outdated voting equipment, inaccurate and incomplete voter registration records, and allegations of voter intimidation and fraud.

A bipartisan group of members came together last Congress to change that and on October 29—almost exactly 1 year ago—President Bush signed into law the Help America Vote Act. At the signing ceremony at the White House, the President proclaimed:

[w]hen problems arise in the administration of elections, we have a responsibility to fix them.

But rhetoric alone will not fix the problems. It will take leadership and funds, and that is what the Help America Vote Act provides—Federal leadership in the form of new minimum requirements that all States must meet in the conduct of Federal elections and $3.8 billion to fund the implementation of these requirements.

Some of these requirements must be in place in time for the Federal elections next year. But Congress has failed to provide the funds to the States to finance them.

All 50 States have begun the process of drafting the required State plans outlining how Federal funds will be used to meet the requirements. Many of the States have begun implementation of the new requirements; but, they require full funding of the promised Federal funds to complete implementation of some requirements by next year and have compliant voting equipment in place by the 2006 Federal elections.

Federal funding is the most critical key to nationwide implementation of this Act and may well govern the success and effectiveness of the new law.

Federal funding is crucial. Since the States are in key planning and implementation stages of HAVA, they are relying on Federal funds to make election reform a reality nationwide.

To help pay for election reforms and avoid an unfunded mandate on the States, HAVA authorizes a total of $3.9 billion over 3 fiscal years: $2.16 billion in fiscal year 2003; $1.04 billion in fiscal year 2004; and $660,000 in fiscal year 2005.

But in fiscal year 2003, Congress appropriated only $1.5 billion. Of that amount, $650 million has been distributed to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and American Samoa.

I thank my colleagues for their support during the fiscal year 2003 appropriations process. In particular, I thank my two lead co-sponsors of HAVA and both major players in the appropriations process—Senator MCCONNELL who was lead co-sponsor of election reform and Senator BOND who also co-sponsored HAVA and championed the anti-fraud provisions. I also thank Senator STEVENS, chair of the Appropriations Committee and Senator BYRD, ranking member on Appropriations.

But the fact is, the fiscal year 2003 appropriation reflects a reality starkly different from our promise. As a result, the States have experienced a shortfall of over $660 million in the first critical year of funding under HAVA. Given the dire financial budget constraints faced by our States and counties, the shortfall in promised Federal support creates an unfunded mandate that is both unfair and unnecessary.

While the fiscal year 2004 Transportation, Treasury appropriations bill has not been completed in the Senate, I note that both the President and Congress has earmarked a mere $500 million for HAVA, a funding level that is half of what was authorized and is both inadequate and unacceptable.

According to the National Governors Association, the current financial health of State and local governments was at its lowest point since World War II last year and has worsened in the past 10 months.

Full Federal funding for HAVA is crucial to ensuring that the reforms that Congress overwhelmingly approved, on a broad bipartisan basis, and the President endorsed with his signature, are implemented. The very integrity of our elections, and consequently our democracy, hangs in the balance.

Surely, it cannot be argued that building ''taj mahal'' Iraqi prisons and market centers for the private sector in Afghanistan are more of an emergency than securing democracy in America.

We can do both. We must do both. But it is unacceptable to chose the reconstruction needs of Iraq and Afghanistan over the needs of our own democracy.

Full funding of HAVA is critical to our national credibility for fairness and accuracy in Federal elections. It is fundamental to the integrity of our democratic process.

The problem of Federal funding for HAVA can be solved by Congress today, now. The problem of Federal funding for HAVA can be solved right here in the context of the fiscal year 2004 Supplemental bill that we debate today.

I seek bipartisan support from my colleagues to help me strengthen democracy both abroad and at home—the same bipartisan support that lead 98 members of this Senate and 357 Members of the House to pass HAVA just 1 year ago; the same bipartisan support, and need, that encouraged President Bush to sign this legislation into law.

In order to make election reform a reality, and to live up to the promise we made to State and local officials to be a full partner in Federal elections, I intend to offer an amendment to this measure which will provide full funding for HAVA in an amount of $1.86 billion. This amount reflects the total authorization for the Federal partnership.

This effort is overwhelmingly supported by a bipartisan and powerful coalition of State and local election officials, in conjunction with all the major civil rights, disability, language minority, and other voter interest groups in the United States.

I thank each and every one of them for their strong support in passing HAVA and their continuing commitment to see that Congress makes good on its promise to be a full partner in Federal elections by fully funding the provisions of HAVA.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter by the coalition, entitled ''Democracy Begins At Home: Fully Fund the Help America Vote Act.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Any effort to fully fund HAVA is as much of an emergency as the needs presented in the bill before us for Iraq and Afghanistan and I am prepared to ask the Senate to support full funding of HAVA on the same emergency basis.

However, there are sufficient funds in the reconstruction portion of this bill which are of questionable emergency status that can be used to offset the entire cost of fully funding election reform. For example, $450 million from the public safety, national security and justice sector of this bill, including, $400 million in funds to construct 2 maximum security prisons of 4000 beds each at a cost of $50,000 per prison bed; and $50 million for witness protection at a cost of $1 million per Iraqi family.

There is $1.02 billion from the electrical sector, including $1 billion for the development and construct of thermal power stations—which are more expensive than other forms of power generation and will take up to 3 years to construct; and $20 million for embedded consultants, building repairs and a master plan for the Iraqi Electricity Commission.

There is $37 million from the public works section, including funds for waste management that would pay for a portion of the proposed 2,000 dump trucks, at a cost of $50,000 per truck.

There is $353 million from the private sector development funds, including $200 million for an American-Iraq Enterprise Fund to be run by a private board of directors; $85 million for 5000 computers at a cost of $3000 per computer and basic and specialized computer training and teaching English as a second language to Iraqis; $25 million to modernize equipment and curriculum in vocational institutes; and $43 million subsidy to private employers for on the job training of new employees and the improvement of employment centers.

I close with a quote from the Coalition's letter:

No Civil Right Is More Fundamental to America's Democracy than the Right to Vote. As Our Nation Spends Billions of Dollars Helping to Promote Democracies Abroad, Congress Simply Should Not Allow Doubts about the Legitimacy of Our Electoral Process to Continue to Linger Here at Home.

I urge my colleagues to fulfill our commitment of last year to ensure the integrity of our Federal elections and

the very foundation of our democracy by fully funding the Help America Vote Act.

I commend Senator MCCONNELL for his commitment to securing additional funds this year, and so I will withhold offering my amendment at this time.

EXHIBIT 1

DEMOCRACY BEGINS AT HOME—FULLY FUND THE ''HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT''

SEPTEMBER 29, 2003.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We, the undersigned organizations, urge you to ensure that full funding for the Help America Vote Act (P.L. 107–252) (''HAVA'') is included in the upcoming supplemental appropriations for reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. As you know, the Bush administration has requested that Congress provide $21.4 billion for these reconstruction efforts. We ask that Congress provide, at the same time, a mere fraction of that amount for the purpose of strengthening our own democracy here at home.

The Help America Vote Act was enacted with overwhelmingly bipartisan support in order to prevent the many problems of the 2000 election from ever happening again. Among its many reforms, it places significant mandates upon states and localities to replace outdated voting equipment, create statewide voter registration lists and provide provisional ballots to ensure that eligible voters are not turned away, and make it easier for people with disabilities to cast private, independent ballots.

To help pay for these reforms, HAVA authorizes a total of $3.9 billion over three fiscal years, including $2.16 billion for FY03 and $1.045 billion for FY04. To date, however, the actual funding of HAVA has been woefully inadequate. So far, only $1.5 billion of FY03 funding has been appropriated, and $830 million of that amount has yet to reach the states because the President has not nominated and the Senate has not confirmed the members of the new Election Assistance Commission. Additionally, only $500 million is currently included in pending FY04 appropriations; once again, this is a sum that falls well below what is needed for successful implementation of HAVA. States and localities were assured by Congress that this new law would not evolve into a set of unfunded federal mandates. It is now time for Congress to honor its commitment to the states and to the American public at large.

Given the difficult fiscal circumstances facing state and local governments, immediate and full funding of HAVA is now needed in order to make essential progress before Election Day in 2004. Without the strong leadership that HAVA promised at the federal level, states and local governments simply do not have the ability to complete implementation of the important reforms that they are now required to make.

No civil right is more fundamental to America's democracy than the right to vote. As our nation spends billions of dollars helping to promote democracies abroad, Congress simply should not allow doubts about the legitimacy of our electoral processes to continue to linger here at home.

We thank you for your support of funding for the ''Help America Vote Act,'' and we look forward to working with you on this critical issue. Should you have any questions, please contact Rob Randhava of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights at (202) 466–6058, Leslie Reynolds of the National Association of Secretaries of State at (202) 624–3525, or any of the individual organizations listed below.

Sincerely,

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

National Association of Secretaries of State.
National Conference of State Legislatures.
Council of State Governments.
National Association of State Election Directors.
National Association of Counties.
National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Educational Fund.
National League of Cities.
International City/County Management Association.
International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers.
National Association of County Recorders, Election Officials and Clerks.

CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

Alliance for Retired Americans.
American Association of People with Disabilities.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund.
Asian Law Alliance.
Asian Law Caucus.
Asian Pacific American Legal Center.
Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now.
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law.
California Council for the Blind.
Center for Governmental Studies.
Center for Voting and Democracy.
Common Cause.
Demos: A Network for Ideas & Action.
Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund.
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.
League of Women Voters of the United States.
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund.
National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees.
National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems.
National Council of Churches.
National Council of La Raza.
Neighbor to Neighbor Action Fund.
Organization of Chinese Americans.
People For the American Way.
Project Vote.
Public Citizen.
The Arc of the United States.
United Auto Workers.
United Cerebral Palsy.
U.S. Action Education Fund.
U.S. Public Interest Research Group.
National Spinal Cord Injury Association.
National CURE (Citizens United for Rehabilitation of Events).
American Foundation for the Blind.
National Industries for the Severely Handicapped.
Association of University Center on Disabilities.
American Council of the Blind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me say to my friend from Connecticut that was a grand quest on which we were mutually engaged over a year ago to enact new election reform legislation, a major piece of civil rights legislation, along with Senator BOND and others. Both of us are committed to getting it fully funded and both of us agree the current supplemental appropriations is not the place to do it. But we are committed to trying to achieve that, and to achieve it soon, and at a more appropriate time.

I thank my colleague from Connecticut for not offering the amendment on this measure and pledge to work with him to achieve the goal we both desire.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kentucky. I thank Senator REID as well, the minority whip, Senator STEVENS, and Senator INOUYE for interrupting his prepared statement. I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I stepped off the floor. Just so I understand, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, is going to speak for approximately 20 minutes. Senator STEVENS indicated to me that there were two or three amendments on the majority side that they want to offer, and we have offered several amendments this morning. They wanted to, in effect, catch up. We want to reciprocate with amendments. Following that, we will offer an amendment. I don't know how many amendments the Senator from Alaska wants his side to offer prior to going back to our side. If we just had some idea so we can have our folks lined up here.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I had an amendment with Senator DURBIN. Are we ready for that amendment?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to talk to the Senator off camera, so to speak. But we have a plan, if the Senator will approve. I will talk off camera momentarily.

Could Senator STEVENS give us an idea of how long the work on your side is going to take so we can have an amendment lined up after that?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I really can't tell how long it is going to be. We haven't put any time limit on amendments today. I won't do it on this side. They wouldn't take them on the other side. There will be no time limit on these amendments: Senator HOLLINGS has an amendment, Senator HUTCHISON has an amendment, and Senator WARNER has an amendment. I think there is an amendment on the list for Senator NICKLES. There are a series of Senators on this side who still have amendments that could be raised.

My understanding is that once we have measured about the same number of amendments presented by the other side so far today we would come back to our side of the aisle.

Mr. REID. The only thing I would say is that everyone knows we have a lot more amendments than the other side. We have at this time I think still 29 or 30 amendments. It doesn't seem fair,

for lack of a better word, that the majority is going to get rid of basically all of their amendments leaving us with all of ours when we still have to finish this bill tomorrow. That is looking more remote all the time. I don't see how in the world we can do that under the guidelines. I apologize to my friend from Alaska for not being able to get a time agreement on one of the amendments. That is the only one. On the rest of them, we worked out time agreements.

I think, again for lack of a better word, in basic fairness we should have some idea about how long it is going to take on the other side until we are ready with amendments over here. Otherwise, I would have no alternative but just say go ahead with regular order and start offering the amendments that are already pending.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, that may be the alternative because I have tried all day to speed up that side in terms of consideration of amendments—all day long now. I started at 11 o'clock this morning. We have just finished handling five amendments on that side of the aisle. We haven't had one from this side of the aisle yet. I don't think it is beyond fair to say Senators who notified me they want to bring up their amendments that it is time for us to bring up amendments on this side. We couldn't get any agreement on time over there. I don't know of any reason why we should have time agreements over here.

If the Senator wants to proceed with regular order, I am all for it. There are 16 amendments. We will be on those until midnight. Some of them may not be called up at all. But we can call them up, if the other side wants to do that.

I believe, in balance and fairness, we have been compelled to be balanced on this side now for 5 hours. I think we are now going to be on this side for about 4 or 5 hours.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, everyone here should know that this bill will not be finished tomorrow. Understand that it will not be finished tomorrow. If it is going to be 4 or 5 hours on amendments on the majority side when they have just a few amendments, this bill will not be finished tomorrow, period. Take however long they want. We have done everything to cooperate. There was one amendment that we didn't get a time agreement on, but we still finished that in a reasonable period of time.

I have the greatest affection, respect, and admiration for the distinguished manager of this bill. But to take 4 or 5 hours, that is 9 o'clock. To think we can finish this bill tomorrow is hallucinating. We can't do that.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I remember my good friend from Nevada saying just let things work out this morning at 11 o'clock when I tried to get the time; let things work out.

I don't know how long these amendments are going to take. I haven't seen them, either. I didn't see the ones either from that side this morning. You can't tell how long an amendment is going to take until you look at it and read it.

As a practical matter, I am asking the Senator from Nevada to do on their side exactly what we had to this morning—take the assurance that we are going to move as quickly as we can and turn to some of the amendments on this side for a while.

Mr. REID. There is a basic difference. If I may say, there are some people over here who really don't care much about this bill ever passing. That is the way the Senate is.

Senator DASCHLE has used his good office because of a gentlemen's agreement that he had with the manager of the bill and Senator FRIST to move this along as quickly as possible. We are trying to do that. It is no one's fault, but one of the Senators had a medical problem that held us up for several hours before we were scheduled to vote. It seems there is always some problem here.

We have tried as much as we can to be responsible in our ability to move this bill.

Four or five hours—I just repeat, we can't finish this bill tomorrow. Everyone should understand that. That isn't done with any animosity. It just can't be done.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator is correct in terms of the process. We still have a lot more than six amendments. We have a whole list of amendments, depending on what amendments are raised on that side. All I am asking for is balance and fairness in terms of what we allowed the other side to do in handling their amendments until now. If that means we have to go to regular order, I am prepared to call for regular order. If that is the case, I am saddened to hear my friend from Nevada say a gentlemen's agreement was made on the basis that the Democratic side of the aisle is allowed to call up amendments whenever they want and for how long they want but they want time agreements and assurances on our side. That isn't the agreement we made. That is not the gentlemen's agreement which I understand we made.

If the gentlemen's agreement is broken and we do not finish by tomorrow, we should know that right now. If that is the case, then I can assure the Senate that we will be back in session Saturday and we will be here Sunday. We are going to finish this bill this week. That word I took as a word of a Senator. All leadership agreed that we would finish this bill tomorrow to the best of our ability. I am still relying on that word.

Mr. President, I suggest we proceed with Senator INOUYE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). Under the previous order, the Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the current situation in Iraq and the growing concern that many of my colleagues have expressed regarding our policies in this most volatile and dangerous region of the world.

Last October, I was one of 23 Members of this Senate who voted against a resolution to authorize the war in Iraq. Voting on a resolution to send our young men and women to war is one of the most difficult issues any politician has to face.

I voted against going to war for five main reasons.

First and foremost, I did not believe the administration had made a compelling case that attacking Iraq was in our vital national interest.

Second, I was not convinced that the classified information presented to the Senate offered conclusive evidence that Saddam Hussein provided a threat to the American people or that he would use weapons of mass destruction if he possessed them.

Third, I was not convinced that his regime was aligned with al-Qaida terrorists or was in any way involved with the September 11 attack on the United States.

Fourth, I did not see that the administration had presented a well-thought-out plan for dealing with postwar Iraq.

Finally, I believed that attacking Iraq when many of our closest allies and virtually all of the Nations in the region were opposed to it would cast the United States as the aggressor in this conflict and deal a terrible blow to our international reputation and prestige.

I was convinced that going to war under these circumstances would almost certainly sacrifice the almost near universal support and good will this Nation had gained following the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. I regret today I still have many of the same concerns about the policy.

Having said that, the majority of my colleagues disagreed with me, and Congress approved an attack on Iraq. I know this is not to second-guess but only because it sets the stage for where we are today. The question for the Senate is what should the Congress do at this point? Our principal responsibility as Senators is to protect the people of this great Nation. Particularly, it is my belief we must fight for those who defend us. I have often said less than 1 percent of our population protects all the rest of us by wearing our Nation's uniform. I will say once again, I strongly believe it is our sacred duty to serve them. We simply must support the men and women willing to serve in harm's way.

Our forces fought gallantly in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Our military strategy proved to be effective in war even if the rationale for war and postwar strategy can be questioned. Our forces proved once again that they are the most effective fighting force in the world.

Today, more than 125,000 U.S. military personnel remain in Iraq. While

all of us would like to know how long they will stay and how long they will be needed, I am confident each and every one of my colleagues agree they deserve our support. To guarantee the support, we must ensure that we provide sufficient funding for our forces to be equipped and ready to meet the challenges they face in Iraq.

Many in this body question the administration's policy. They want to criticize the war because we have not yet found weapons of mass destruction. Our debate should not be focused on whether Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. Regardless of how we came to be in Iraq, I ask my colleagues what do we want to do now? Should we punish the administration for putting us in this position? I would only say in seeking to mete out punishment on those political leaders with whom we might disagree, we will most likely only punish our sons and daughters who have volunteered to risk their lives. That we cannot let happen.

The question we must ask at this moment is, How should we proceed? The cost of the ongoing war on terrorism is staggering. As has been mentioned often in the Senate, $87 billion is an enormous amount of money. Since September 11, the Congress has approved the supplemental defense funding in excess of $100 billion in response to the terrorist attacks on our Nation and for the operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, because of these costs, coupled with the impact of large tax cuts, we no longer are running a surplus. Instead, we have a deficit estimated to exceed $500 billion.

I understand my colleagues' frustration and understand why they demand better accountability. In seeking solutions, they have argued we should not have to pay for the reconstruction of Iraq. They want Iraq to use its oil reserves to pay for its own infrastructure. I am all for Iraq paying as much as it can to rebuild its country, but realistically, it is not in any position today to do much of that.

So should we wait? I would argue no. Our sons and daughters are in Iraq and the conditions are not good. The infrastructure to support our military and Ambassador Bremer and his staff is not conducive to getting Iraq back on its feet. We cannot turn our backs on our men and women serving in that theater because we disagree with this war. But even more important, we want our forces to come home as soon as possible.

I can assure my colleagues of one thing: Our forces will be in Iraq a lot longer if we refuse to make the investment in that country's infrastructure.

Three weeks ago, Hurricane Isabel caused widespread power outage in the Washington, DC, area. For several days, many were without power and we complained. Let me say to my colleagues that was a minor inconvenience compared to what our forces face in Iraq. I know we were all grateful when we finally saw the Pepco truck in our neighborhoods. It was a real boost to our morale.

I can assure you our troops in Iraq are the strongest supporters of us putting up $20 billion to help get Iraq reconstruction started. For them, getting this money will be like seeing the Pepco truck finally enter their neighborhood.

This funding is not charity. The fastest way for us to get our sons and daughters home is to get Iraq back up and running. Congress approved this war, the Congress agreed it was worth the cost to rid the international community of Saddam Hussein. In reviewing this request, it is not a question of whether Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. It is not really relevant if Saddam was or was not linked to Osama bin Laden. It is not a question of whether this war was right or wrong for our country. Those issues will be debated next year as the country determines its next President and its next Congress. It does not matter how we voted last October. This October it is our responsibility to support the men and women in the military who are doing what we required of them.

I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental request to support our military forces to help end this conflict quickly and do all we can to get our sons and daughters home sooner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1874

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we turn to discussion of the amendment currently pending before the Senate.

Today, we call on the Department of Defense to finalize regulations that will ensure that the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the medal that the Joint Chiefs of Staff picked and that the President has authorized for military operations, will be awarded on an expedited basis to the men and women of the Armed Forces of our country who serve in the global war on terrorism.

Recently, on this bill we dealt with an amendment that would have created a congressionally mandated medal when a medal already authorized by the President and recommended by the military was already in the works and awaiting final approval of the necessary regulations. That medal awaiting final approval is the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal. It can be awarded to all who serve in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Our victories in the global war on terrorism would not have been possible without the dedication, the courage, and the service of the members of the U.S. Armed Forces and their coalition partners.

It is entirely appropriate that we recognize these brave men and women of the Armed Forces by awarding them service medals for personal bravery and other leadership actions and for their service in military operations abroad and for support operations at home and support operations overseas.

But the fact is, historically, the President has relied on senior military officers to recommend the personal and theater campaign medals.

Here, with the Global War on Terrorism Medal, that longstanding tradition was preserved with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combatant commanders, including GEN Tommy Franks, U.S. Army, former Commander of the U.S. Central Command, recommending the medal to be awarded.

Taking the advice of his senior military and civilian defense leaders, President Bush, by Executive Order 13289, on March 12 of this year, established the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal to be awarded to service members who served in military operations to combat terrorism on or after September 11, 2001, including, but not limited to, actions in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, in such locations as Afghanistan, Iraq, the Republic of the Philippines, and elsewhere in Southwest Asia.

Now, that Executive Order by the President went beyond our men and women in the Armed Forces and much further than the recent, other medal amendment would have. It also established a Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, recognizing duty in Operation Noble Eagle and the homeland defense mission against further terrorist attacks and recognizing duty in support of military operations performed in areas that do not qualify for the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

We all know of the fine work that is going on to preserve our homeland security. We know of the efforts to guard our borders, hunt down terrorists, and screen our airports. We recognize those efforts with this amendment and the medal. But we bring focus and attention to all of the important support staff. Ask any soldier, ask any sailor, ask any airman, and each will tell you how important it is to have the right staff sending you the right stuff—having the right staff sending you the right stuff. Without a competent, capable, and talented support staff in the global war on terrorism, our men and women in the Armed Forces would not have the right tools for the job. Their lives would be at greater risk and so, too, would the freedom we cherish here at home. It is right that we recognize all that they provide for our soldiers, our sailors, and our airmen, as well as what they do for all of us.

Yet the implementing regulations for eligibility for both these medals have not been issued by the Secretary of Defense.

So today, what we will do, if my amendment is adopted, is we, in the Senate, will call upon the Secretary of Defense to complete action as soon as possible on implementing regulations so these awards can go to any person who renders qualifying service with the Armed Forces in those phases of the

global war on terrorism, including Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle.

This amendment says the regulations providing for a medal already in the works, designed by soldiers and authorized by the President, should be implemented as soon as possible and, in doing so, should also recognize those who serve in Operation Noble Eagle and in support roles for our military abroad. These are the critical distinctions between the amendment before us now and the amendment that was considered 2 days ago.

Mr. President, I know Senator MCCAIN and Senator WARNER would also like to speak to my amendment. They are not in the Chamber at the moment but would like to speak. And I believe there is another Senator on our side of the aisle who would like to speak on this amendment as well.

So pending their arrival, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to address the sense-of-the-Senate resolution on behalf of men and women in the Armed Forces offered by our distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to give strong support to this and I want to say against the background—and the other day we had a similar matter before the Senate and I rose to address that. It was a technical problem, primarily, with that resolution. This one, which I have read carefully, in a very straightforward manner, recites the history of personal decorations and theater awards and, in particular, how these matters, throughout the military history of this country, have been actions taken by Presidents upon the recommendation of the senior officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and, indeed, the Coast Guard. In this instance, this administration has moved to put in place those recognitions—most deserving, I would say—of men and women who have gone to the farflung corners of the globe and accepted the risks, together with their families, of going to those areas for the cause of freedom and to protect the security interests of the United States of America.

That region of Iraq is very much in our hearts and minds every day. I have had the privilege, as have many in this body, to go there and visit with our troops. Likewise, I have had the privilege to go and visit with our forces in Afghanistan. Most recently, I went to Liberia, where the strike task force—largely composed of U.S. marines but under the control of a very fine Army officer—performed extraordinary duties on behalf of the people of Liberia, who have suffered a decade-plus of civil war turmoil. I could go on and on, but others are anxious to address this.

The point I wish to make is these decorations are proudly worn on the uniform of the men and women in the Armed Forces. They are coveted items of families for generations. In my office, I have proudly displayed the decoration earned by my father who volunteered as a young Army doctor in World War I to go to France where he served in the trenches. I remember as a young person of his telling stories to me about life in the trenches, the extraordinary devastation he witnessed, the loss of life, and the carnage. But there on the wall was his World War I Victory Medal. It had on it three bars of the three major conflicts. He was proud to wear it on the uniform of the United States when he saw service.

It is a carefully thought through process that we cannot award a separate medal for every conflict. We have to recognize the theater of operations. For example, in World War II, it was the European theater and it was the Pacific theater. There was a medal given to those in the continental limits in training commands. There were three basic theaters of operation, and then stars were awarded for the major conflicts in the theaters of Europe or the Pacific.

It is not a wise course of action to award a separate medal of decoration for each of the many theaters we are engaged in today. Rather, there should be just the principal decoration which, as we say in the final paragraph of this resolution, and I will read that:

> It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should, on an expedited basis, issue the necessary regulations to implement these awards and ensure that any person who renders qualifying service to the Armed Forces in those phases of the Global War on Terrorism, including Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle should promptly receive these awards.

That is a category of awards given primarily for Iraq and Afghanistan and contiguous areas where the men and women of the Armed Forces are serving actually in the front lines or, indeed, in a support phase.

I strongly urge the Senate adopt this amendment. I hope there are 100 votes in recognition of this course of action.

To those who, with the best of intentions, have recommended specific theaters, specific zones, such as Iraq, we then have to think of Afghanistan, we have to think of Liberia, although, fortunately, that was an operation that was successfully performed in a relatively short period of time. I could go throughout the world.

It is better there be theater-of-operations awards and individuals singled out. I know, for example, if I may say, when I was Secretary of the Navy and heavily involved in the subject of awards, I remember so much working with the father of the distinguished Senator from Arizona who was commander in chief of all military forces in the Pacific, ADM ''Jumpin'' Jack McCain. I remember him well. I learned a lot from him.

The Senator from Arizona will recall from his earlier experience how theater recognition is given and then the star to recognize those engagements in which one participated. That is a process carefully supervised by the senior military, primarily the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I am quite interested in the views of the distinguished Senator from Arizona on this subject. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Virginia that perhaps we should for a moment discuss what happened yesterday and what we are trying to do under the leadership and initiation of Senator MCCONNELL.

Yesterday there was, as part of the $87 billion assistance package to Iraq, an amendment that was proposed which would have bestowed a specific decoration on those who fought in the Iraqi conflict. There was a provision also that prohibited others, those eligible for that medal, from being eligible for other decorations, as I understood it. Then that provision was voluntarily removed by the sponsor of the amendment. I ask my friend, isn't it a little appropriate to remember what happened?

On March 12, 2003—that was a number of months ago—the President of the United States, by Executive order, which is the proper and accepted methodology for this kind of designation of awards, established the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal to be awarded to service members who serve in military operations to combat terrorism on or after September 11, 2001, including, but not limited to, actions in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, in such locations as Afghanistan, Iraq, the Republic of the Philippines, and elsewhere in Southwest Asia, in recognition of sacrifice and contribution.

In addition to that, in that same Executive order, the President established the service medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal recognizing service in Operation Noble Eagle and the homeland defense mission against further terrorist attacks—for example, military duties here domestically—in providing security and much-needed service here.

In other words, isn't it the Senator's understanding there were two medals? That by Executive order, following the advice of senior military and civilian defense leaders, President Bush established two different medals for men and

women who have engaged in the war on terrorism since September 11?

I guess what I see coming from my colleague is, if we are going to make a specific award for Iraq, shouldn't the same award be bestowed in Afghanistan? In other words, in other areas? Wouldn't, at least in the President's Executive order, the expeditionary medal and the service medal cover service literally globally? I think we might have difficulty if you gave a specific medal for Iraq, which was a dangerous mission which entailed the loss and injury of brave young Americans, but also Afghanistan is being left out. I think that was the point the Senator from Virginia and I were trying to make yesterday.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is very correct in the recitation of the facts. I add one other perspective, and that is how well the Senator from Arizona understands with his distinguished career the identification of the families with the serviceperson, and should a special award be made for Iraq, think of the families of those who served in Afghanistan, particularly who lost life and limb. They would think: Why is not the sacrifice of our family in every respect equal to the sacrifice of the other families in the Iraqi situation?

Yesterday, or today, the Senator from Arizona and I took to the floor together in a similar colloquy to urge colleagues to let the system work because it is working and it is working in the traditions of our military.

It is working in a manner that is equitably recognizing the performance in this area.

Mr. McCAIN. Could I also point out to my colleague, this was also an argument, I think he would agree with me, to allow the executive branch to act in what has been, frankly, the executive branch's area of responsibility, and that is the designation of service medals, expeditionary medals, et cetera, including, by the way, higher awards which would be bestowed for acts of heroism and courage no matter where they fall. This is not the only medal of recognition available for a lot of these young men. But when we get into a bill which is legislation that is for the reconstruction of Iraq, and all of a sudden we come up with a great idea to designate a medal, we have to think these things through.

The Senator from Virginia is the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Was this issue ever raised in the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, no. Our committee does have jurisdiction over these matters. It was not brought to the attention of myself.

I saw momentarily the ranking member. I do not see him at the moment. To the best of my knowledge, he did not have knowledge of it aforehand.

Mr. McCAIN. Again, I know the Senator from Virginia shares my admiration and appreciation for the Senator from New Mexico who proposed this amendment. In a good-faith effort, he wanted to recognize the service and sacrifice of those who had served. I appreciate that. But I would also caution my colleagues that it is probably best to explore what has been done and also what should be done by the committees of jurisdiction. Otherwise, we should not have committees of jurisdiction; we should all just come to the floor with our ideas as to how best to address issues.

I think the Armed Services Committee has a reputation, as one of the oldest committees in the Senate, of never shirking in its duty to address issues, including ones such as these.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague. I also add that, very importantly, one very good development resulted from the debate we had yesterday.

I was under the impression that the two declarations to which the distinguished Senator from Arizona made mention were actually in being. I am perhaps remiss. I thought that by now they were in being, but in fact when I went directly to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and those involved in the process, I found this needed a little congressional incentive. That is the basic reason for this amendment that is laid down today. We have their attention now, and they are going forward with these decorations.

So for that reason, we must say to Senator BINGAMAN that that was a very fortunate development.

Mr. McCAIN. Again, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his desire and motivation to honor these brave young people.

I say to my friend, President Bush signed this Executive order on March 12. The way I count, that is 7 months ago. I am deeply disturbed that the Secretary of Defense has not acted to implement these regulations. I would like to tell my friend from Virginia that I still have people who work over in the Pentagon, who provide me from time to time with information—usually anonymously, for obvious reasons—but I have been told that these regulations have been on Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz's desk for 3½ weeks. That is not right. I know the Deputy Secretary of Defense is busy and I know the Secretary of Defense is busy, but I think we have every right to expect immediate action on this so that these men and women can go about receiving this recognition because they cannot until these papers are signed.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct.

Mr. McCAIN. I yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator is absolutely correct. As I said, we have brought this matter and the urgency of it to their attention, and that is one of the very positive results from the efforts of our colleagues on the other side and the initiative taken by the distinguished whip on this side in this amendment.

Mr. McCAIN. Could I mention to my friend from Virginia, too, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, perhaps we should look at whether individual medals should be given for operations in Iraq, and perhaps individual decorations should be given for the conflict in Afghanistan, as two prime examples. Perhaps it is not sufficient to just have an expeditionary medal and a service medal.

I had hoped that if we had acted in order to separate those two conflicts from others, we would get input from the Secretary of Defense, that there would be proper consultation and hearing and scrutiny before the Senate Armed Services Committee before we acted.

I think the Senator from Virginia pointed out that if we only gave an Iraqi freedom medal, what about those in Afghanistan? Is there an Afghanistan freedom medal, too? No, that was not part of the proposal yesterday. That is why these things with noble motivation have to be thought through. I hope that with this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which we will all vote on, we will send a message that we are all in support of the incredible importance of recognizing the service and sacrifice of the young men and women of our Armed Forces today.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague. I have known the McCain family. I served with the Senator's father and have followed the distinguished Senator's career, and it stands in parallel to the finest careers of those who have served in this body in years past, today, and who will serve in the future, who have worn the uniform of this country. So I value greatly the views of the Senator from Arizona and I thank him.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I say to my good friend he fails to mention that I served under the distinguished Senator from Virginia when he held the position of Secretary of the Navy. I might say I served way under. Given the chain of command, there were probably at least seven or eight individuals who separated the two of us, but I certainly appreciate the honor and pleasure of having served under then-Secretary of the Navy Warner. I have appreciated the relationship we have enjoyed in the intervening 30 years.

Mr. WARNER. I do not know. I fail to count the number of years. It is 30 plus. But I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. My career is so inconsequential in the U.S. military compared with his. I do believe I received the good conduct medal. To the best of my knowledge, the Senator never received that; did he?

Mr. McCAIN. I do not think I was ever considered for that.

Mr. WARNER. I do not think the Senator was eligible then and he is not eligible now. I think it is likely the Senator will never be eligible.

Mr. McCAIN. If it was up to a vote of our colleagues, I doubt I would be eligible today.

Mr. WARNER. Well, maybe we should cease this colloquy at this moment. I see others who perhaps would like to speak.

Again, we commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his initiative on this matter. I was somewhat saddened yesterday that we had to have a division of views on what I believe was the best of intentions by the Senator from New Mexico. I think now this is an opportunity for us to shake hands on both sides and move on and resolve this matter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I note the presence of the Senator from New Mexico. I hope he was able to hear our remarks concerning our appreciation for his motivation to honor these young men and women who have served and sacrificed. We look forward to and anticipate we will continue working together on this worthy cause.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I understand the majority leader will be coming to the floor shortly to address our current legislative circumstances. I have become increasingly concerned about our ability to finish this bill. We have noted that concern to the majority leader, as well as to the manager of the bill.

Our concern stems from really two issues: One, the unwillingness on the part of some to have votes on the pending amendments. I am told now there are eight or nine amendments that are pending, that have been offered and that have been set aside. Tomorrow is Friday. We wanted to have votes on all of those amendments. Yet for whatever reason, we have been unable to get to the votes.

The second issue is the issue involving the amendment to be offered by the Senators from Indiana and Wyoming, Mr. BAYH and Mr. ENSIGN. I am told, for whatever reason, many of our colleagues on the other side are unwilling to allow that amendment even to be brought up. If that is the case, obviously we are not going to be able to finish this bill. We can't have completion of the consideration of this legislation until that amendment has been offered and we have an opportunity to debate it and vote on it.

So, for whatever reason, we are stymied this afternoon at 5 o'clock with, I guess, some 30 amendments pending.

We had indicated all along we would make our best good-faith effort to try to finish this legislation. But I emphasized all the way through, this is going to take cooperation on both sides. I think we have cooperated in every sense of the word. We have laid down the amendments. I think most of the amendments that have been offered have been our amendments. We have laid them down. We have not in any way stalled consideration of this legislation.

Now we are here Thursday afternoon at 5 o'clock with nine amendments we are told we cannot have votes on, and one of them that cannot even be offered. So we are going to have to come to some understanding about how to proceed. I must say, with each passing hour the likelihood that we will be able to complete our work as we had hoped we could—by the end of the day tomorrow—dwindles and diminishes to a point where it will soon be nonexistent.

I call these concerns to the attention of my colleagues and ask we get some clarification about the schedule and about our ability to deal with these issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend, the Democratic leader, we agree that the amendment to which you referred is one of the last—I hope the last important amendment to be offered. I don't know whether there are other amendments on that side of the aisle that will have a need for debate at some length. But the amendment to which the Democratic leader referred is obviously one a number of people are going to want to speak to. I think we will be able to go to it sometime in the early evening because there are people here who are going to want to speak on that amendment. I know people on your side are going to want to speak on that amendment.

I am still optimistic that we can press on into the evening. It is still our hope to finish the bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am gratified to hear the distinguished assistant Republican leader is optimistic. I was optimistic. I hope I can have that optimism restored. As I noted just a moment ago, there are about 30 amendments pending, but we really believe that a lot of the amendments that are still pending depend on the outcome of the amendment to be offered by Senators BAYH and ENSIGN. So it is hard for us to move forward on the other amendments until that one has been resolved.

So we are in a situation where we cannot move forward until our Republican colleagues acknowledge the need to, not only offer the amendment, but to have it debated and voted upon, so we can clear the way for whatever additional amendments along the lines of the subject matter the Bayh-Ensign amendment addresses.

That is the issue. That is the concern we have. I hope we can clarify it soon. But I only raise this concern because I suggest the hour, while it is not late, is getting later, and we do not have a lot of time to finish all the work that is left.

I believe we made our commitment, kept our commitment, and I hope we can accomplish what many of us had hoped we could do 2 weeks ago.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Not to prolong this, because I think we are at essential agreement, but it was hard to get anything going during the day today, as is often the case around here. This is quite a nocturnal institution. The Sun goes down and we get busy working. But I certainly share the view of the Democratic leader the amendment to which he referred is a significant amendment. It is certainly our expectation we will be able to go to that amendment sometime early in the evening, accommodate those who want to speak, on both sides, move in the direction of completing action on the amendment at some point this evening, and move ahead, I hope.

I say to my good friend, that doesn't mean we have a whole lot more amendments coming from that side of the aisle that are going to require extensive debate. I heard the Senator from South Dakota and others say that is the last significant amendment. I certainly hope that is the case because then I think we have a chance of wrapping it up sometime soon and moving on to other matters.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I hope I didn't say that this was the last significant amendment because I know many of my colleagues who have amendments to offer certainly view them as significant. I wouldn't want to characterize their amendments as insignificant. If I led the Senator from Kentucky to that conclusion, I want to clarify that was not my intention.

But I also reiterate, we have eight or nine amendments pending that would require votes. We are basically in a quorum call with no real expectation of a vote on many of these amendments for the foreseeable future.

There are two issues. One is this amendment on loans offered by Senators BAYH and ENSIGN. The other is clearing the logjam of amendments that have already been offered, including one by this Senator, that awaits a vote. So the sooner we can get on with those votes, the sooner we can get on with the consideration of the Bayh amendment and the sooner we can address the other backlog of amendments that are waiting to be offered.

I thank my colleagues for their attention to this and hope we hear from the majority leader sometime soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. REID. I very much appreciate the Democratic leader's observation and his patience. We have a number of amendments that we have asked Members to withhold offering because there have been other matters on the Senate floor. During this period of time, we have had virtually no quorum calls until the recent episode where there has been movement—speaking only for myself—preventing anything from happening on this bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I will in just one second. So we have basically been without

quorum calls. And we still have, as the Senator from South Dakota, the Democratic leader, mentioned, about 30 amendments we have to dispose of.

As the leader said, some of these will fall as a result of the vote on the Bayh-Ensign amendment. But that still leaves at least 15 or 20 amendments we have to dispose of, and that doesn't count those at the desk. Just basic numbers indicate we have a lot of work to do.

I would also say that for my friend, the distinguished majority whip, to indicate we haven't been doing anything during the day—we have. There were some concerned about the time Senator BYRD spent on his amendment. But there was nothing done to stall for time. That time was taken, every minute, by some of the more distinguished Senators who spoke in support of Senator BYRD's amendment. He wouldn't agree to any time limit, but there certainly was no effort to stall anything. Then we were waiting to offer other amendments.

My point is that just by sheer numbers, if the Senator from Kentucky says it will take several hours of debate when we get to it this evening, does that mean we get to it at 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock? Are we going to spend 2 hours on that? That means we finish that debate at 9 or 9:30. We have a vote on that, we have 9 matters at the desk to vote on, and then we still have the amendments that have not even been offered.

So this is no easy chore we have. I, frankly, in spite of the good will between the distinguished majority whip and our Democratic leader—I think it is going to be difficult to do that based upon what we have been told by the majority this afternoon.

I am happy to yield for a question from my friend.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I was going to suggest we vote on this amendment at 20 minutes to 6, the pending amendment.

Mr. REID. The amendment before us? I would say I haven't had a chance to speak to my friend from New Mexico, but is this anything we object to?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to voting on this, voting at 20 minutes to 6. I would like a chance to speak for 4 or 5 minutes on the amendment, if I could.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, through the Chair I say to my friend from New Mexico that it is my understanding he does not oppose the amendment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, that is correct. I have no opposition to the amendment. I just want to speak to and explain my views on it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, that is my whole point. There is no reason to vote on this amendment. This is the old stall we are getting. That is all this is. There is no reason to vote on this amendment. We have substantive issues, and this is very important. I appreciate the good speeches from the chairman of the committee on this most important issue. But everybody is going to vote for it. If we are trying to finish this bill, which obviously we are not at this stage, the stall is going on and whatever has to happen to make sure the vote count is right on the Bayh amendment.

We need to move forward on this legislation. I will vote on it anytime we want. But I am just saying that it is a waste of time. I have seen stalls before. This is a stall. That is speaking only for myself.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are prepared to vote now, if that is agreeable with the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I would be happy to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Is it true——

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Arizona for a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Is it true that we had a 97-to-0 vote on the Byrd amendment, as I recall?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. REID. I would like to respond to the question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nevada to respond.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think it would be totally appropriate to have a vote on this as long as the Senator from New Mexico has 5 minutes to speak. This issue brought now by the majority is a result of the very important amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. I have no problem. My only point is this: There may have been one vote that was 98 to 0. I don't remember that. There certainly could have been. I assume this will be another one. But I think that will be fine after the Senator from New Mexico speaks, and then vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent that there be 10 minutes equally divided between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Mexico and that at the end of those 10 minutes, the Senate proceed to a rollcall vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object and ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, Mr. BAYH, No. 1871, be the next amendment in order.

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, as the Senator knows, we had an amendment as lined up to be considered on this side. Senator NICKLES also is not able to be here, but he has given me the information and I am prepared to offer that amendment for him. This is the first of the three amendments we are going to call up. I would be compelled to object to that setting of the Bayh amendment before we have some consideration of amendments on this side.

Mr. REID. I then ask unanimous consent that the request be modified so the Senator from Indiana may be allowed to offer his amendment following the disposal of the Nickles amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. STEVENS. I will not object to that. I ask unanimous consent to amend this request so that I may be recognized to present the Nickles amendment following the vote on the McConnell amendment, and following that Senator BAYH be recognized to present his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me speak very briefly on the pending McConnell amendment which Senator MCCONNELL, Senator WARNER, and Senator MCCAIN have offered.

First, I congratulate them. I think this is a very constructive amendment. It gives recognition to the men and women who are serving overseas in various locations. It puts the Senate on record, even though it is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, in support of the issuance of appropriate medals to these individuals.

I believe, as I was arguing the day before yesterday when we had the other debate on this issue, that the appropriate course is either on the initiative of the Pentagon or through action by the Congress that at some stage fairly soon we authorize combat medals for those who serve in Iraq and for those who perhaps serve in Afghanistan. That seems to me to me to be consistent with the course we followed previously. We had a medal of that sort for those who served in the first gulf war. We had a medal of that sort for those who served in Kosovo. There is ample precedent for that.

To lump all military engagements that we have after 9/11 under this large umbrella of the global war on terrorism and say we are going to give you one medal for whatever military engagements you serve in after that date I think is inadequate. I think the men and women serving in Iraq today deserve special recognition for that.

I have seen the suggestions being considered at the Pentagon for putting a star on some designation—on a generic kind of a medal dealing with the global war on terrorism, some kind of star indicating services in Iraq. To me, that would not be consistent with what we have done before. I hope we won't go that route.

Obviously, this is a step forward. I commend the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Arizona, and the Senator from Kentucky for putting forward this amendment. I intend to support it. I hope all Senators will support it.

But I hope we will find a way or that the Pentagon will find a way to do

more to recognize the service of these individuals both in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I say to my colleague from New Mexico, with whom I have had the privilege to serve now for close to two decades in this body, and who was a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and a very valued member, that he has gotten this Senator's attention. I appreciate what he is doing to support the pending amendment, and I urge colleagues to do likewise.

If I might say first, while he was not present in the Chamber when I brought to the attention of the Senate that the debate which followed his amendment the other day did bring about this Senator's personal attention on the status of several decorations, I found that it was not moving along, in my judgment, in an expeditious and timely manner. That debate the other day served a very important service to the men and women of the Armed Forces who are engaged in these particular theaters.

I would like to work with the Senator and with the Department of Defense to pursue his thoughts about perhaps additional recognition for service in the theaters of Iraq Afghanistan. I am just not prepared at this time to give a definitive answer.

This is the course, as proposed by the amendment which is before the Senate, which has been followed for years. So many places in the world today have often no geographic boundaries and have no identity. Yet people who are on guard wearing our uniform, coalition forces and other nations, are subject to loss of life and limb in combating that terrorism.

I am not able at this point in time to come up with some definitive suggestion. But I certainly would like to associate myself with the Senator's remarks that there should be an expression of gratitude to those persons serving in these theaters right now for their service and that given by their families. I thank the Senator.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield back the remaining time.

Mr. WARNER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. WARNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 1874. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) would vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 387 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Akaka	Dole	Lugar
Alexander	Domenici	McCain
Allard	Dorgan	McConnell
Allen	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Edwards	Miller
Bayh	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Murray
Biden	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Boxer	Frist	Pryor
Breaux	Graham (FL)	Reed
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Reid
Bunning	Grassley	Roberts
Burns	Gregg	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hagel	Santorum
Campbell	Harkin	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hatch	Schumer
Carper	Hollings	Sessions
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Chambliss	Inhofe	Smith
Clinton	Inouye	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Coleman	Kennedy	Stabenow
Collins	Kerry	Stevens
Conrad	Kohl	Sununu
Cornyn	Kyl	Talent
Corzine	Landrieu	Thomas
Crapo	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Daschle	Leahy	Warner
Dayton	Levin	Wyden
DeWine	Lincoln	
Dodd	Lott	

NAYS—1

Jeffords

NOT VOTING—2

Craig Lieberman

The amendment (No. 1874) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1869, AS MODIFIED; 1870; AND 1857, AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have three amendments that have been cleared by both sides: Amendment No. 1869, as modified; amendment No. 1870; and amendment No. 1857, as modified. I send them to the desk and ask that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1869, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to arm, train, or employee individuals under the age of 18 years for the Facilities Protection Service)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2313. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'', or under any other heading, may be obligated or expended for the purpose of arming, training, or employing individuals under the age of 18 years for the Facilities Protection Service, to carry out any function similar to the functions performed by the Service, or for any other security force.

AMENDMENT NO. 1870

Insert at the appropriate place in the bill:

SEC. . Section 1605 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding a new subsection (h) as follows:

''(h) Notwithstanding any provision of the Algiers Accords, or any other international agreement, any United States citizen held hostage during the period between 1979 and 1981, and their spouses and children at the time, shall have a claim for money damages against a foreign state for personal injury that was caused by the Foreign State's act of torture or hostage taking. Any provision in an international agreement, including the Algiers Accords that purports to bar such suit is abrogated. This subsection shall apply retroactively to any cause of action cited in 28 U.S.C. 1605(a)(7)(A).

AMENDMENT NO. 1857, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To improve the process for timely informing members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, their families, their employers, and Congress of changes in deployment policies and schedules applicable to mobilize members of the reserve components)

On page 22, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 316. (a) In the administration of laws and policies on the period for which members of reserve components of the Armed Forces called or ordered to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code, are deployed outside the United States, the deployment shall be considered to have begun on the first day of the active-duty service to which called or ordered and shall be considered to have ended on the last day of the active-duty service to which called or ordered.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BREAUX. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Ms. CANTWELL. I have offered an amendment to this bill that will bring predictability and clarity to our deployment of National Guard and Reserve units.

I thank my cosponsors, Senators BOND and LEAHY, the cochairs of the Senate National Guard Caucus, as well as Senators BINGAMAN, LEAHY, JOHNSON, NELSON of Florida, GRAHAM of Florida, MURRAY, KENNEDY, PRYOR, LAUTENBERG, and KERRY, who are joining me in sending a message that we need to be consistent in how we calculate the deployment times for our Guard and Reserve personnel.

This amendment will direct the Pentagon to consider the full activation time for Guard and Reserve personnel in considering its deployment policies and also to establish a program to

more effectively notify troops and their families of changes in deployment policies and/or extensions in deployment periods.

This action will go a long way in ensuring better predictability for our military reservists, their families, and employers—they certainly deserve it.

I am proud to say that it has been endorsed by the National Guard Association of the United States, the Reserve Officers Association and the National Military Families Association.

As many in this Chamber know, over 20,000 troops in Iraq were faced with a rude awakening last month when the administration changed a 50-year standard practice in calculating deployment policies—a change the effectively extended deployments for these troops by several months in many cases.

Prior to last month's decision, the length of deployment was calculated based on the time a reservist was activated—when a member of the Guard and Reserve left home. However, last month, the administration changed the method of calculation to time deployed ''in theater.''

This is not the way to treat our Reserve component. We are asking more and more from them, and they deserve better. The Guard and Reserve are critically important to our national security both at home and abroad.

Since September 11, 2001, the National Guard has mobilized 210,000 of its 350,000 soldiers at one time or another. The Reserve has mobilized 85,000 of its 205,000 in that same time period.

In my own State, with the recent alert of the Army National Guard's 81st Armored Brigade, 41 percent of Washington State's National Guard—4,041 troops—are currently alerted and deployed, as well as 2,100 reservists from bases around my State.

These are historic levels of sustained mobilization, and we need to be clear that we are asking a lot from these men and women—and we must do everything we can to ensure that the Guard and Reserve continue to recruit and retain skilled and committed personnel.

It goes without saying that these men and women definitely signed up to serve when their country calls. The reservists in my State do not dispute their commitment; they embrace it.

However, we need to know that we are asking an extraordinary commitment from our Nation's Guard and reservists, their families and their employers and we need to recognize the full commitment.

This is why I was concerned when the Pentagon announced that it will calculate deployment lengths for the over 20,000 Guard and Reserve members in Iraq based on the actual time in the theater of operations—otherwise known as ''boots on the ground.''

This change altered a long-standing practice dating back to the Korean-war era in which deployment lengths for Guard and Reserve officers were calculated from the moment they were actually activated—that is, when they are called to leave their jobs and families to begin pre-mobilization preparation time and included post-mobilization time.

This preparation time can sometimes take as much as 3 to 6 months.

As a result, thousands of troops in the theater of operations who were expecting to go home—literally counting the days to return—were just informed that their time would be extended, some by as much as 6 months.

This is just wrong.

As Mark Kimmey, an Army reservist, wrote in the New York Times: ''the message to reservists is unmistakable: the Army no longer takes into account sacrifices made to maintain two career lives.''

We absolutely own it to our Guard and reservists to give them predictability in the process and to fully recognize that the Guard and reservists' lives are serving from the point they are activated.

My amendment will direct the Pentagon to revert back to the standard practice in considering, for the purposes of deployment announcements, mobilization reports and communications, the clock to start ticking from the point of activation—that is, ''boots out of the house.''

If we need our reservists to serve in theater for 1 year and 6 months in preparation time, that's fine. But let's be honest, these troops are being deployed for 18 months—not a year. Troops, families, and employers deserve the respect of our acknowledging the sacrifice.

Let me be absolutely clear—this amendment does not, by any means, seek to limit the operational use of the Guard and Reserve, nor are we seeking to limit the flexibility of their use.

This does absolutely nothing to limit the ability of the Pentagon to mobilize and use our Guard and Reserve units, nor does it limit the length of time that they can be deployed.

Moreover, the amendment's provisions can be waived at any point in the case of dire, unexpected operational needs.

We are simply asking the administration to adopt the standard practice in effect for decades in calculating deployment times so that troops and their families can know when to start their clocks.

Ultimately, this is a very modest amendment. We are asking the Pentagon to be honest, consistent and predictable in the use of our Guard and Reserve. They deserve it; their families deserve it; we owe it to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1876

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] proposes an amendment numbered 1876.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that all countries that hold debt from the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein should be urged to forgive their debt)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) The Senate finds the following:

(1) When Saddam Hussein came to power in the 1970's Iraq was a prosperous county with no foreign debt and significant foreign cash reserves.

(2) Iraq's reserves were exhausted during the Iran-Iraq War in the 1980's and Iraq became a debtor nation.

(3) Today, the debts incurred by Saddam Hussein's regime are estimated to be as much as $150,000,000,000.

(4) A process has been put in place that will establish a new representative Iraqi government based on a democratic political system with a free market economy. The goal is a prosperous Iraq that is not a threat to its neighbors.

(5) For Iraq to be prosperous it must rebuild. In the near term the United States and other donor countries will provide grants to begin the process. In the longer term Iraq must be able to fully participate in the international financial system.

(6) It is impossible for Iraq to borrow funds in international financial markets based on its existing debt. Eliminating that debt will make possible Iraq's continued rebuilding toward a prosperous and stable nation. A prosperous nation is less likely to be a threat to its neighbors and to be a breeding ground for terrorists. A prosperous Iraq is more likely to be a positive force in the region and participant in the world economy.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that all countries that hold debt from loans to the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein should be urged to forgive their debt.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment urging the countries that presently hold Iraqi debt to cancel or forgive that debt. All of the Iraqi debt was generated after Saddam Hussein came to power in that country.

The history of the Iraqi debt was that, when Saddam Hussein took control, it was a very rich country, and it had no debt. Saddam Hussein started a war with Iran and he incurred a lot of debt. As a matter of fact, when he came into power, they had no foreign debt. During Iraq's war with Iran, Iraq incurred debts estimated at about $80 billion. Most of that was to finance the war.

Iraqi arms purchases during the 1980s were estimated from $52 billion to $102 billion. Saddam Hussein used debt to purchase arms. He used debt to build palaces. He used very little debt, if any, to help the Iraqi people.

We asked the Congressional Research Service to give us an analysis of what countries hold or own Iraqi debt.

I ask unanimous consent to print this information in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTRIES TO WHICH IRAQ MAY BE INDEBTED

[In billions of dollars]

	Low	High
Western Countries (G–8)	16	44
Canada	1	1
France	2	8
Germany	2	4
Italy	1	2
Japan	3	7
Russia	3	16
United Kingdom	1	2
United States	2	5
Middle East Gulf States	60	82
Saudi Arabia	25	25
Kuwait	17	27
Other	18	30
Other Countries	16	16
Commercial (London Club)	3	11
Total	95	153

Source: Congressional Research Service Memorandum.

Mr. NICKLES. There is a significant range. I will go over a few of these countries, but the essence of it is that none of these countries have received payments on Iraqi debt for years. In most cases, for decades payments have not been made. Saddam Hussein incurred a lot of debt. The countries holding that debt may hold it as if it is worth something, but, frankly, no payments have been made on that debt for some time.

Who holds that debt? The range of the total amount of debt according to CRS—and I am not talking about war reparations for Saddam Hussein's war with Iran and invasion of Kuwait. There are a lot of claimed reparations for damages. That is not covered by this resolution. We are talking about debt incurred by Saddam Hussein's regime, and that was estimated by CRS as being a total of $95 billion and $153 billion.

Some of the debt ranges are for Western countries and some are for Middle Eastern Gulf States. Some of the Western countries are: Canada is estimated to have $1 billion. France, from $2 billion to $8 billion; we are not certain of the exact amount. Germany, from $2 billion to $4 billion. Italy, from $1 billion to $2 billion. Japan, from $3 billion to $7 billion. Russia, from $3 billion to $16 billion. The U.K., from $1 billion to $2 billion. The United States, from $2 billion to $5 billion. These were debts incurred under the regime of Saddam Hussein.

The essence of this amendment is to urge these countries to forgive or wipe off the debt from the books.

For the Middle Eastern Gulf States, it is much more. Saudi Arabia is reported to hold $25 billion of Iraqi loans; Kuwait, $17 billion to $27 billion; other Gulf States, from $18 billion to $30 billion.

If the Iraqi debt is from $95 billion to $150 billion—let's say it is $120 billion—if we were making payments even at 5 percent—that is $5 billion, $6 billion, $7 billion a year in interest payments—they could not afford to pay that. These interest payments would consume 80 percent to 130 percent of Iraq's oil revenues. Clearly, that is not sustainable.

The Iraqis have a lot of infrastructure needs. They have a lot of rebuilding needs. They have a lot of needs that have been ignored by the previous regime, by Saddam Hussein, for decades. If they had to make payments on this existing debt, I think it would only complicate, frankly, their future and their survival.

I urge in this sense-of-the-Senate amendment countries that are holding debt that was incurred by Saddam Hussein's regime to forgive that debt so Iraq can move forward with a new government without being so constrained, so the new government can move forward and rebuild Iraq without being so tied up with this existing debt.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was interested in the comments by my colleague from Oklahoma. I don't know of anyone here who would object or disagree with the contention that those who hold Iraqi debt ought to forgive that debt. I have spoken on this subject at some length a couple of times.

Ambassador Bremer appeared before our Appropriations Committee and indicated that Iraq would be producing about 3 million barrels of oil a day beginning in July of next year. I asked the question then about using future proceeds from pumping Iraq oil for the purpose of reconstruction. He indicated that would not be possible because of the encumbrance that existed with foreign debt.

I asked Ambassador Bremer who holds this foreign debt. He said Russia, Germany, France, among others. When I did research later, I discovered exactly what the Senator from Oklahoma discovered. In fact, Russia, Germany, and France do hold Iraqi debt, but the larger debt is owed to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other Arab states which, incidentally, in combination, equal about the debt that both the Saudis and the Kuwaitis hold with Iraq.

It occurred to me that if we are concerned that Saudi Arabia and Kuwait recover the loans they gave to Iraq, maybe we ought to ask the Saudis and Kuwaitis to track Saddam Hussein down and present him with a bill. The Iraqi government that incurred that debt, the government that existed at that point, was the Saddam Hussein government. It clearly was not a legitimate government.

As you know, in the last election of that government, Saddam Hussein received 100 percent of the vote and those who voted had to walk down an aisle, a long gallery of pictures of Saddam Hussein, and hold their ballot above their head that was clearly marked ''Saddam Hussein.''

That is the government we are now told legitimately owes money to the Saudis and the Kuwaitis. In my judgment, that government no longer exists, and the encumbrance of Saddam Hussein ought not, in my judgment at least, obligate the Iraqi citizens to do anything.

I know there will be people who are tall thinkers with thick glasses who have some thought about international obligations that I may not understand. It may be that I don't understand all the nuances, but I do understand this: That Saddam Hussein has vanished. The Saddam Hussein government was a government run by a butcher. We are, in fact, opening football-field-size graves with 10,000 and 12,000 skeletons in them, and we are told the only legacy of that government that ought to remain an obligation is the debt Saddam Hussein ran up with other countries.

I don't think that debt ought to be considered to be existing debt at this point, with all due respect to those countries. If in the 1980s we had countries that were pals of Saddam Hussein because he was taking on the country of Iran and they were lending Saddam Hussein money, at this point it seems to me they ought to track down Saddam Hussein and present him with a bill.

We are told from time to time by intelligence sources that Saddam perhaps has a substantial amount of money squirreled away in Swiss banks. They say he stole that country blind. I don't know the facts about that. I suspect that is the case. I suspect Saddam Hussein and his government squirreled away a substantial amount of money. In any event, we can't find him. I suggest to those to whom he owes money or to those whom his former government owes money, they ought to track him down and present him with a bill.

We have had a long discussion here and will, I guess, again, perhaps tonight or tomorrow, about what kind of obligation the American taxpayers should have with respect to the reconstruction of Iraq. It was my belief—and I regret my amendment was not adopted, but I accept the voice of the Senate on that amendment—it was my belief that we should lend the money to Iraq for reconstruction and that Iraq should repay those loans out of the proceeds from oil that it pumps out of the ground in the future.

Once again, we expect, according to the testimony of Ambassador Bremer, about 3 million barrels of oil a day. In fact, the Iraqi Governing Council—these are the Iraqis who are now in charge, running ministries and so on—they visited here a couple weeks ago and said they thought it would be 6 million barrels a day.

Let's take Ambassador Bremer's number instead, 3 million a day. That means that country will pump about $20 billion of oil, about $16 billion of which is available for export. So we have $16 billion a year of Iraqi oil, beginning next July, available for export. That is $160 billion in 10 years, $320 billion in 20 years. That is a substantial amount of money for the reconstruction of a country the size of California with 24 million people. It is ample money to do that job.

I understand we have already decided that question. My amendment did not pass the Senate. But as we discuss further amendments about grants versus loans, I wanted to make a comment following the discussion by the Senator from Oklahoma. I believe his numbers are accurate. Those are the numbers I discovered with respect to foreign debt owed by Iraq. More properly, I think it is foreign debt owed by Saddam Hussein's government, a nonlegitimate government, a brutal dictatorship.

In my judgment, the Iraqi people ought not at this point be burdened by that debt and I would suggest to creditors, including the Saudis and Kuwaitis, that the paper for those debts is worth only that which it will produce once Saddam Hussein is found and it is presented to him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma, and I think perhaps a little discussion about the history of debt and debt repudiation, debts being placed upon countries that have been defeated or liberated, might be in order.

In anticipation perhaps of this debate, a member of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, Melanie Mickelson, prepared a memo for me and other members of the committee entitled ''Iraqi Debt and Reconstruction.'' I ask unanimous consent that this memo be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, when we think of forgiveness of debt or repudiation of debt, we think back usually to Germany, to the debt that was placed on Germany at the end of the First World War by the Versailles Treaty and the great political hay Adolf Hitler was able to make out of this debt as he told the people of Germany that the Versailles Treaty had been a stab in the back and the people who had imposed that debt on Germany were the people who were Germany's primary enemies.

I do not want to make too much out of that aspect of Hitler's rise to power, but there was no question but what the enormous debt placed on Germany at the end of the First World War was destabilizing on the country and made it very difficult for Germany to bring itself back as a viable nation and made Germany potentially vulnerable to the kind of political appeal Adolf Hitler represented.

Let us put this in some perspective with respect to Iraq and what we are talking about here. At this time, the debt that was placed upon Germany was roughly two times Germany's gross domestic product, or GDP. To put that into perspective for the United States, right now our debt is roughly half of America's GDP. If we assume the GDP is running at $11 trillion in round figures, we would say the debt Germany faced by comparison would be similar to putting a debt on the United States of $22 trillion. That, of course, takes one's breath away when you think about the impact of that on the United States. Twenty-two trillion dollars. How in the world, even with as vital and vibrant an economy as we have, would we be able to survive if we had a national debt of $22 trillion? That was the debt that had such significant historic impact on Germany in the last century.

What are we talking about with respect to the debt Iraq currently faces? Is it half their GDP, as it is in the United States? Would it be as burdensome as the German debt at two times GDP? No, neither of those figures applies. When we talk about the size of the debt Iraq currently carries compared to their present GDP, we are talking about ten times GDP; not two times but ten times current GDP. Again, to translate that into numbers we can compare to America, that would mean that America, the strongest economy in the world, with our present GDP of roughly $11 trillion, would be saddled with a debt in excess of $120 trillion.

How prosperous would America be if we were faced with that kind of a debt load? Obviously, it would sink us, even though we have the strongest economy in the world.

We have people around here who are worried because our current debt is roughly half of GDP, and to talk about ten times GDP is absolutely impossible. So the logical thing to do is for all of the countries to respond to the call that is represented by the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma and forgive the debt.

Why? Let us go through the reasons. One of them has been raised by Senator DORGAN. That is, this debt was incurred on behalf of a brutal regime which has been overthrown. Some of the debtor countries might say, when there is a coup in a country and the government is overthrown, whoever takes over takes over the obligations. Saddam Hussein was not overthrown by a coup from the Iraqis. He was overthrown by the 82nd Airborne. He was overthrown by the United States of America and the marines, by the British troops, the Polish troops, and the other coalition members that joined us in overthrowing that government.

So while the Iraqi people are very grateful Saddam Hussein has been overthrown, while the Iraqi people rejoice that Saddam Hussein has been overthrown, the Iraqi people by no means are responsible for the debt that survives because he was overthrown. They were the victims of the debt, not the beneficiaries or perpetrators of the debt. For that reason, they should not be held accountable.

There are other reasons. There are sound economic reasons. We have a principle of bankruptcy in this country. When, as a result of circumstances, whether they were caused or just out of somebody's control, someone finds himself absolutely incapable of repaying the debt, we go through bankruptcy court and say we are going to give you an opportunity for a fresh start. We are going to give you an opportunity to wipe the slate clean and move forward. We are going to discharge your debt through bankruptcy.

If any country has been reduced to bankruptcy, it is Iraq. The GDP I described is substantially below what their potential earning power will be, but they can never realize that earning power if they are not free from their past debts by virtue of a bankruptcy action.

What the Senator from Oklahoma is proposing is essentially the countries that hold the debt allow the Iraqis to file bankruptcy; that the countries that hold the debt say, we recognize reality. We recognize we are never, ever going to get this money.

There are some who might say, yes, but Iraq has all that oil and eventually maybe they will be able to give us this money, so let's just restructure the debt. Let's just say okay, no payments for a while, no payments on principal, interest is deferred, we will give you a chance to get on your feet, and then we will collect the debt.

That is not a principle that applies in reality with respect to most bankruptcy situations. Even those who have the ability to earn money later on can get everything discharged with bankruptcy if it is clear the existence of the debt as it stands is going to prevent them from earning money later on.

The most significant return that can come to the countries that are currently holding Iraqi debt will come from a vibrant Iraqi economy with which they can open meaningful trade relations.

Think of what the potential of Iraq is in terms other than oil. We held a hearing on this in the Joint Economic Committee. Of course, the primary focus was on oil revenue, but I was interested to discover that Iraq has other things besides oil. Iraq is blessed with fertile soil. Iraq is blessed with water. Iraq has a history, pre-Saddam Hussein, of being a net exporter of food. In other words, an economically healthy Iraq, rebuilding its infrastructure, reclaiming its opportunity to move water around the country through canals and pipelines and starting irrigation can be an Iraq that can have a vibrant agricultural sector; an Iraq that can then create a manufacturing sector to provide the farm implements that are necessary to support its agriculture; an Iraq that can have a middle class that can buy things; that can have a society that is not just based on oil.

It can become, properly reconstructed, one of the most vibrant economies in the region. It can outstrip some of the economies around it that are dependent solely upon oil and

thereby become an example of capitalism in the region, from which we and others around Iraq can reap enormous benefits. Those benefits, properly reaped, will establish greater economic value than the collection of the debt.

This is the prospect you have here. If we wipe out all of the debt, if the countries respond to the plea contained in the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma and forgive their debts so a vibrant Iraq can be built without the shadow of debt hanging over it, those very countries that currently hold the debt can benefit with the opportunity for trade with a vibrant and vital Iraq.

I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma in proposing his amendment. I hope it will pass overwhelmingly as a message to those countries that do hold Iraqi debt, to say to them the United States recognizes the importance of allowing Iraq to declare bankruptcy as if it were, if you will, an American corporation. The United States recognizes that the hope of the future will come from allowing all of this to happen, allowing these debts to disappear, and allowing Iraq to get on with their reconstruction.

EXHIBIT 1

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Memo: Iraqi Debt and Reconstruction.
Date: October 9, 2003.

THE ABC'S OF IRAQI DEBT

Dealing with debt accrued by Saddam Hussein and the Baath party is a lynchpin to Iraqi reconstruction. According to Businessweek, Iraq owes $216 billion. Of that, $32 billion is war reparations, owed mainly to Kuwait. Loans comprise $127 billion of the debt, and contracts agreed to during the past ten years racked up $57 billion. Other estimates of total debt skate from $95 billion to $350 billion (the Bush administration calculates Iraqi debt to be $200 billion, as reported by CRS).

The debt's creditors include a long list of nations, as compiled by Jubilee Iraq, an organization of British origin dedicated to the repudiation of Iraqi debts. Table 1 displays the list of nations as well as amounts owed. In addition to these nations and organizations, Iraq also owes the IMF and World Bank a total of $150 million, as reported by Representative Carolyn Maloney at the June 11, 2003 JEC Hearing.

A SECOND GERMANY?

In American history, precedents of debt repudiation focus on post-war Germany. Following WWI, Germany's economy was shallow with debts amounting to two times German GDP. The Treaty of Versailles pointed out German guilt and obligation to pay war reparation, however the United States renounced all reparations and did not sanction the treaty. Due to German government resistance and inability to collect funds, the Dawes Plan of 1924 reorganized the Reichsbank under Allied supervision and created a tax system to fund reparation payments. Reparations to the European Allied nations made the bulk of their lend-lease payments to the United States. Germany staggered under heavy debt as Europe suffered through the 1920 depression. The Young Plan (1929) reduced the sum Germany owed, delineating a distinct dollar amount as well as how to collect it through budgeting and a transportation tax. In 1931, President Hoover issued a one-year moratorium on all international debts. The Lausanne Pact of 1932 substituted bond issues for reparation debt, but Adolf Hitler repudiated all WWI reparations while in office. Payment resumed in 1953 by West Germany.

The debts owed to the U.S. by our WWI allies were defaulted by 1934 excepting Hungary, which did so in 1939, Finland, which paid in full, and Russia. Russia repudiated the debt, owing to its becoming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

After WWII, the Allies received German reparations in the form of assets and industrial equipment. Because of disagreements between the USSR and U.S. regarding payments, West and East Germany formed, each paying reparations to their respective political counterpart. The U.S. ended German payments in 1952, the USSR ended payments in 1953. Germany paid reparations to its former allies, against U.S. advisement. The United States collected war reparations from Germany's ally, Japan, through 1949, and renounced all further payments in 1951.

ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Iraqi debt differs from German post-war debt in a major way. Germans dealt with a debt twice the size of the country's GDP. Iraq faces debt estimated to be ten times national output (BusinessWeek). The payment of such an amount is near impossible, even with the development and future revenues of oil resources. Placing this burden on a new government cripples Iraq's ability to accumulate capital, expand production, and increase the standard of living. Repudiating this debt also sends the red light to creditors who loan to sketchy governments, in this case, nations whose loans were used to amass Hussein's weaponry and technology. Some argue the new government will have trouble obtaining loans with such history of repudiation. However, no moral hazard issue exists; the loans forgiven belong to Saddam, not the Coalition Provisional Authority or the government that may follow.

Those on the opposing bench feel repudiating Saddam's debt will jostle the credit market and create uncertainty now and whenever government turnovers occur. This cannot be the case. Iraq is such a unique situation; few countries, if any, can follow this paradigm.

On a side note, Basil Al-Rahim, founder of the Iraq Foundation, Spoke of creating a debt trading system in Iraq. At the June 11, 2003 JEC hearing on transforming Iraq's economy, Al-Rahim spoke of trading debt for points in a system that would use the points in dealings of concessions, licenses, and contracts (see p 20–21 of the JEC transcript).

TABLE 1.—COUNTRIES TO WHICH IRAQ MAY BE INDEBTED

	($bn)	Date	Sources and notes
Australia	0.5	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
Austria	0.8	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
Belgium	0.2	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
Brazil	0.2	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
Bulgaria	1	1998	CSIS.
	1.512	1995	22nd Bulgarian Iraq Committee on Cooperation does not include interest.
	1.7	2003	Deutsche Presse-Agentur 7/3/03.
	1.7	2003	Exotix (Iraq: Just the Debt, Exotix Ltd, April 2003).
Canada	0.6	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
China	>2	2003	ABC, China claims it is owed ''billions''.
Czech Rep.	0.06–0.1	2003	Boston Globe 20/4/03.
Denmark	0.03	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
Egypt	??		CSIS.
Finland	0.2	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
France	3	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	1.7	??	Paris Club (10 July '03).
	3.75–4.3	??	Dow Jones 29/3/3.
	8	2003	Salah al-Shaikhly's estimate quoted in Moscow Times.
	4	2003	Noreenah Hertz. Ff1 fighters, Exocet air-to-surface missiles, laser guided missiles, attack helicopters.
	8	2003	Financial Times.
Germany	2.4	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	2.1	??	Paris Club (10 July '03).
	3.9	2003	The official number from the German ministry of finance, on Handelsblatt (03/04/25).
	4.3	2003	Financial Times.
Gulf States	30	2002	CSIS—The war debt.
	17.5	Exotix	
Hungary	0.017	1995	CSIS.
India	1	2003	The Hindu, 14/4/03.
Italy	1.7	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	0.33	??	Paris Club (10 July '03).
Japan	4.1	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	3.4	??	Paris Club (10 July '03).
	7.02	2003	$4.109bn + $2.919bn in arrears. Export credit $6.46bn, Japan Bank or International Development (JBIC) $4550m. (June 11th).
Jordan	0.295	1991	CSIS.
	1.3	2003	Minister of Finance, Michael Manto (July 15th).
Korea	0.04	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	1.1	2003	Dow Jones 29/3/3, debt to Hyundai for infrastructure projects in 70s and 80s.
Kuwait	17	1992	CSIS.
	27	2003	MEES quoting Kuwait Investment Authority (KIA).
London Club	2.6	2003	Syndicated loans issued by Rafidain Bank and others Reuters. Also loans in 1983 from Chase Manhattan (now J.P. Morgan Chase), Irving Trust (now Bank of New York) and BNP (now BNP Paribas) Forbes.
	11	2003	Herald Tribune 26/4/3 Emergent Alternative Fund, Aberdeen Asset Management and Argo Capital Management all offer funds that dabble in Iraqi debt.
Morocco	0.032	1999	CSIS.
Multilaterals	1.1	2003	Exotix.
Netherlands	0.1	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).

TABLE 1.—COUNTRIES TO WHICH IRAQ MAY BE INDEBTED—Continued

	($bn)	Date	Sources and notes
Paris Club (others)	0.8	??	Paris Club (10 July '03): Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Sweden.
Poland	0.4	1998	CSIS.
	0.564	2003	FT ''Iraq after Saddam'', 17/4/03.
	0.7	2003	Boston Globe 20/4/03.
Poland + Czech + Romania	0.1	2003	Exotix.
Romania	1.7	2003	(Bucharest Business Week on 21st April).
Russia	3.4	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	9.6	??	Paris Club (10 July '03).
	9	2003	Dow Jones 29/3/3. Used to buy: helicopters, MIG fighters and radar equipment.
	12	2002	SIS.
	8	2003	Financial Times.
	16	2003	Including interest—Channel News Asia.
Saudi	25	2002	Arab News SR94bn.
	25	2003	Exotix.
	25	2003	Financial Times.
Serbia	1.8–2	2003	Minister of Economy. Serbia + Montenegro claim 38% of this (about $700–750m).
Spain	0.3	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
Sweden	0.1	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
Switzerland	0.1	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	0.7	2003	Exotix.
	0.3	2003	Swissinfo mainly machinery & building materials.
Turkey	0.8	1993	CSIS.
United Kingdom	0.9	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03).
	1.6	2003	ECGD (Conversation, 623 pounds principal).
United States	2.2	1991	Paris Club (11 July '03) Inc no accrued interest.
	2.1	??	Paris Club (10 July '03).
	5	??	Dow Jones 29/3/3. Clinton considered using Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to satisfy Creditors with frozen Iraqi funds, but the creditors failed to agree how to distribute the small amount of frozen funds available.

Source: Jublilee Iraq, www.jubileeiraq.org/reperations.htm.

TABLE 2.—COMPENSATION CLAIMS FROM 1991 WAR

[In millions of dollars]

Category	Resolved	Award	Paid	Unpaid	Unresolved
Individuals:					
A	$3,450	$3,210	$3,210	0	0
B	20	13	13	0	0
C	8,760	4,990	4,990	0	$2,540
D	4,440	2,040	1,740	$300	15,410
				300	17,950
Corporations:					
E1—oil	443,300	21,430	660	20,770	285
E2—non-Kuwait	12,650	848	779	69	1,010
E3	7,830	364	337	27	280
E4—Kuwait	11,300	3,280	2,920	360	176
				21,230	1,760
Governments:					
E/F—export	6,120	311	180	131	0
F1—non-Kuwait	18,610	291	244	47	0
F2—Saudi and Jordan	17,670	264	256	8	0
F3—Kuwait	113,900	8,260	2,150	6,110	0
F4—environmental	1,680	954	315	639	78,200
				6,940	78,200
Total	251,160	46,250	17,780	28,470	97,900

Key to categories

A: Individuals' who had to depart from Kuwait or Iraq between the date of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on 2 August 1990 and the date of the cease-fire, 2 March 1991.

B: Individuals' who suffered serious personal injury or whose spouse, child or parent died. There were 5,734 of these claims.

C: Individuals' claims for damages up to US$100,000, including those relating to departure from Kuwait or Iraq; personal injury; mental pain and anguish; loss of personal property; loss of bank accounts, stocks and other securities; loss of income; loss of real property; and individual business losses.

D: Individuals' claims for damages above US$100,000 each, losses similar to those in category C, with the most frequent being the loss of personal property; the loss of real property; the loss of income and business-related losses.

E: Corporations and public sector enterprises. Including claims for construction or other contract losses; losses from the non-payment for goods or services; losses relating to the destruction or seizure of business assets; loss of profits; and oil sector losses.

F: Governments and international organizations for losses incurred in evacuating citizens; providing relief to citizens; damage to diplomatic premises and loss of, and damage to, other government property; and damage to the environment.

Source: http://www.jubileeiraq.org/reperations.htm.

REFERENCES

Buckley, William F. ''Odious Activities.'' October 7, 2003. http://www.nationalreview.com/buckley/buckley200310071228.asp.

Crock, Stan. ''Iraqi Debt: Fast-Track the Restructuring.'' BusinessWeek. October 13, 2003. http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/03_41/b3853055.htm.

Joint Economic Committee. Hearing on Transforming Iraq's Economy. June 11, 2003.

''Paying for Saddam's sins.'' Economist. May 15, 2003. http://www.economist.com/displaystory.cfm?story_id=1780943.

Sanford, Jonathan E. ''Foreign Debt of Iraq and Foreign Claims Against Iraq.'' CRS Memorandum. October 2, 2003.

Sanford, Jonathan E. and Elsea, Jennifer K. ''Export-Import Bank Operations in Iraq.'' CRS Memorandum. September 12, 2003.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah, Senator BENNETT, for his comments. He is exactly right. This existing Saddam Hussein-incurred debt will suffocate Iraq and prevent Iraq from really rejoining the world economy, from making significant progress. These are countries, including the United States—Canada, Germany, France, Russia, and others that have something at stake—sure. But they have never been paid a dime on this debt and, frankly, they will not be. I hope they all saddle up and say: We want to have an investment in Iraq's future. By doing so, we forgive this debt and we will enable Iraq to start to grow and make some progress.

This idea we are going to be debating shortly, that maybe the $20 billion or a portion of the $20 billion should be a loan, that is if this existing debt, is not written off, there is no chance whatsoever any additional debt would ever be able to be repaid. We can act as if it can be, we can pretend it will be, but it will not be. So this debt needs to be written off.

We made a mistake at the conclusion of World War I. The victors didn't write off the debt of the Germans. At the end of World War II, we did write off the debt of the Germans and the Japanese. That was significant. It was controversial but it was the right thing to do, and this is the right thing, not only for the Western countries, the G8 countries, but also for the Gulf States—for Kuwait, for Saudi Arabia. The Gulf States benefitted greatly because we have eliminated a real threat to them. If it had not been for the U.S. protection, the 1991 war and the war just concluded, their future, their freedom would have been in jeopardy. So they benefitted probably more than any country and they have every reason, in my opinion, to write off this debt.

I hope we will have a unanimous vote, an overwhelming vote from the Senate. That would encourage these countries to do the right thing and

that would be to write off the debt and not suffocate the Iraqi economy from being able to rebuild and grow and join the world economy in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if Senator NICKLES, before he yields the floor, would just discuss this with me and answer a couple of questions.

Mr. NICKLES. I would be happy to.

Mr. DOMENICI. As the Senator spoke, it dawned on me that none of this debt would be worth 2 cents if the United States had not done what we did.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Where would they get the money, if the United States were not involved in having invaded Iraq, trying to free them and then trying to put their economy back? This debt here would not be worth the matches that it would take to burn it.

So I don't think you are just offering a resolution giving some kindly advice. It seems to me you are expressing a reality that these countries ought to be very serious before they try to extract from new Iraq, old Iraq's debt when it would be absolutely useless, based upon the country they lent the money to, and the dictator to whom they lent the money. Right?

Mr. NICKLES. To respond to the statement of my friend and colleague, he is exactly right. If one were trying to take this debt or paper on the international market prior to the U.S. liberation of Iraq, it would be worthless because no payments were made on it before. I think it was generally assumed no payments would be made by the Saddam Hussein regime. My colleague from New Mexico is exactly correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. So the point of it is that whatever they are having this debtor's conference for, people ought to be thinking about what they are going to be discussing and we ought to be thinking about how we are going to respond.

You are offering some kind advice to us, what we ought to be saying, right? We ought to be thinking: Well, how long has it been since we have been involved in trying to make this country have some money and have it worthwhile? How many billions have we spent? And that I am for. How many more are we going to spend? And they would have the audacity to come to some kind of conference and say, put us on this debtors list; we will take 50 cents on a dollar. Yes, 50 cents on the dollar maybe 30 years from now, or 50, when everything that has gone into making this country alive again has been taken care of.

There are a lot of messages from this simple resolution to these countries. In simplest terms: Forget about it. But in more sophisticated terms, the truth is, but for America, what you got is worth nothing. That is what I think is important about the resolution. I think, rather than just being a typical one that we offer as a resolution, I think it is a very important sense of those of us who are sharing, with very few countries, the burden of trying to help that country.

Look at all those countries. Where have they been when we have been going through all this? They have been offering nice words, maybe; call the President and say hello. Maybe they have been sending a little postcard. They haven't put up anything yet. Some of them are thinking about it. I hope they keep thinking.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate that.

You mentioned a couple of these countries. Saudi Arabia has the largest, according to CRS estimates it is $25 billion. They say Kuwait may have $17 billion to $27 billion of Iraqi debt. They are Iraq's neighbors. Our liberation of Iraq eliminates a threat to them. I believe most of that money was lent when Iraq was fighting Iran.

Frankly, they should not be insisting on payment. They were never repaid in the past. Nor should U.S. taxpayers or other people who were in the process of trying to rebuild Iraq be making contributions thinking maybe that will be going to satisfy creditors from the previous regime. That would be a mistake.

I thank my friend and colleague from New Mexico.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I understand we can get an agreement that we would postpone the vote on the Nickles amendment until we consider the Bayh amendment. By a previous order, that is the next business.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Nickles amendment take place following the debate on the Bayh amendment, and the Bayh amendment follow that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. It is my understanding staff is preparing a unanimous consent request; is that right?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, we are preparing it, but that will be the understanding so Members will know there will not be a vote here until sometime, at least I would say, 8:30 or 9 o'clock.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Democratic leader is here. He has agreed, on our side, if we can have the vote at 9 o'clock, and have the time until 9 o'clock equally divided between both sides and at that time have 2 minutes for the amendment of Senator NICKLES, equally divided on that amendment, and then 2 minutes prior to the vote on the Bayh amendment, equally divided.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the time would be equally divided between now and 9 o'clock on the Bayh amendment. Is that the proposal?

Mr. REID. That is right. There would be no amendments in order to either amendment prior to a vote on or in relation to each amendment.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, reserving right to object, could I add by unanimous consent that after those two votes I be allowed 30 minutes equally divided?

Mr. REID. Senator BYRD has been waiting all day for an amendment which he and Senator DURBIN have.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Is there a possibility for some time in the morning?

Mr. REID. I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that she has been very patient, and she has been here for the last 2 days, and I understand that. We will do our very best to get her on that as soon as possible.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have sent out a hot line for people who want to speak on this amendment. There are 10 Members who want to speak for 5 to 15 minutes. We have really basically 80 minutes left between now and 9 o'clock. I would suggest we ought to at least make the first vote start at 9:30.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the request I propounded be modified to that effect.

Mr. STEVENS. Let me ask this: I ask unanimous consent that the pending Nickles amendment be temporarily set aside and Senator BAYH be recognized to offer his amendment; provided further that the time until 9:30 be equally divided for debate in the usual form.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Nickles amendment to be followed by a vote in relationship to the Bayh amendment with no second-degree amendments in order to either amendment, and prior to the votes there be 2 minutes equally divided before each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1871

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators BEN NELSON, CLINTON, DORGAN, ENSIGN, COLLINS, SNOWE, GRAHAM of South Carolina, the distinguished Presiding Officer, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], for himself and Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, and Senator CHAMBLISS, proposes an amendment numbered 1871.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require that funds for reconstruction in Iraq be used for certain purposes)

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2313. (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 donors 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. BAYH. Mr. President, I also neglected to mention that our distinguished colleague, BYRON DORGAN, is an original cosponsor of this amendment, along with the other distinguished Members I mentioned.

Mr. President, the question of Iraq has divided our Nation and this Senate for some time now. I count myself in the camp that believes removing Saddam Hussein was the right thing to do. The evidence of torture chambers and mass graves is evidence enough for me. The fact he invaded his neighbors not once but twice and that he would surely have threatened them and the world again which would doubtless require American action at some point in the future means to me it is better to deal with him on our terms and at a time of our choosing rather than on his terms and at a time of his choosing.

Finally, the fact he previously had and used biological and chemical weapons, had a nuclear program, and would almost surely seek to reconstitute those programs, even if they had currently been destroyed and even if there is a 10-percent chance that weapons of mass death would fall into the hands of suicidal terrorists or would be used by regimes like Saddam against a peaceful world, means this is a threat best removed.

But regardless of where Members stood on the question of what to do about Iraq toward the war, we are now there. We have no choice but to succeed in our efforts toward reconstituting and rebuilding a more stable, a more democratic, and a more secure Iraq. There can be no alternative but success.

If we are not successful, the southern part of this country will probably reconstitute itself into some sort of radical Shiite state closely aligned with the nation of Iran, the foremost sponsor of terror in the world.

The northern part of what is currently Iraq would probably be first a Kurdish entity of some type followed by a Turkish invasion which would create further chaos in that part of the world.

The central part of this troubled land would undoubtedly develop into some chaotic Sunni enclave serving as a base for terror against both the United States and the rest of the peaceful world.

We must not let that happen. We must not.

I favor, along with my colleagues who have cosponsored this amendment, aggressive steps to stabilize and create a free, prosperous, and diverse Iraq. This means unwavering support for security because we understand security measures are the essential prerequisite for democracy, for investments, for commerce, and for the development of civil society in Iraq. It means equally aggressive steps to restart Iraq's economy and Iraqi society, which is rebuilding schools, hospitals, roads, and many other activities.

A strong, vibrant Iraqi economy is the foundation which is essential to Iraq's stability and our ultimate withdrawal. But if this reconstruction is to succeed, it must be conducted on terms that maximize our chances of success in Iraq and terms that are fair and equitable to the American people. American perseverance and resolve is being tested in Iraq today as seldom before, and for that perserverance and resolve to be forthcoming we must base our efforts there on principles of fundamental fairness without which our efforts will be impossible to sustain.

Specifically, we have to call upon the other nations of the world to do the right thing with the Iraqi people and for themselves by forgiving the loans they extended to Saddam Hussein's tyrannical regime, to wipe the slate clean, and to give the Iraqi people a fresh start. It is the moral thing to do.

Particularly for countries such as France and Germany, which have previously benefited from the rest of the world's largess through the Marshall plan, they must now demonstrate similar generosity in the case of another country in need—Iraq.

If the rest of the world demanded the repayment of Nazi debt or Vichy debt, clearly that would not be tolerable. Neither are the repayments of these debts.

Second, if you do business by extending loans to dictators, you assume the risk of nonrepayment in the event those dictators are overthrown. This is truly ''odious debt,'' to use the term employed by international lawyers. The Iraqi people have a right to repudiate this debt. If they do not, the other nations that incurred it should surely do the right thing by forgiving it.

Finally, with regard to the debt forgiveness issue, if Russia, France, Germany, and the other nations insist upon repayment, then so must we. We can't possibly tolerate a situation where those who propped up the tyrannical regime of Saddam Hussein are repaid their debts but the American people who helped to liberate the country are repaid nothing. That would be an outrageous outcome and one our amendment will prevent through terms which I will shortly discuss.

It also gives us a seat at the table if these other nations are not willing to do the right thing, and it gives us leverage in any further debt restructuring negotiations to insist that they forgive the Iraqi people.

Our proposal gives us maximum leverage toward an equitable and fair outcome, lower debts for Iraq, a fresh start, but fairness to the American people if other nations are not willing to join us in this case.

Second, we must also ask the Iraqi people to do what they can to help themselves. This is not a country that is dead broke like some in sub-Saharan Africa or Afghanistan. In fact, the nation of Iraq has great wealth. It is estimated to be $2.8 trillion to $5.1 trillion. What the nation of Iraq has is a cashflow problem, one we should be willing to help them with. But a temporary cashflow problem is no excuse for not doing what they can to help rebuild themselves to the extent they are capable and, as I have just mentioned, they have great capabilities.

This is compounded by the fact that when the Iraqis finally are able to sell oil in some quantity on the international markets, they will sell it at a price that is not set by a free market but which is instead dictated in large part by a cartel known as OPEC—giving them the ability to reap profits from that not once but twice if our loans are given first in the form of monopoly oil payments and, second, if we just give them the cash.

This is particularly inequitable if other nations do not forgive their debt and essentially contribute nothing at

all when the American taxpayers are being asked and the American consumers have been asked and required to contribute not once but twice.

Our amendment calls for three steps: First, the immediate provision of $5 billion to meet the immediate security needs of the nation of Iraq because we understand that we should err on the side of being more aggressive than less when it comes to stabilizing that country, ending the bloodshed and violence, and allowing the Iraqi people to get on with commerce, civil society, free elections, and the other things that will head them in the proper direction.

Second, we would propose providing $5 billion in terms of an immediate grant to meet the eminent reconstruction needs. The World Bank has estimated this would provide almost the entirety of the funds to be absorbed by Iraq for reconstruction over the next year. It is our proposal to err on the side of being more generous rather than less in providing the Iraqi economy with momentum, an immediate jump-start, priming the pump to get things going. The first $10 billion would be $5 billion to meet the immediate security needs of Iraq in the form of a grant, $5 billion to meet the immediate reconstruction needs, those that we envision over the next year in terms of an immediate grant.

The third provision would be in the form of a $10 billion loan for long-term reconstruction needs of the Government and the people of Iraq to be forgiven whenever the other nations of the world that extended debt to the regime of Saddam Hussein are willing to forgive up to 90 percent of those sovereign debts. Again, that will maximize and provide an incentive for those nations to do the right thing and give us a seat at the table and leverage to insist they do the right thing in the event they are dragging their feet in doing so.

Doubtless we have heard several arguments against our approach. Let me address them briefly.

First, the argument that our amendment should not be adopted because we would merely add to the already burdensome debt facing the people of Iraq estimated to be between $100 and $130 billion. Let me say clearly that, on the contrary, our approach seeks to eliminate, minimize, do away with the outstanding burdens facing the Iraqi people and gives us a seat at the table and maximum leverage to accomplish the objective to do the right thing, giving the country a free start.

Second, we have a recent example in the case of Argentina. There, a democracy with a freely elected government voluntarily incurred unsustainable debt. They chose to default recently upon their debts and were rewarded within 48 hours by a new agreement from the International Monetary Fund. Argentines are seeking up to 75-percent reduction from their creditors of their outstanding debts. In the private sector, it would be known as a cram-down. They threatened to default entirely and are now demanding the creditors forgive the loans. Surely what is good enough for the people of Argentina, who did not exercise physical adequate fiscal control over their affairs, should at least be good enough for the people of Iraq who have had the burdens imposed upon them by a tyrannical dictator.

Next, it is the principled thing to do. Surely we cannot allow a state of affairs to exist where those who helped sustain the regime of Saddam Hussein are repaid, but the American taxpayers who helped to liberate the country are not. This would be an outrageous outcome and one that our amendment seeks to prohibit.

The second argument offered against our proposal is that there is no Iraqi Government currently in power to take on these obligations. Really? Can it possibly be argued by others that the obligations of Saddam Hussein are more legitimate than the decisions undertaken by the newly empowered Iraqi Council? How can that possibly be? Is it possible to say that the obligations of Saddam Hussein should be enforced but those undertaken by the council should not? Obviously not. No one elected Saddam Hussein. How can he be given more legitimacy and more credence than the new council of the newly liberated Iraq? Obviously, that is something that cannot be allowed to happen. Our amendment is perfectly consistent with not allowing that to happen.

Finally, the new council is perfectly empowered to apply the freedom of the people of Iraq by enforcing its laws against a variety of criminal activities. They are empowered to hold elections. They are empowered to draft a constitution. How can it possibly be that they are not allowed to take out a simple loan on behalf of the people of their country? Obviously, that is an illogical inconsistency to those who adhere to the argument there is no Iraqi entity in power to take on the obligations.

Finally, we hear repeatedly the argument requiring some of these obligations to be undertaken in the form of a loan if other countries are not willing to forgive their debts. That would feed the perception alive in the Middle East and across the Islamic world that our activities in Iraq were solely about the Iraqi oil. This is a slippery and dangerous slope. If we begin to tread down that line of argument, no telling where we will end up.

For starters, this is clearly a lie. We all know it. The American people did not shed their blood in Iraq, we have not spent our treasure there to seize the Iraqi oil. This is a malicious falsehood and one that we cannot possibly allow to influence our deliberations in this great body.

Second, how can someone seriously argue that false opinions in other countries should set the public policy of a great Nation like the United States of America? What precedent would this set for this body and for our people? Should we stop the hunt for Osama bin Laden because it is popularly believed in other parts of the world that the attack on September 11 was designed as a zionist plot against our country? There have been polls on Al-Jazeera indicating a majority in some nations in that part of that world believe this canard. Should we allow that to affect the activities of our country? Obviously no. That would be outrageous.

Should we end our alliance with the State of Israel and form one with the Palestinians and Yasser Arafat because popular opinion in that part of the world would have us do so? Of course we cannot do that. The policies of the United States of America must be based upon the principles to which our great country has always adhered. We must base our policies upon the truth, upon the facts, and not the misguided beliefs of others.

We know our intentions in Iraq have always been honorable. This amendment is perfectly consistent with those intentions. Should we not do the right thing because of the misguided arguments about public opinion elsewhere in the world?

Finally, this argument is obviously a demonstrable mathematical falsehood. This is in repayment, not a confiscation or an appropriation. If I give you $100 and say that I am going to give you $50 of it as a grant, and I am even willing to forgive the other $50 and make that a grant, if another creditor is willing to forgive $100 that he has also given you, how can that possibly be characterized as a confiscation or expropriation of your property? Obviously, it is not.

So, in conclusion, let me say our amendment provides for the aggressive help that the Iraqi people need to meet their pressing security needs. Our amendment provides for generous and substantial help to meet the pressing reconstruction burdens facing that country. It gets them on their feet, provides them with a fresh start, and primes the pump for increased commercial activity there that is important to the success of our endeavor. But it does so in a way that is consistent with the principles of fairness to the American people and in a way that maximizes the prospects from the success of these moneys in the nation of Iraq, without which this endeavor, these funds, the blood and treasure that we have expended to date, will have gone for naught. That is something we must avoid. That is something this amendment will avoid.

Therefore, I ask our colleagues' support, and I thank my cosponsors.

I am pleased to yield time to others who have so patiently waited to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BAYH. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I thank the chief sponsor of the bill. It has been

a pleasure working with him and others in a bipartisan manner on this important amendment.

I understand there are deep feelings on both sides of this amendment. This is a fundamental, legitimate disagreement on policy: What is the best way to go forward for the United States, with the same goals in mind—that goal being that we have a stable Iraq in the future—that is in the interest of all Americans?

It is worth doing the $87 billion investment that the President has requested, the rebuilding of Iraq. All who support this amendment are in support of that concept because we think it is important to have a stable type of government, whatever that will be in Iraq, democracy or whatever they choose. It is important to have that for the stability of the region and for the spread of freedom and freedom-loving people, especially in that part of the world which up to this point has only known rule under dictatorship.

I will make a couple of points about the bill. Of around $20 billion—and I will use the round numbers—$5 billion was recognized for security needs for the Iraqi Government; in other words, money to train and get security forces and an army in place as quickly as possible. Everyone recognized that is in the direct interest of the United States because every person put in place, every Iraqi put in place, allows an American not to be in harm's way. So there is no question that everybody agreed that $5 billion should be in the form of a grant.

With other sponsors of the bill, we had a little disagreement on the next $5 billion. But basically around $5.2 billion is needed in the first 12 months. And working together, in a bipartisan fashion, we wanted to make sure the President had the maximum flexibility for that next $5 billion, so we decided to make that in a grant as well. We did not want to get caught up in any bureaucracies or any kinds of problems, so that Ambassador Bremer could go ahead, fund what he needs to fund right now, get everything started over the next 12 months, and get Iraq on the road to recovery.

Now, the next $10 billion is the part that we said we think is best to do in the form of a loan. First of all, that is not the money that is needed right away, so we have some time on that. But another point on this—and my colleague from Indiana said it well when he talked about we are not trying to undermine the President; we are actually trying to strengthen the President's hand.

Let me make a couple comments about the President and the administration in the job they have done in handling the war in Iraq and postwar Iraq.

I think the President and his administration, the Department of Defense, and, obviously, our military have performed in a spectacular manner. Have there been problems? Absolutely. There always are problems, and they have adjusted to the problems. They have handled an incredibly difficult situation. And especially the President has shown great leadership through the entire process. It is incredibly challenging in that part of the world to deal with different cultural problems than we are used to dealing with in this country.

So we are trying to strengthen the President's hand. And that is what many of us believe this amendment will do. When we are going out and we are asking other countries to put in grants, we are saying: We, the taxpayers of the United States, are putting up $10 billion in grants. But a lot of countries are also owed money, and so is the United States right now. We are owed money. We, the sponsors of this amendment, believe that Iraq would be best off going forward if they had no debt.

We believe the best way to ensure they will have no debt is if the President is able to go forward with a $10 billion loan from the United States and is able to look at those other countries and say: We gave $10 billion in grants; We have a $10 billion loan here; and we are willing to forgive that $10 billion loan if you will.

But why should the American taxpayer—when the oil starts producing revenue, when people start actually paying their power bills, when other things start generating revenues in Iraq, why should the American taxpayer not be paid back if the taxpayer in France, if the taxpayer in Germany, if the taxpayer in Russia—countries that were not willing to support us when we were doing what was right in the world—why should those taxpayers be paid back and not the taxpayers of America?

That is really the whole point of this, which is, if we can give the President the leverage, he can do the best job he can to try to provide Iraq going forward with as little debt as possible. But if these other countries will not forgive the debt, then the American taxpayer will have a chance to be paid back. And that is what the fundamental purpose of the language in the amendment really is.

I want to make just a couple of comments about some of these other countries in the world that are owed this money. Remember, we are loaning this money to a legitimate government in the future in Iraq. This is a legitimate, democratically elected government going forward, a free people going forward that the loan is going to.

Who did France, Germany, Russia, and others loan that money to? An illegitimate regime, the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein. And the argument that they should be paid back for loaning a brutal dictator money, and the American people not paid back for loaning a legitimate free people money, is just very difficult to justify for this Senator. That is why this Senator is so strongly supportive of this amendment.

We hope this amendment is adopted. We think it has a good chance of being adopted tonight.

So I will close by saying that working across the aisle, doing what is right—and I have heard people say, you are just trying to pander to people back home. Frankly, I do not know how many people back home are even paying attention. On a night like tonight, I think most people are going to pay attention to the Red Sox and the Yankees and not to what we are doing here.

In a bipartisan fashion, we are just doing what we believe is right. And the people on the other side of this issue believe what they are doing is right. It is OK to fundamentally disagree. What I hope does not happen in this debate tonight is that we impugn each other's motives. There are true, fundamental differences of belief on the way we should go forward.

We are presenting one alternative that we believe strongly we should go forward with. So I hope the debate stays on a high ground, and let the votes fall where they may. That is the kind of debate we need in the Senate.

I thank the chief sponsor of this bill for yielding me time, and I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague for his comments and his leadership.

Mr. President, as you know, this has been a truly bipartisan undertaking by those of us who supported this effort in Iraq from the beginning, members on your side of the aisle and members on my side of the aisle.

So I commend my colleague for his leadership and his courage. It is a pleasure to work with him.

I now yield time to our distinguished colleague from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Indiana for the opportunity to speak in support of this amendment. I thank my colleagues who are cosponsoring this amendment: Senators ENSIGN, COLLINS, SNOWE, LINDSEY GRAHAM, and the Presiding Officer, Senator CHAMBLISS. It is a pleasure to be working with them in a bipartisan way on what I think is an important point to the American people and an important point as a message to the world.

When the President delivered his address announcing the $87 billion he would ask Congress to approve for postwar military operations and construction and reconstruction in Iraq, known as the supplemental, there was clearly a collective gasp from the American people. This was primarily because I do not believe the American public was prepared, before the war, for the cost of reconstruction after the war.

Americans clearly want our mission in Iraq to succeed. We cannot fail. And

we want our young men and women to come home safely. Now our No. 1 priority must be that we do everything in our power to make sure that happens in a fiscally responsible way for the United States and Iraq.

The American role in the liberation of Iraq planted the seeds for democracy. The creation of the Coalition Provisional Authority, led by Ambassador Bremer, and the interim Iraqi Governing Council, have laid the foundation for what I hope will be a lasting Iraqi Republic.

Now is the time to seek greater international support for security, perhaps through NATO, as I have previously suggested, and also to seek more international support through the United Nations, to help democracy and freedom in Iraq by the drafting of a constitution, the holding of legitimate elections, and the participation by all Iraqis in the political process.

Funds for military operations must not be delayed and should be quickly appropriated so that the 140,000 American troops in theater, and those supporting them, will have the tools they need to do their job.

Our soldiers should not be held hostage because of deliberations on controversial portions of this supplemental.

The reconstruction funding the President requested may be the appropriate amount to accomplish our goals. However, as we have all indicated, we have concerns with the way the funding is being made to the Iraqis. The President's reconstruction request simply gives money to Iraq as a grant. It asks the American taxpayer to pick up the entire cost for postwar construction with the hope that we will get others to be donors in this process. It asks nothing from the international community at the present time, and certainly it asks nothing of Iraq in return.

The United States liberated Iraq, but should reconstruction become the sole responsibility of the American people with the expectation and the hope we might get additional contributions from the donors conference? Furthermore, the question can be, Is that the best for Iraq? I don't think so.

The amendment we offer today will ask that the international community do more to aid Iraq in their reconstruction, while simultaneously easing the financial burden that Iraq now carries because of the policies of a brutal tyrant. In contrast to the administration's proposed total direct grant, which does not ask Iraq to contribute financially to its own recovery, this amendment is both generous and fair.

As my colleague from Indiana has indicated, the amendment first provides for a grant covering $5 billion for building Iraq's security services. That is a grant. And it provides $5.2 billion in emergency economic assistance. That is a grant. It also asks the administration to notify all relevant congressional committees of every $250 million obligated out of the $5.2 billion so that there is some transparency and accountability on how these dollars are going to be spent.

Most importantly, our proposal asks America to negotiate with the world on behalf of Iraq. Iraq, unfortunately, due to the tyrannical powers and programs of Saddam Hussein, owes money in reparations to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. It also has debts to France and Russia primarily for military purposes. France and Russia are owed $6 billion and $6.9 billion, respectively. Saudi Arabia is owed approximately $25 billion. This is debt that was incurred by Iraq as a result of the tyrannical forces, powers, and programs of Saddam Hussein.

Our colleague from Oklahoma has proposed a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which will be voted on later this evening, as will this amendment. He has asked that we request the countries that own the debt to forgive the debt. I think that is a start that is halfway to the conclusion that this amendment brings us. But it is only halfway. It is asking rather than providing leverage where I think we will absolutely have the opportunity to seek the forgiveness of this debt. So that if France, Russia, and others can forgive Iraq's debt, the international community would consider this as a positive step toward independence. This immense gesture would enable the Iraqi economic engine to become energized, free of a burden most Iraqis never wanted in the first place.

It is estimated as well that Iraq's proven oil reserves are worth $2.8 trillion and its potential oil reserves might be worth $5.5 trillion. Freeing the Iraqis of their prewar debt would help them use their oil resources immediately to provide for their people and their reconstruction.

Our amendment is the only amendment offered that directly addresses the issue of Iraqi debt. Our amendment provides an incentive to those nations to forgive Iraq of its Saddam-era debt. It is my hope the administration and the Iraqi Governing Council will be able to satisfactorily and successfully negotiate with the international community to eliminate 90 percent of the prewar bilateral Iraqi debt. If those negotiations are indeed successful, this amendment would provide that the remaining $10 billion in reconstruction funding to the Iraqi people would be in the form of a grant. It will be convertible from a loan to a grant in exchange for the forgiveness of 90 percent of the prewar bilateral Iraqi debt.

If the negotiations are unsuccessful, which we hope they would not be, then the $10 billion will be appropriated as a long-term loan to the Iraqi Governing Council and all prewar debts will be subordinated to the U.S. postwar debt of $10 billion. This would allow the Iraqi people to get the same jump-start on rebuilding their country while delaying their payments to us and the world until this Iraqi nation has established an economy and can meet its responsibilities to the world community. The loan would be secured by revenues from Iraqi oil exports in the future.

There are some who will charge that making reconstruction funds available as a loan is evidence that the United States is after Iraq's oil. In my estimation, they will hold that contention regardless of what we do or don't do in regard to funding reconstruction. In fact, the use of the funds to rebuild within Iraq is evidence to the contrary. But even if we can't prove to the rest of the world that we are not after the oil, we must pursue a loan approach as we are proposing.

I can understand that the administration does not want to add to the debt of the Iraqi people. This isn't, as long as the prewar Saddam Hussein indebtedness is forgiven. We owe it to our taxpayers to be just as concerned about growing our budget deficit as we are about Iraq's deficit.

I hope my colleagues will join in support of this generous and fair amendment, recognizing that those who said an entity doesn't exist, that that argument just doesn't wash. If it exists for a grant, it exists for a loan. There are those who have said we are loading it up with debt. It is just the opposite. They have even cited post-World War I Germany with the debt that was added there. The intent here is to clear the debt, to clear it up so we put Iraq on a firm financial footing as it moves forward. All we ask is the help of the other nations.

This provides leverage to go to the donors conference and say: We are prepared to make a grant. We just want to make sure the debt that is existing prior to the war, the Saddam-era debt, is forgiven.

I appreciate the opportunity. It is a pleasure to work with my colleagues. I thank my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, we are grateful for the leadership and the eloquence of our colleague from Nebraska. He was a successful businessman, an outstanding Governor, and now a very wise Member of this body. I thank him for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. BAYH. I am pleased to yield time to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I give my remarks, let me thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard to craft this amendment. It has been a great pleasure to work with all of them. I believe the proposal we are advancing this evening not only reflects a great deal of thought and deliberation but is by far the best policy we could pursue.

The Senate is engaged in a historic debate: the consideration of the most comprehensive package of military and foreign reconstruction assistance since the Marshall plan. The administration has asked the Congress to appropriate $87 billion, some of which would go to

Afghanistan, but the vast majority would go for Iraq.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I visited Iraq last July. I am well aware of the urgent need for additional funding to support our troops. Rogue elements operating in Iraq, whether it is the remnants of the Baathist regime or terrorists from other countries, endanger our troops and threaten to undermine our efforts to establish a prosperous and democratic society. It is imperative that our troops have all the support they need to be as safe and as effective as possible. In that regard, it is indeed heartening that the $66 billion included in this package that will be used to support our troops enjoys widespread support.

The stakes are very high. We simply cannot fail in Iraq. The sacrifices of our young men and women in uniform cannot be in vain. This funding will help to support their efforts and to ensure their success.

I also recognize that Iraq needs our assistance in constructing a modern infrastructure and rebuilding its security services. There are $20 billion included in this bill targeted for those purposes. I note the significance of that amount; it is more than our entire foreign aid budget. So this is a very significant assistance package we are considering tonight.

It is vital that basic services be restored to the Iraqi people as soon as possible so that their hardships do not continue. Without reliable electricity and clean water, the Iraqi people cannot rebuild their lives, their country, and their economy. I believe there are, however, ways to structure this assistance to provide the Iraqis with the help they need while lessening the impact on the American taxpayer. That is the goal of the bipartisan amendment we have put forth this evening.

While I fully support the President's overall budget request, we have an obligation to explore ways to lessen the burden on the American taxpayer. To accomplish this goal, our amendment proposes that part of this assistance be provided to the Iraqi people in the form of a loan, to be repaid at some point in the future when Iraq once again becomes the prosperous nation it has the capacity to be.

When I visited Iraq, I was struck by how little damage the war actually inflicted on the infrastructure of that nation. I saw firsthand evidence of how our precision weaponry and the care our troops took were successful in targeting installations that posed a threat to our troops or supported the regime of Saddam Hussein while sparing the civilian community.

I was also struck, however, by the dreadfully poor infrastructure of communities throughout the nation. Basic elements of a modern nation, such as the electricity, clean water, schools, hospitals, roads, and bridges, were ignored by Saddam Hussein as he looted the country and left it in shambles. In fact, when you think about it, what we are really talking about is construction costs, not reconstruction. Iraq lacks many of the elements of a modern and well-functioning infrastructure.

I do not believe it is in any way unfair to ask the Iraqi people to invest in their own future by repaying the American taxpayers some of the funding used to construct their infrastructure, particularly when they clearly will have the ability someday to do so, for Iraq is not Afghanistan; Iraq has an educated population, abundant natural resources and, most notably, the second largest oil reserves in the world.

The administration projects that Iraq will be generating $20 billion in annual oil revenue within just 2 years. With such economic assets, Iraq undoubtedly one day will have the financial wherewithal to repay this loan. Moreover, asking the Iraqis to take some responsibility for rebuilding their own country will help give them a sense of ownership, increasing the chances that our reconstruction efforts will endure long after our troops have returned home.

One of the arguments put forth by opponents of the loan concept is that Iraq is already burdened with an estimated $100 billion to $125 billion in debt from Saddam Hussein's regime. But what is often left out is that some of the largest holders of that debt are Saudi Arabia, France, Germany, and Russia. If it were up to the leaders of three of those nations, the Iraqi people would still be suffering under the brutal and repressive regime of Saddam Hussein.

The American people will be justifiably outraged if one dime of their money is sent to France while the American people are pouring millions of their hard-earned tax dollars into rebuilding Iraq. France, Germany, and Russia should not be paid for the debts incurred by one of the most despicable and violent leaders in decades while the American taxpayer invests billions in the rebuilding and stabilization of Iraq.

I also point out that structuring our assistance as loans is not without precedent. Most of the large-scale infrastructure projects undertaken in postconflict Bosnia have been administered through the World Bank in the form of loans with reasonable repayment conditions. If this approach is not hindering the reconstruction of Bosnia, the same surely should hold true for Iraq, a country with far greater economic resources.

That is why we have joined this evening to offer this amendment. This amendment ensures that the American taxpayer will eventually be reimbursed for a portion of our investment in Iraq. Under our proposal, $10 billion in our construction assistance will be made available for use as loans while the other $10 billion will be available as grants.

So you can see we have taken a very reasonable, moderate approach in constructing this amendment. By making available $5 billion in grants for rebuilding Iraq's security services and yet another $5 billion to jump start the reconstruction process, our approach ensures that the administration has the funds necessary to address the immediate and pressing needs.

Furthermore, the amendment requires the administration to notify congressional committees after the expenditure of every $250 million of the funds. This provision will help to enhance accountability. The President is then authorized to use the remaining $10 billion as loans to the Iraqi Governing Council or its successor.

Here is an important provision of our amendment. We say that if, however, 90 percent of Iraq's bilateral foreign debt is forgiven, then the remaining assistance will be converted to grants and the loans already obligated will be forgiven. So this is a very generous proposal.

This provision will encourage other countries to forgive at least a portion of their debt and ensure that we are not financing the rebuilding of Iraq's infrastructure while nations that loaned money to Saddam Hussein are repaid.

In addition, the amendment includes a sense-of-the-Senate provision encouraging all the nations to forgive their pre-liberation bilateral debt and to provide robust levels of reconstruction aid to postwar Iraq at the upcoming donors conference.

The American people are very generous. They not only want to give our troops the support they need but they want to provide help to the Iraqi people. The American people understand that Iraq cannot repay this money immediately. That is not what we are asking. But the American taxpayer does deserve to be repaid eventually for some of our investment in this country. And Iraq deserves to be treated as a country that has the enormous economic potential that it clearly has. Structuring our reconstruction assistance as a loan is a reasonable approach that satisfies both concerns.

Again, I acknowledge the hard work of the group of Senators, including the Presiding Officer, who have worked very hard to come up with what I believe is a commonsense approach to this aid package.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I wish to tell my colleagues who debated on the other side of the issue that I have great respect for their position. I just happen to disagree with it.

I stated some time ago that I had hoped a significant portion of the $20

billion for reconstruction of Iraq could be in the form of a loan. I would like to see that be the case. I just happen to think, upon further review, that it is not possible now. It might be possible a year from now, but it is not possible now, at least in my opinion.

There is no government in Iraq today. Hopefully, there will be. It is our objective to have a democracy in Iraq. It is our objective to have Iraq run by Iraqis. There is nobody in Iraq who can sign a note and say: We will borrow $10 billion and pay you back. Nobody. I guess one could say Ambassador Bremer could do it.

I listened to Ambassador Bremer, and I have great confidence in him. I think he has done a great job. This amendment is saying we know better than he does. He happens to be living in Iraq. He is working there. He is risking his life daily. I don't know how many assassination attempts have been made on his life and on the lives of the people working with him. I actually have a former staff member who is working in the Iraqi government. She is fluent in Arabic. I happen to think they have made a good choice.

Maybe in the future loans can be made, but right now there is not an Iraqi government. There is no one to sign the note. There is no one who can say: We will make payments and pay this back.

Frankly, if one looks at their current situation—Iraq is a country that was so ignored by Saddam Hussein, so devastated by his terrible plundering of the country for military purposes, that their ability to pay back debt is nonexistent for some time.

Iraq has inherited a lot of debt. I have an amendment we will be voting on shortly that says countries that own Saddam Hussein's incurred debt should forgive that debt. I hope that amendment will be supported, and I hope that will send a signal to those countries that hold some of that paper.

That paper is worthless. Saddam Hussein did not make payments on it. There is no way in the world future Iraqis could inherit that debt and prosper. So it needs to be written off.

If we say, before you write that off, we want to add another $10 billion, even though you don't have a government, we want to add another $10 billion on top of that, and, oh, yes, we want to be paid back, but we want you to write off the $100 billion or the $150 billion of debt previously owned, I think that complicates that message.

Maybe I am wrong, but when we are saying we want to lend $10 billion and we want to be paid off, but you other countries who hold a bunch of Iraqi debt, you should forgive that, I think it will get lost in the translation. This amendment says $10 billion will be released when and if 90 percent of that debt is forgiven. Maybe it is a carrot, maybe it is an incentive that $10 billion will never be spent. I do know there is not a government that can sign this note. There is not an Iraqi government that can make the payment. Maybe it will make people feel better to say it is a loan, but there is nobody to sign that note. There is nobody who has the authority and who is supported by the Iraqi people who can say: Yes, we will be making these payments.

Likewise, it greatly complicates our efforts to get other countries that currently hold worthless Iraqi paper to write off that debt. They are going to say: United States, if you are going to take on $10 billion of loans and you expect to be paid, then we expect to be paid. I think it will greatly complicate efforts to get other countries to write off their debt.

Let me say this about Ambassador Bremer. He has done a fantastic job. Do we support him or not? I asked Secretary Powell yesterday: Is there a government in Iraq that can pay this note back?

He said no.

Is there anybody there who can pay this note back?

He said no. That is our Secretary of State.

I asked basically the same questions of Ambassador Bremer. Is this possible?

He said no. He was strongly urging us to go the grant approach; give them the flexibility to get this country going, not complicate their efforts when they are trying to get other countries to write off some of the existing worthless debt.

I have confidence in Ambassador Bremer. I have confidence in Secretary Powell. I think this amendment is very well intended. Again, I have no complaints whatsoever about the authors of this amendment. I respect them greatly as colleagues, but I think they made a mistake, and I urge our colleagues to vote no on this amendment when we vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am going to start off with a quote from Winston Churchill and people are going to say: Why on Earth would I be quoting Winston Churchill in this regard as to whether or not we will come to the assistance of the Iraqis with a loan or a grant? But I think it has application, and it refers back to what the distinguished Senator from Indiana said. I would like to repeat what the Senator from Oklahoma has stated. I have nothing but admiration for the work the Senator from Indiana and others who have spoken to this amendment have done on this issue. Senator BAYH is a very valued member of the Intelligence Committee.

Let me get back to my point, and that is, Churchill said on hearing about the attack on Pearl Harbor—if you stop and think about it, 9/11 is our modern-day Pearl Harbor, so I think it is an apt quote. He said:

> Silly people, that was the description many gave in discounting the force of the United States. Some said they were soft, others that they would never be united, that they would never come to grips, they would never stand bloodletting, that their system of government and democracy would paralyze their war effort.

Let me repeat that:

> that their system of government and democracy would paralyze their war effort.

Now we will see the weakness of this numerous but remote, wealthy and very talkative people.

Then Churchill said:

> But, I had studied the American Civil War fought out to the last desperate inch. American blood flowed in my veins. I thought of a remark made to me years before—the United States is like a gigantic boiler. Once the fire of freedom is lighted under it, there is no limit to the power it can generate. It is a matter of resolve.

Let me repeat that:

> It is a matter of resolve.

Why do I bring up the Churchill quote and the issue of resolve in regard to whether or not we apply a grant or a loan to the Iraqi people?

I think it is a question of resolve in the eyes of more especially those in the Arab world, more especially the Iraqis. In the last 2 days, I have had visits from three ambassadors. I am not going to go into their names or countries. It was a confidential discussion. Obviously, they were countries directly involved in this whole effort. They asked me quite frankly about American resolve. They asked me about the whole WMD issue, whether or not the American people still had the resolve to see this through.

Then they asked me about this loan situation and this grant situation. They were very mindful of the attitude the Senator from Indiana already spoke to that there will be those in the Arab world, our adversaries, if you will, who will interpret this as a grab that they originally described as to why the United States became involved in this conflict—a grab for the oil of Iraq.

On April 8, 2003, the President and the Prime Minister of Britain said in a joint statement regarding the future of Iraq:

> We reaffirm our commitment to protect Iraqi's natural resources, as the patrimony of the people of Iraq, which should be used only for their benefit.

U.S. interests in Iraq lie solely with the development of a free and democratic nation. Congress should not now add a condition of our involvement that suggests the United States had an interest in Iraqi oil all along. Using the Iraq's oil as collateral for loans would play now into the hands of those who wrongly attributed an oil motive. That is in reference to a statement made by both the President and the Prime Minister of Britain.

Now, the distinguished Senator from Indiana said that is not true. I do not

think it is true either, but I think it is true in the minds of many Arab leaders. I do not know who is paying attention to this debate tonight. There are not many Members present. We are going to have a vote later, but most Americans are probably watching the playoffs in regard to the World Series, so I doubt if too many people are paying attention.

I tell my colleagues who will pay attention: Every intelligence community and every Arab leader in the world will go over every word of what we say tonight. I have had three ambassadors come to me wondering about the resolve of the United States and are we reneging in regard to our support for the war. Rightly or wrongly, I think that is a real problem.

I think we also have a real problem with the timing of this in regard to the loan, just as the President goes overseas, goes to the donors conference. People say, well, this will allow us a seat at the table. My colleagues, we are the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes. Does he request more time?

Mr. ROBERTS. I request an additional 30 seconds, if that would be possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. In summing up, I support the amendment that has been introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma and would say it is a matter of resolve in the eyes of the Arab world. It is much larger than Iraq and much larger than a $10 billion loan or $5 billion here or $5 billion there. In fact, it will be viewed in the Arab world, in the Arab community, as a test of America's resolve, and I do not want us to fail that test.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, probably by the end of the week, if things stay the way they have been, unfortunately we will have some injured troops and maybe some will lose their lives.

There is a resolve by the American people and this body to stay the course. If anybody has looked at what we have done in a reasonable, rational manner—and that is all I ask the world to do—they will see great resolve on our part. The biggest contribution we have made to the Iraqi people has nothing to do with money. It is the 350, somewhere in that number, growing by the day, young men and women. That is our biggest contribution. We have spent a lot of money, a billion dollars a week, to try to transform a country from tyranny to civility, and the middle is chaos. We are making great improvements. That is an honest statement.

Having been to Iraq, one can see the resolve in the soldiers' eyes. I dare say there may be some men and women in the Armed Forces who are so decent that they would say: Give the Iraqi people money, we do not want to be paid back. That is the strength of our country.

We are in it for the long haul. There is more dying to come. There is more money to be spent. If we try to build up the infrastructure in the next months to come, chances are it will be attacked because we have not secured the country yet. To expect it to be secured in 6 months is impossible, because the Iraqi Army and all the bad people who are in it have gone into the civilian population.

Senator MCCONNELL is right; they are not just killing Americans. They are killing people who are trying to transform the country into democracy.

People may say, oh, this loan proves they were over there for our oil. I cannot tell my colleagues how much it bothers me to hear that because my colleagues know it is not true and I know it is not true. Nobody in a rational thought process would send 350 people and climbing to their death, spend $70 billion and climbing, to make a $10 billion loan that may never be collected.

So people can say what they want to say. If our country gives in to that way of thinking, and if we are swayed by people who hate us to begin with and we change our policy based on people who are never going to be with us, we will never get this right.

My hope is that the Iraqi people who see our soldiers on the ground, see the schools being opened and built, and the hospitals being repaired would be the first to reject this kind of reasoning, because God knows we are not there to take anything they have. We are there to help them, but we are also there to help us.

Why did we go to war? Why did we pick people from South Carolina, California, and all the places in between to go to a foreign land and risk their lives and have some die? To make sure that Saddam Hussein could do no more damage to the region or us than he has already done.

President Bush has shown great leadership. He has said that the 21st century will not be ruled or dictated by terrorists, dictators, and murderers. He is absolutely right. God bless him for his resolve.

This amendment puts $10 billion on the table, unencumbered, to spend however you would like. This chart shows from $95 billion to $153 billion of debt incurred to Saddam Hussein. The reason I am so passionate about this, I do not want to give in to a great lie. We cannot buy our way out of this problem. We cannot take $10 billion of taxpayer money and people are losing their jobs to buy our way out of a great lie.

It would be terrible if the people of this country, who have sacrificed so much, wound up not getting a dime back for doing a good thing, and all they invested in Iraq to produce profit and money went to pay the people back who kept Saddam Hussein in power. That is unacceptable to me, and that is the scenario we are charting. Please do not do that. It would be bad for everyone. It would not make the world safer.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes to Senator SESSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, and appreciate his leadership in this matter. He has been in this body a long time. He has served his country in the military, and I think he sized up this matter quite correctly. We are at war.

I was at the Walter Reed Hospital a couple of weeks ago, meeting soldiers who served in Iraq. They have been wounded, some seriously. Most who I met were getting better. They were great in spirit and were most impressive young people.

We are in a war. We have an $87 billion request, and $67 billion of that is going to be to fund our military at $4 billion a month. Twenty billion dollars is what has been set aside for infrastructure.

My goal, and I believe the goal of this country, is to stabilize Iraq, create a healthy environment as best we can, and to continue to draw down our troops in a rapid way; get out and come home. The $20 billion gives us the best chance to do that. That means we need money for police.

When I visited Iraq in August, I went to observe the police training. I wanted to do that because I was a Federal prosecutor for a number of years and I wanted to see how they were doing. They are doing very well. They are being targeted now because they are doing so well.

We need money to get electricity. Electricity needs to be on in Baghdad. When we get the electricity on, that country is going to be better off. It is going to be more stable and there is going to be less violence. That is what the infrastructure money does.

I do not see how this President can ask other countries to not try to collect on debts they have to the Saddam Hussein regime if he is asking that the money we put in for this infrastructure be classified as a debt. I just do not believe that is good policy for him. I think it is going to complicate matters in many different ways. Secretary of State Colin Powell indicated those ways to us recently. The entire administration, the Vice President, those

who dealt with this issue so closely, are passionately of the belief it would be a colossal error for us to try to put a mortgage on Iraq in order to get paid back for half, I guess, now of the money we are providing to improve the infrastructure in that country. It does not make good sense to me.

I think the right thing to do is for us to step forward as we are doing, be bold and courageous, complete this job, improve the infrastructure, establish a police force that has ability and integrity, a security force that can protect areas of the country that are at risk, and bring on an Iraqi Army.

I visited the training camps for the Iraqi Army. We have the potential to do even more than we are doing, in bringing on those troops even more rapidly than we are doing. If we spend that money for that purpose, I believe this country can be in a position to continue to draw down our troops.

We had 250,000 troops at the peak of this effort. We are now down to 138,000. I see no reason that number cannot continue to go down. Whole areas of the country are doing very well. We have to be pleased with what has happened in Mosul in the north, where the 101st and General Petraus have done so well; Kirkuk in the south. Basra is doing exceedingly well.

We have seen reports recently of the economic vitality on the streets of the country. I believe it is just a big mistake for us to try to now come in and worry about whether this ought to be a loan.

I don't take a back seat to anybody in this Senate on trying to preserve the taxpayers' money. In fact, most of the people I hear who want to make this a loan and are so worried about collecting this money back have not been counted on a lot of tough votes on spending when we have had some real challenges here, to contain the growth in spending. So it is painful to me to think about $67 billion, $87 billion to be spent there. But we made a commitment. This Senate voted over three-fourths to support this effort. We had no doubt when we entered this effort that it was going to be costly. In fact, we have to be pleased the war went better than we could ever have expected it to go. It went faster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair and will just conclude by saying I believe the amendment should not be adopted. We ought to make this a grant. Let's go forward, stabilize this country, and bring our soldiers home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding the time, and I compliment Members on both sides of this issue for the excellent debate, the tone of this debate.

It is a very important debate we are engaged in right now. This is probably the most important decision we will make because it is going to shape the postwar policy of a reconstruction that will have a dramatic impact on the national security of this country. So I think people are taking this vote very seriously and I think they should take it seriously because it has incredible ramifications.

This is a vote I believe we will look back on as one of the most significant votes we will cast in the area of foreign policy, certainly in the time I have been in the Senate, in Congress. So I am pleased to see there is a good, active debate. The words being exchanged I think have been helpful.

A lot of the comments I heard from some of my colleagues who support the Bayh amendment, which I do not, have been reassuring to me. The intent of this amendment is not to show a lack of resolve on the part of any Member of the Senate that the policy of this administration in Iraq is being supported by those who may differ with the way the package is put together. Those words are important. Those words matter.

My concern with those words is those words do matter, those words are important, but what matters more and what is more important are actions. There are too many people around this world who are not going to hear these words, but they are going to see the action. There are too many people in this world who will ignore the words and focus and take advantage of them to portray America really differently and portray this Senate differently than what the words in support of the Bayh amendment articulate.

Yes, words matter. Intent of the offerors of this amendment, supporters of this amendment, matters. But the problem is the action of what is going to occur matters most. The action here is clear. We are saying to a country that is flat on its back economically, that has just gone through a 25-year-plus horrific regime, has just been through a war, we are saying to them: We came there to liberate you, to create freedom and rebuild your society into one that is peaceful and democratic, and, oh, by the way—and it is the ''oh, by the way'' this amendment is all about. The ''oh, by the way'' is we want some of that money back.

Of course, the only way they can pay it back, and this is what the world community will see, this is what the people in the Arab world will see, is through oil revenues.

That ''oh, by the way'' action trumps all of the words we heard here tonight which are no, we are not after oil, we are not after this. But it really doesn't matter what we say because what will be interpreted is what we do.

The impact of that in this very fragile postwar period is profound, the impact on the donors conference which is coming up, where we are asking those around the world to contribute money, not to loan the money but to give the money. These are people who did not participate, in many cases, in supporting the United States action. So we are asking them, for humanitarian purposes, for purposes of promoting stability in the world, to support reconstruction in some cases where they didn't support the action in the first place. To go there with less than generous support—although I agree with many of my colleagues, we have been generous. The American public has been incredibly generous. But to have those strings attached is going to send a message that is not going to be positive in getting additional contributions from the donor nations. That will have a serious impact on the buy-in we need to make postwar Iraq successful.

It was said by someone in the administration yesterday at our luncheon that there are now elections being held in Saudi Arabia, local elections for the first time as a result of the model that is being set in Iraq. The impact of a successful Iraq, a democratic Iraq, on that region of the world is like the MasterCard commercial—it is priceless. It is priceless.

Why we, in any small way, would put that in jeopardy or give those who would like to see it not succeed an opportunity to use this vote and this action by the Senate to undermine that objective is to me something that does not make sense.

So I hope my colleagues understand, this is an important vote, one we will look back on throughout history, like I believe those in 1948 look back on their vote on the Marshall plan. I hope we will get a vote to defeat this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I say to Senators BAYH, NELSON, GRAHAM, COLLINS, SNOWE, and ENSIGN what a pleasure it is to work with all of you on this issue where we know we are doing the right thing for America and the American people as well as for the people of Iraq.

I start out by saying that nobody, according to my political opponents, has been a stronger supporter of this administration and this President than this Senator from Georgia. I continue to support my President. I support his request for $87 billion in funding for Iraq. The only thing I disagree with the administration about is how we structure that funding. None of us disagrees about the fact that we need the $67 billion for the military operation in Iraq. But to take the remainder of the $20 billion and to put half of it in the form of a grant to tell the people of Iraq we

are going to give you the money to go in and rebuild your infrastructure is certainly reasonable. To tell them also that we want you to make an investment in Iraq just like we as the American taxpayers are making an investment in Iraq is also reasonable.

There are three reasons that I feel so strongly about this issue. Before I talk about those three reasons, I wish to address one issue on which I know our political enemies in the press, particularly in other parts of the world, are going to be attacking us as Members of the Senate tomorrow if this amendment does pass. That attack is going to be geared to saying: Here we go, we told you all along that the Americans came into Iraq because they wanted our oil. My friend from Oklahoma has already addressed this issue. What he has said is very clear; that is, the debt that Iraq now owes—it is listed on this chart that has been entered into the RECORD—there is no money left. No money is left to pay this debt.

To say we went into Iraq for oil because we are asking the Iraqi people to make an investment in infrastructure is simply not true. There is no way you can say it is true.

Let me get to my three reasons.

First of all, should the American taxpayer invest money in Iraq so that the Iraqi people can have their infrastructure rebuilt and have their economy revitalized so that these debts can be repaid? My friend from Maine has already addressed this issue, and I think the answer is very clear.

Second, if America is to invest in Iraq in rebuilding its infrastructure, is it unreasonable to ask the Iraqi people to share in that investment?

What is going to happen when we start investing over there and start rebuilding their infrastructure? I can tell you what is going to happen—some of the same things we have already seen happen. We have seen pipelines attacked by the terrorist community in that part of the world. We have seen bombs blown up in front of the hotels in Baghdad. We have seen other entities, including Americans, attacked on a regular basis.

When we rebuild the infrastructure, we can expect the terrorist community, which is alive and well in that part of the world, to continue to come out and attack those investments we are making.

If the Iraqi people share in that investment, are they going to be more likely to help us in preventing those attacks and also in bringing the perpetrators of those attacks to justice? You bet they will. I think there is every reason in the world to ask them to make a joint investment with us.

Third, my goal is that when the American presence in Iraq is gone, all of these debts are relieved. How do we best do that? Do we best do that by investing $20 billion and saying: OK, we are going to rebuild your infrastructure? You go out, and because your economy is back up and running, you take care of those debts. No. They are not going to leave them debt free if we do that.

If the President goes to the donors conference next week or calls up President Putin or any of these other countries and says, Look, my country is owed $10 billion, we invested $10 billion to rebuild the infrastructure, if you forgive your debt, we will forgive our debt, does that give a moral leverage in what he would have if he went in and said, We put $20 billion in there, why don't you forgive your debt? Be a nice guy and forgive it? The nice guys have already spoken—Germany, France, and these other countries such as Russia have already spoken. They are not going to be nice guys. We simply can't expect that from them.

We need to give the President the leverage he can use to go in and get these debts forgiven. When that happens—and I sincerely hope it does happen in the short term—then our $10 billion in the form of a loan is going to be converted to a grant, and it won't be repaid.

That is what we are here debating tonight—whether or not we are going to give the President the right kind of leverage he needs to deal with these countries that sit in creditor status with Iraq today.

What has been our investment in Iraq? Our investment has been whatever it costs us to this point in time. I don't know how many billions of dollars—maybe $100 billion. I don't know what it is. How much is it going to cost us in the future? It is going to cost us another $21 billion, or is it another $87 billion? That is going to get us through the next year. Next year we will be back here debating on another supplemental on continuing the effort in Iraq.

All we are asking the Iraqi people to do is to take part of that $130 billion, $150 billion, or $170 billion—whatever it has been today—and share part of it with us; share $10 billion with us.

Second, there is not a country on this chart, outside of the U.K., that has lost one life as a result of the conflict in Iraq and freeing and liberating the Iraqi people. As of today, we have lost 332 American lives—just as of today. A young soldier from Valdosta, GA, was found floating in a river. He apparently drowned over there. We have lost 332 brave American men and women. These countries, outside of the U.K., have lost none. They have made no investment of life in the freedom of Iraq.

Let me close by answering my friend from Oklahoma, who is truly one of my dearest friends and a guy I respect so much. But when he says, from the standpoint of to whom we are going to lend this money, there is nobody to sign a note, what are we going to do with this $21 billion? Are we going to stand in a hotel window and throw it on the streets of Baghdad? Give me a break. There is somebody in place to give the money to. There is somebody in place to lend the money to. All you have to do is think about what we are going to do with the money. We are going to rebuild the infrastructure in Iraq. There is somebody who owns that infrastructure. I don't care whether it is the former government or the Coalition Provisional Authority. There is an entity in place that is capable of signing a note. That is simply a very weak argument, to say that we don't have the legal capacity to make this loan.

Again, I am very proud of the fact that we have come together in a bipartisan way to do what we think is right for the American people.

Again, I am thankful for the leadership of Senator BAYH, Senator COLLINS, and Senator ENSIGN, who were so instrumental in this.

I ask my colleagues to think seriously about this because it is maybe the most important vote we will make. The future of our children and grandchildren, particularly when it comes to rooting out terrorism around the world, may rest in this vote. I am very confident that the right vote is in support of this amendment.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. BAYH. I ask my colleague: The Senator from Michigan has been waiting quite some time.

Mr. STEVENS. I have had the Senator from Washington waiting for a substantial amount of time, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to join my well-meaning colleagues on both sides of this debate in trying too determine the best mechanism for not only our leadership in Iraq and getting the Iraqi people on their feet, but also in getting other countries to help by forgiving Iraqi debt.

It is crucial that we in this Chamber send a strong message to the Iraqi people that we will be the world's most outspoken advocate for Iraqi reconstruction and that the United States will play a leadership role.

Now I don't impugn the motives of other Members who want to qualify our assistance through a loan formula.

I share my colleagues' concerns that the funding for Iraq reconstruction is a serious cost that we need to thoroughly consider and oversee.

However, I think it is critically important to realize that Americans have already been making a serious investment in this region in order to ensure that we are so close to achieving: A stable, peaceful, democratic Iraq.

We spent billions of dollars to expel Hussein out of Kuwait; we spent billions throughout the nineties patrolling a no-fly zone; and we spent billions to liberate Iraq, and we are spending billions to secure and stabilize the country.

We are now the closest we have ever been to achieving the very goal that we have sacrificed lives and spent billions to achieve.

We are very close to taking the Iraqi people off their knees and putting them on their feet. Yet, the right way to do this is by helping them build a strong economy not by saddling the Iraqis with further debt.

Let's consider what we are saying when we ask the Iraqi people to take on this loan. Think about it. Iraq's annual oil revenues may be somewhere around $15 billion, but we are on the verge of adding to an existing debt level of $200 billion—and expecting them to pay with their oil revenues.

To think that Iraq can pay off a loan by oil revenues when its debt is thirteen times its annual oil revenues is ridiculous. A future Iraq would end up spending half of its oil revenues on interest payments alone.

Is that the message we want to send to the Iraqi people?

Is that the message we want to send to the mayor of Kirkuk who I met?

To the governor of Basra who doesn't have enough electricity to serve his community?

To the members of the Iraqi council, who are not only giving their time to serve their country, but are risking their lives.

To the woman of the Iraqi council who spent 16 years in hiding with other women only to rejoice when she found out that the United States was coming to give them an opportunity to meet and express their opinions in public.

These courageous leaders have stepped out to rebuild this country, and are willing to give their lives to do so.

We need to help these people re-build their country, not pile on additional debt.

Now is not the time for the United States to back away form its leadership role in nurturing Iraq's future.

Make no mistake, I am disappointed like all my colleagues that the American economy isn't recovering as well as it should.

I am disappointed in our terribly low levels of domestic investment.

I have as much concern as anyone over our domestic economy—my home state of Washington is still facing a terribly high 7.5 percent unemployment rate.

But we cannot tell the American people that we are going to solve their problem by somehow holding down the Iraqi people to a future debt that will not let them stand on their feet.

The United States must play a leadership role in Iraq reconstruction.

And it is very hard to play a leadership role when our commitment to Iraq reconstruction is qualified by the conditions of a loan.

We need to say to the rest of the world community that it is time for them to help build Iraq, too.

We need to say that if they are serious in their commitments about rebuilding Iraq, as the U.N. did in its resolution today, then get behind that message and deliver.

But to say that out of the $87 billion that we are talking about, that somehow $10 billion of it ought to be paid back in a loan—only if the other countries are not willing to commit to debt forgiveness—is not the message of a leader.

A leader who believes in the Iraqi people will stand behind them and give them the ability to get their country on their feet. We must be this leader and get them on their feet and get our troops back home.

Mr. BAYH. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, after that, I yield to Senator BURNS 5 minutes from our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is requesting that Senator BURNS follow Senator LEVIN.

Mr. BAYH. If the Senator from Montana would like to follow the Senator from Michigan, I have no problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I first thank the Senators who have been so deeply engaged in coming up with a bipartisan amendment. It is critically important there be a bipartisan amendment relative to issues of war, peace, reconstruction, and the aftermath of war. I congratulate them on it. I support this amendment.

The administration has requested approximately $20 billion for the reconstruction of Iraq and the entire sum is intended to be a grant. We are told that Saddam Hussein's debts are so great that we cannot contemplate the new Iraq taking out a loan against their huge resource, the second largest oil reserves in the world, perhaps $1 trillion or more, so that they can become involved in their own reconstruction. Only a grant, we are told, will do, even though this is a country with a tremendous resource. We are told they cannot contribute to their own reconstruction financially.

It was just last March Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz said that ''we are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon.'' And it can. It surely can help finance its own reconstruction and would be far better off if it did help to finance its own reconstruction.

If the Iraqis possessed billions of dollars in gold bullion, I cannot imagine anyone talking about granting them $20 billion. They have $1 trillion in liquid goal. Yet the suggestion for us to propose to Iraq that they can stand on their own feet, that they can contribute to their own reconstruction by a tiny fraction of that asset being used, somehow or other that does not mean we are leading—I reject that. We have led with our lives, almost 350 American lives. Every one of those lives shows resolve. Every one of the 1,700 Americans who have been injured show resolve. And we are going to continue to show resolve with our lives on the line.

To suggest that Iraq, with an asset of $1 trillion, somehow or other should not be part of its own reconstruction financially is portrayed here as a lack of leadership. To me, it is a central element of wisdom and recognizing that Iraq has a right to be treated as a country that has great resources, great capabilities and we need to treat them as a partner.

What is missing from the Bremer plan is a sense of ownership by Iraq of its own reconstruction. The money involved in the plan is U.S. money being appropriated to a U.S. administrator, who is going to spend the money pretty much as he sees fit. That is not the best way to succeed in Iraq. The best way is Iraq having the will to succeed.

There has been a suggestion that somehow or other we do not have the resolve if we become partners with Iraq. It is quite the opposite. Iraq must have the will to succeed and contribute to its own reconstruction with a tiny fraction of its own resources as a reflection of that will to succeed.

If Iraqi money were involved, I don't think this plan would have proposed new ZIP Codes for Iraq; sending Iraqi students, at huge expense, to business schools; some kind of a big honeypot for U.S. consultants. Is that how the Iraqis would be spending their money? I doubt it. When we talked to the Iraqis who came here, we asked them if they had a role in this plan? We were told, no; this was our plan.

This has got to be their plan for their own reconstruction. They have to own it. It is their country. We can help them. We can be a partner, and God knows we have been. All the blood that we have shed for their liberation has surely made us a partner. Nobody is going to be able to misconstrue this as our aiming at their oil resource. No one can misconstrue a grant of $10 billion, and a following loan of another $10 billion if others will contribute, as somehow or other targeting their resources. Nobody is going to buy it. There may be an effort made to misconstrue it, but nobody is going to buy that. We shed too much blood. We have spent too much money in Iraq for this to be misconstrued this way.

One other thing: Our simply giving them billions without their participating, and then our deciding how to spend it, is going to keep America as the target of terrorists, not just because of the military power that we deploy so visibly, but because of the reconstruction projects that we choose so unilaterally. If an electric power plant is built with our money—it's a visible U.S. target for terrorists. If its built with Iraqi money—it's less of a lightening rod.

The distinction is important in another way. Iraqis will have more incentives to protect and to fight what their money builds. For those reasons alone, the future of Iraq will be more assured if Iraqis have the financial stake to succeed.

This has to be a partnership. We must join with Iraq in the reconstruction. We should not dominate. We should not control. We should not determine. Their resources should be

spent on their own reconstruction, with them, surely in part, choosing their priorities as to what is important for them.

That is what we should all want for Iraq. And our simply saying, here is $20 billion, these are the ways we will spend the $20 billion—is not the way to help Iraq get back on its feet. It is the way to signal to the world that we control, we dominate, and that is the worst message that we can send to the world.

Mr. President, do I have time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 40 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, my own preference would have been, instead of a direct loan from us, that there be a loan from a third party, guaranteed by us. That is my preference because that would have taken away any possibility of misconstruing what we are doing, any propaganda value that might be gained by anybody else by saying somehow or other the United States is going to be a creditor, therefore, we have designs on Iraq. That could have been avoided if there were a third party making the loan, with our guarantee. If this amendment were not adopted—and I hope it will be—I would offer such a loan guarantee amendment as a preferable way to go. But this amendment is preferable to the grant approach of the administration.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Does the Senator have control of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Maryland, if he wants to ask a question, I don't see any harm in that.

Mr. SARBANES. No.

Mr. President, does the time then come back to the Senator from Indiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct. The Senator from Indiana can seek recognition at that time. The Senator from Indiana has 13 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I will defer until the Senator concludes, and then I will seek to have an exchange with the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, we just got back from Iraq last Saturday. I just want to share with you a couple of thoughts that I had while I was there and coming back because once you go and you look and you see and you feel what is going on in that country—I am going to oppose this amendment, but I am opposing the amendment, and I am opposing the idea, but not because some of my good colleagues, for whom I have the utmost respect, are promoting this.

There are as many Iraqis and more dying today than there are Americans. If we lose one American life, it is a tragedy. But their new police department that is on the street is doing a good job, and they are paying with their lives also.

I am not going to get into whether we can afford it or we can't afford it or whether they can afford it or they can't afford it. But this investment, my colleagues, is probably one of the biggest ones we will make. The returns in the next 20 years will be way beyond expectation. We are changing something in the Middle East that has not even been touched since the end of World War I.

We went into those communities where poverty is rampant, with trash, garbage. Kids are happy. They come up to you. We talked to parents in refurbished schools. And, by the way, we have refurbished 1,500 of them, done by an Iraqi contractor who hired 30,000 Iraqi workmen to do it.

We talked to parents. I talked to one woman there and asked: Do you want us to go away?

She said: No, absolutely not.

And I asked her: Give me one reason, one reason.

She said: My little girl is going to school.

Little girls did not go to school under Saddam Hussein. Think about that impact on that neighborhood. I am talking ground level, folks. This is not the palaces. This is not the CPA or the IGC. These are people who are on the street.

What kind of a message is this: ''Well, we will loan you the money, but expect you to pay it back''? And they will say: ''Gee, thanks. The last thing we need is another loan.''

We have all been down that street. We loan; we lose control of the money. Is it spent where it is supposed to be spent? Does it really build the infrastructure? Or do we see somebody going out and buying a Mercedes-Benz and putting it in their trunk and saying: ''Well, I have had enough of this''? We have seen that happen, too. That has been our experience with some of our foreign aid.

We control it. But I want to get back to this issue that we are going to change some things over there on the success of Iraq. We don't know whether their constitution will be like ours. I daresay it will not. But it will be some form of representative government, which to us is a baby step, but to them it is a giant step.

If you throw a map down on the floor and you take a look at all of the Middle East, here is what we have done: We have invested in a corridor that will be the economic road for not only Iraq but for Jordan, for Egypt, for all the countries that border Iraq because, for the first time, we will have a communications and transportation system that is free and open, and even in the fly zones that run from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the time?

Mr. STEVENS. I am sorry, I do not have an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BURNS. Will you give me another minute to close?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the Senator 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, if you think, why is King Abdullah of Jordan so supportive of us? Why is Turkey so supportive of what we are trying to do? It is very simple: because the corridor of freedom is being opened.

Now you tell me if there is not a better investment in this world. And you have cracked closed societies. Would Saudi Arabia announce they are going to have free elections had we not done what we have done?

We cannot make it in the form of a loan because we lose control of it. Let's help those people. They want to do it. Their will for freedom is just as strong as ours. How strong is our will? How strong is ours?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BAYH. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to make sure, as I understand the Senator's amendment, $10 billion of this $87 billion which he proposes as a loan on the reconstruction side, under the very terms of his amendment would be forgiven if 90 percent of Iraq's outstanding debt were forgiven by other countries; is that correct?

Mr. BAYH. That is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to commend the Senator for the wisdom of his amendment. If we do not adopt this amendment, the United States presumably will go to a debtors conference trying to persuade people that they should forgive the debt to Iraq. If your amendment passes, the United States is in a position at that debtors conference to say: If you will forgive your debt, we will forgive this debt. In fact, the amendment, by its terms, would require that.

If we make it all a grant, we will go to the debtors conference and we will say to them: We made a grant. Now you should forgive your debt.

They are going to say: Well, that is over and done with. That is water over the dam. That grant has happened. What do you have to give us here at this conference?

So presumably at that point, we are going to come up with another chunk of money, would that be correct?

Mr. BAYH. The Senator understands the amendment perfectly. It provides an incentive for the rest of the countries to forgive their odious debt they extended to Saddam, and if they do

not, it puts our country in a position of maximum leverage to insist that they do in any debtors conference.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BAYH. I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as usual the Senator from Maryland has put his finger on one of the most important aspects of this amendment. It is one of the reasons I rise to support the Bayh-Nelson-Ensign-Collins-Snowe amendment. It is a very sound proposal. It establishes several important principles relative to the steadfast commitment of this Congress to finish a job that has already been started.

As the chief sponsor of this amendment stated in his opening remarks, whether you voted to use force to overthrow this regime or not, the fact is, we are there now. We have an important job to complete. This is one of the most challenging tasks ever undertaken by the people of the United States. The Bayh amendment outlines a roadmap that might actually get us to where we want to go. Words such as freedom, education, prosperity, democracy, vibrancy, a free enterprise economy, I have heard my colleagues speak with passion. This amendment is an attempt not to undermine those principles but to ensure that we will actually get there, to the goal of this whole effort.

I am afraid without this amendment, the plan before the Senate, which we are well aware of, will not get us where we want to go.

It establishes a couple of important priorities. It says Iraqi security is important. It says the Congress, by good faith, will put up the $5 billion which, by the way, dwarfs the contributions of all other countries. And it sets up an incentive, a very important incentive, for the other nations to forgive the debts. It highlights the strength of the resources in Iraq and opens the opportunity to perhaps expand on that by rebuilding with the Iraqi-owned resources, once this plan is laid down.

The Bush-Bremer plan of billion-dollar grants only, often, and alone will simply not work. Let me repeat: The plan we have before us—not this amendment—the plan that has been presented of billion-dollar grants only, often, and alone will not work. It can't be sustained. The American people don't support it now. They will not support it in 30 days. They will not support it in 4 months. They will not support it in 4 years. The little girl the Senator from Montana spoke so passionately about is in school today. This amendment is about keeping her in school 2 years from now and 3 years from now and seeing that she graduates from college.

This amendment lays a sustainable roadmap to get us where we want to go. That is why I support it. That is why it is important. The RAND, World Bank, and Institutes of International Finance have estimated the cost will exceed $36 billion, $75 billion over the next not 30 days but 5 to 7 years. We need this amendment to get us on the right roadmap, laying down the right plan so we can sustain it to complete the task ahead of us which is very important, very complex and, as I said, one of the most challenging.

I support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Virginia 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished manager, and I commend the Senate for an excellent debate. I rise today to oppose this amendment that would use loans for much needed reconstruction, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Seldom do we have choices before us as fundamental as this one. We can truly help the Iraqi people and secure an important opportunity for change in this part of the world, or we can turn our backs and watch this fledging nation drown in a sea of debt. The second choice would represent failure. There is no choice. Failure is not an option. We must go forward; we must stay the course and help the people of Iraq win the peace without conditions.

We have achieved extraordinary success, in a relatively short period, in Iraq. Saddam Hussein and the threat he posed are gone; the future is hopeful for the Iraqi people. We must send a strong message of resolve to our fellow countrymen, to our troops, to our coalition partners, and to the rest of the world, that we will see this through to completion—to win the peace.

Over the July 4, recess, I traveled, along with eight colleagues from the Armed Forces and Intelligence Committees, to Iraq. During the 3 days we spent in Iraq, we met with Coalition Provisional Authority leaders, military leaders, soldiers, and local Iraqi leaders. Their courage, dedication and determination in a very difficult environment was inspiring. We saw the enormity of the task with our own eyes—the antiquated, dilapidated oil infrastructure; the mismanaged irrigation system; the piles of garbage and open sewers; and the cowed and brutalized, but hopeful people of Iraq. These problems will not be fully fixed overnight, or even with this significant infusion of resources. But, it is an important step forward. We must quickly build on the foundation that has been laid by Ambassador Bremer, his international team, and the Iraqi people, to sustain and accelerate the momentum for building a secure, and economically viable, democracy in Iraq.

Over the past few weeks, I have had the opportunity to meet with several Iraqi leaders. Recently, I met members of the Iraqi Governing Council. We noted the tragic absence of Ms. Akila al-Hashimi, a member of the Governing Council who was scheduled to travel to the United States this week but was gunned down last week outside her home in Baghdad, most likely by remnants of the Ba'athist regime intent on intimidating the new Iraqi leaders. She symbolized the courage, hope, and determination of many Iraqis to build a new, democratic Iraq, even in the face of great personal risk. We mourn her loss, along with the people of Iraq, and we must now renew our pledge to help Iraq establish the security, quality of life, and opportunity to enjoy the liberties of a free, democratic nation. Her colleagues on the Iraqi Governing Council are clearly committed to achieving these goals and deserve our support.

Some have suggested that providing $20.3 billion dollars for Iraqi reconstruction is too generous and that full or partial repayment should be formulated. This notion is borne from the belief that Iraq is a potentially prosperous nation, well-endowed with oil reserves, that should be able to pay for its own reconstruction. I respectfully disagree.

The idea of loans for Iraqi reconstruction, instead of grants, would be a terrible mistake. Iraq already has crushing debt, accumulated during Saddam Hussein's brutal, incompetent reign. Estimates of this debt range from $180 billion to almost $400 billion. Additional debt or encumbrances on future earnings now would be economically disastrous, and send the wrong message to Iraqis and, indeed, the world.

General Jay Garner and Ambassador Bremer have both forcefully argued that Iraq must be granted significant debt reduction or forgiveness. The United States will seek to convince the principal holders of Iraqi loans—Russia, France, Germany and Saudi Arabia—to foregive some of all of these loans. To add additional loans, at the same time we are asking others to forgive loans, would be counterproductive and hypocritical.

Later this month, the U.S. will hold a donors' conference in Madrid to solicit contributions from the international community for Iraqi reconstruction. To ask others to make grants to Iraq after we have structured some or all of our contribution to Iraqi reconstruction as loans would undercut our Government's efforts to obtain international support.

In the conversations with Iraqi leaders I mentioned earlier, they were emphatic in their opposition to reconstruction support being structured as loans, especially if these loans were made in the form of ''liens'' against potential Iraqi oil revenues. They rightfully argued that the Iraqi people and the larger Arab and Islamic world would regard such a move negatively

and conclude that their earlier suspicions that the U.S. was more interested in Iraqi oil than Iraqi liberation were true.

We have an opportunity before us to send a message of full commitment to Iraq and of a balanced, fair U.S. foreign policy in the larger Middle Easter region, by providing this reconstruction assistance as grants to Iraq. A loan program using Iraqi oil as collateral would be viewed as just the opposite, and would be counterproductive to our larger goals and interests in this important region.

There is a perception, I fear, that this supplemental will fully fund Iraq's reconstruction. Nothing could be further from the truth. The reconstruction needs of Iraq are enormous—not because of war damage, but because of three-plus decades of neglect, mismanagement and greed by Saddam Hussein's regime. The fund included in this supplemental will only begin to address these daunting needs, but adoption of this package will put the Iraqis in a much better position to help themselves in the future. The Iraqi leaders I spoke with want nothing more than to do just that, but they need our help for now, not with crippling conditions attached.

Some have compared this supplemental for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan to the Marshall plan that funded the reconstruction of Europe following World War II. Most would agree that the investment of our Nation in the Marshall plan has been paid back a hundred-fold.

Some have correctly pointed out that the Marshall plan included loans that had to be paid back and the requirement for matching funds by the beneficiary nations, in some cases. The bulk of Marshall plan assistance, however, was in the form of grants. Students of history, of which there are many in this chamber, will recall, also, that while the Marshall plan began in 1948, it was preceded by a series of programs over a number of years, to provide financial support to meet the immediate needs of devastated European nations, including Germany. In today's dollar, the equivalent of over $100 billion in aid was provided by the U.S. to these nations before the Marshall plan went into effect. Included in this aid was over $35 billion in grants to put these nations in a position to help themselves with subsequent assistance.

The situation is similar in Iraq today. This is a nation crippled by multiple wars, mismanagement, and neglect. The Iraqis are not yet in a position to help themselves, but they can be with our help.

Providing loans to Iraq is an idea that may have merit in the future, but not now. By voting overwhelmingly to authorize the use of force in Iraq, we accepted the responsibilities and challenges of subsequent reconstruction. We must not now shrink from that responsibility. We must first provide the unconditional assistance that will lay the foundation for full reconstruction. That is in Iraq's best interest; it is in America's best interest.

Let us join together to provide the resources that will meet the immediate needs of the Iraqi people and best serve our interests in Iraq and the larger Middle East region. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and send a message to the Iraqi people that we are committed to their liberation and reconstruction unconditionally.

I was very deeply influenced and moved by the Senator from Washington, Senator CANTWELL. She hit it. What is the message we send forth from this Chamber tonight?

I must admit, in the briefings and so forth that took place today before the Armed Services Committee, I repeatedly heard, we are not getting the message out in that part of the world about what we are trying to do and the successes we have had to date in helping the people. Consequently, a vote that would carry this amendment will just spread through that world and be interpreted by that press. It will undo so much of what we have been able to achieve thus far in trying to convince that world we are there for their own interests, not for oil, not to profit from a loan or give a loan. It will be misinterpreted as a consequence of a very small amount of funding in this whole $87 billion.

I would like to put a question to my good friend, fellow member of the Armed Services Committee, who is a strong supporter of the men and women of the Armed Forces, a simple question: Does this amendment make the streets safer for the men and women of the Armed Forces tonight, tomorrow tonight, and in the days and weeks to come, together with their coalition partners? If somehow you can convince me this will bring about a greater measure of safety—this is the thing that concerns me above all. The sacrifices being made by the men and women of the Armed Forces, their families here at home, people in the villages and towns who watched them march off to take up their stations in this battle for freedom. I cannot fairly discern any basis that this will help to make the streets safer for the uniformed people now serving in the coalition forces.

I ask that most respectfully of my good friend and distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's question. The timekeeper informs me I don't have much time left. I will answer succinctly if the time is not deducted from our time.

Mr. WARNER. It should not take very long.

Mr. BAYH. The chairman of the committee, for whom I have the utmost respect with regard to his comments about the message we send, I think would agree that there is no vote we can cast tonight, or no amount of money that we can spend that could compare possibly to the message our brave men and women are giving to the Iraqi people every day with their presence and the heroic efforts they are making to rebuild that nation. I think that is eloquent testimony that far surpasses anything we might do.

To directly answer your question, my answer would be, yes, we provide an immediate $5 billion to meet every security need that has been asked for by the Iraqi government. That is over and above the $67 billion for all of the American security costs while we are there. So there is a complete grant of every security need.

With regard to the domestic reconstruction, we provide $5 billion immediately—

Mr. WARNER. I think the Senator has answered the question. I believe we just have an honest difference of opinion. I think the press in that part of the world will be whipped into a frenzy, with those who will be saying ''we are winning, we are winning.'' That troubles me. I think that will endanger the security of our people in uniform when they are trying to carry out this mission. The press will be whipped up, and this will be the most clear symbolism that those who are against——

Mr. BAYH. May I ask the question? The Senator is concerned that those who wish us ill in that part of the world may say they are winning. In what way will they say they are winning?

Mr. WARNER. They will say it is because we are there for oil, and they will say, oh, they are going to make the Iraqis borrow the money. They don't understand the nuances, the technicalities of a loan, and so forth.

What they will understand is that the Senate did not stand in support of the Commander in Chief, and I am fearful that the press will seize upon this and it will endanger the safety of our people. I say that as a friend and most respectfully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, President Harry Truman once said that ''the only thing new is what we have forgotten about history.'' I am reminded of our history when I think about this debate on giving a loan. I am thinking of the choices we made when dealing with Germany after World War I, and then after World War II. After World War I, we made a choice that was a grave mistake. We defeated Germany, left them in ruins, sent them a bill, and we went home. What was the result? Adolf Hitler.

As early as 1922, Hitler was railing against the Treaty of Versailles, talking about the payments Germany was forced to make. Eleven years later, in

1933, he became Chancellor of Germany. He was democratically elected. He, again, blamed the Treaty of Versailles and the payment of those debts for Germany's woes.

Under such a debt with a failed reconstruction policy, we can see the same thing happening in Iraq. Our post-World War I policy with Germany was an utter failure. It gave us World War II. After World War II, we almost made the same mistake. We began by making loans. This is a summary of the Marshall plan by the Marshall Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUMMARY OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

(From the Marshall Foundation Chart on Funding from USAID, 1975)

Even now a model for positive economic diplomacy, the Marshall Plan was a rational effort by the United States aimed at reducing the hunger, homelessness, sickness, unemployment, and political restlessness of the 270 million people in sixteen nations in West Europe. Marshall Plan funds were not mainly directed toward feeding individuals or building individual houses, schools, or factories, but at strengthening the economic superstructure (particularly the iron-steel and power industries). The program cost the American taxpayers $11,820,700,000 (plus $1,505,100,000 in loans that were repaid) over four years and worked because it was aimed at aiding a well-educated, industrialized people temporarily down but not out. The Marshall Plan significantly magnified their own efforts and reduced the suffering and time West Europe took to recover from the war. The program—whose official title was ''European Recovery Program''—aimed at: (1) Increasing production; (2) expanding European foreign trade; (3) facilitating European economic cooperation and integration; and (4) controlling inflation, which was the program's chief failure.

The idea of massive U.S. loans to individual countries had already been tried (nearly $20 billion—mainly long-term, low interest loans—since the war's end) and had failed to make significant headway against Europe's social and economic problems. The plan that Marshall enunciated at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, was revolutionary in that it required the recipients to organize to produce a rational, multilateral approach to their common economic problems. Another innovative feature was its limited duration: four years maximum, thereby assuring American taxpayers and their representatives that the program would not be an indefinite commitment.

The economic problems in 1947–48 included not only the lack of capital to invest, but also the need for Europeans to overcome a U.S. trade surplus with them so massive as to imperil further trade and to encourage unmanageable inflation. Marshall Plan money helped stimulate the revival of European trade with the world and increased trade among European countries.

Americans were reluctant to invest in Europe because their profits were available only in local currencies that were little desired by U.S. businesses and investors. The Marshall Plan guaranteed that these investors would be able to convert their profits earned in European currencies into U.S. dollars. Grants and loans in U.S. dollars enabled managers in Europe to purchase in America specialty tools for their new industries. Marshall Plan money also paid for industrial technicians and farmers to visit U.S. industries and farms to study American techniques. Plan funds even paid the postage on privately contributed relief packages.

Many people in Washington helped to implement and manage the European Recovery Program that Marshall Plan first outlined at Harvard; this is why, in addition to his normal modesty, Marshall refused to call the idea the ''Marshall Plan.'' He always believed that his greatest contribution to the program was his 1947–48 nationwide campaign to convince the American people—and through them the Congress—of its necessity; he likened his efforts in scope and intensity to a campaign for the presidency.

Over its four-year life, the Marshall Plan cost the U.S. 2.5 to 5 times the percent of national income as current foreign aid programs. One would need to multiply the program's $13.3 billion cost by 10 or perhaps even 20 times to have the same impact on the U.S. economy now as the Marshall Plan had between 1948 and 1952. (Most of the money was spent between 1948 and the beginning of the Korean War (June 25, 1950); after June 30, 1951, the remaining aid was folded into the Mutual Defense Assistance Program.)

On December 10, 1953, George C. Marshall received the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo, Norway. He accepted it, not as his individual triumph, but as the representative of the American people, whose efforts and money had made the program a success.

MARSHALL PLAN EXPENDITURES—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, APRIL 3, 1948 TO JUNE 30, 1952

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Total	Grants	Loans
Total for all countries	$13,325.8	$11,820.7	$1,505.1
Austria	677.8	677.8	.....
Belgium-Luxembourg	559.3	491.3	[1] 68.0
Denmark	273.0	239.7	33.3
France	2,713.6	2,488.0	225.6
Germany, Federal Republic of	1,390.6	1,173.7	[2] 216.9
Greece	706.7	706.7	.....
Iceland	29.3	24.0	5.3
Ireland	147.5	19.3	128.2
Italy (including Trieste)	1,508.8	1,413.2	95.6
Netherlands (*East Indies) [3]	1,083.5	916.8	166.7
Norway	255.3	216.1	39.2
Portugal	51.2	15.1	36.1
Sweden	107.3	86.9	20.4
Turkey	225.1	140.1	85.0
United Kingdom	3,189.8	2,805.0	384.8
Regional	[4] 407.0	[4] 407.0	.....

[1] Loan total includes $65.0 million for Belgium and $3.0 million for Luxembourg: grant detail between the two countries cannot be identified.

[2] Includes an original loan figure of $16.9 million, plus $200.0 million representing a pro-rated share of grants converted to loans under an agreement signed February 27, 1953.

[3] Marshall Plan aid to the Netherlands East Indies (now Indonesia) was extended through the Netherlands prior to transfer of sovereignty on December 30, 1949. The aid totals for the Netherlands East Indies are as follows: Total $101.4 million, Grants $84.2 million, Loans $17.2 million.

[4] Includes U.S. contribution to the European Payments Union (EPU) capital fund, $361.4 million; General Freight Account, $33.5 million; and European Technical Assistance Authorizations (multi-country or regional), $12.1 million.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Marshall Foundation said:

The idea of massive U.S. loans to individual countries had already been tried [right after World War II] (nearly $20 billion—mainly long-term low-interest loans—since the war's end) and had failed to make significant headway against Europe's social and economic problems.

But there was a better idea, a different choice that someone learned from history. It was George C. Marshall. The Marshall plan was a 4-year plan, $13.3 billion, helping to rebuild the economies of 16 countries. Nearly $12 billion was grants, about $1 billion was loan, and what was the result? A continent that had been fighting itself for a thousand years became democratic, stopped fighting among themselves, and became our allies.

That is why we need a ''Marshall plan'' for Iraq. We need a 4- or 5-year plan for building a democracy. The Marshall plan was used for a variety of purposes. It paid for the building of railroads, water systems, medicines, modernizing factories, restoring ports to allow foreign trade, and much, much more.

We should do the same in Iraq. It cost $13 billion from 1948 to 1952—more than $100 billion in today's dollars. We can learn a valuable lesson from our experiences with Germany after World War I, a terrible failure, and after World War II, a remarkable success. After World War I, we made Germany pay its debts and we left them in ruins. We sent them a bill. We went home. We got Adolf Hitler. After World War II, we pursued the Marshall plan. It cost us some money. We gave them the money but as a result we got peace, new democratic economies, and our greatest allies.

President Kennedy said it best in 1961. In his inaugural address, he said:

We shall pay any price, we shall bear any burden . . . to assure the survival and success of liberty.

The people of Iraq need our support. We paid for German reconstruction under the Marshall plan because it was in our interest. We should do the same in Iraq and support the President's request. We cannot afford, in our own interest, to do anything less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 38 minutes 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Nickles amendment and in opposition to the Bayh amendment. I believe in truth in lending, and I think there are some Members of the Senate who think somehow if we talk about this loan, it is going to be acceptable to the American people. Frankly, I believe the loan is going to be a grant.

We just need to be upfront with the American people and say that the $20 billion in the President's request is going to be a grant and explain it to the American people. Iraq has a huge debt—from sources I have heard in testimony—of anywhere between $100 billion to $200 billion. We just heard on the news this evening where one of their major pipelines has been blown up so they are not going to have any ability to expect to export oil. The oil they have now will be used for domestic purposes. That is as a result of an attack by terrorists this particular evening as we are debating.

Let's be honest; whether this is couched as a loan or a grant, it is going to be a grant. It is something we are going to have to give to the American

people in order to move forward with the development of the infrastructure in that country, which I happen to believe is essential if we want to get our troops home quickly. We simply have to get that in place along with security forces. The only way that will happen is if we give the full amount of $87 billion available for the reconstruction and for the security in Iraq.

We have heard time and time again about the complications of going the route of a loan. In fact, Ambassador Bremer testified before several committees in the Senate, and he has actually sent a letter to the chairman, the Honorable TED STEVENS. I will read from it. He says:

> I understand there are various proposals being offered which would convert portions of the funding request to a loan mechanism of some type. Any such proposal would merely add further debt to the already-huge debt currently owed by the Iraqis. As you know from my testimony three weeks ago, I am concerned that, as was the case in the young, fragile democracy in Weimar, Germany, such a situation could destabilize the young Iraqi democracy before it even gets off the ground. Moreover, if the United States makes its contribution in the form of a loan, we will encourage other nations to follow that example at the Madrid Donors Conference next week—further exacerbating Iraq's debt situation, I might add, complicating the eventual process of restructuring the country's overall debt burden.

I sat down with a group of people and I visited with Colin Powell. He also urges us, in the strongest terms, to not make this a loan and that we grant these dollars. It gives us an opportunity to maintain control of those dollars.

We have to keep in mind that Iraq has established trade agreements with many of those countries that opposed our presence in Iraq. If this goes to a loan, they will control the money; they will be the ones letting out the contracts. I feel their inclination would be to be to disburse it all over the international community. That means that countries such as France, Germany, and Russia will be looked to also to share in the contracting out of the building of the infrastructure in Iraq.

The other advantage of a grant is it gives us control of the moneys as they are spent in Iraq.

Finally, a loan means Iraq is going to have that control. It means it is going to complicate our ability to work with other countries with the loss of control. We ought to be straightforward with the American people. We need to tell them this is going to be a grant and account for it accordingly and move forward with the rapid reconstruction of the infrastructure in Iraq. That is the best policy. It is a straightforward policy.

I believe if we are true and straightforward with the American people, the American people will understand the need to move forward with the full $87 billion the President requested.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this has been an extraordinarily good day for the President's policy in Iraq. The naysayers said: Go get international support, Mr. President. Let's prove we can get the rest of the world behind us.

Today, by a vote of 15 to 0—15 to 0—the United Nations passed a resolution. It was one that simply suggested we do what we were going to do anyway. It is a thoroughly acceptable resolution.

To get a 15-to-0 vote, that means the President had the support of the Russians, the French, the Germans, and, believe it or not, the Syrians. This administration's policy in Iraq, as adopted by the United Nations today, had the support of the Syrians. The only remaining obstacle appears to be the Senate, and we will get an opportunity at around 9:30 p.m. to see if the Senate will join with the Russians, the French, the Germans, and the Syrians to do the right thing and begin to rebuild Iraq.

There are some Senators who have argued that somehow this loan-grant issue really is not that important or they have better judgment than the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State, and others about how to structure this.

It seems to this Senator that those who are skilled at conducting foreign policy have gotten it right, and their judgment is that you cannot go to a donor conference next week in Madrid and ask countries to grant—not loan—grant money to share the costs with us of reconstructing Iraq if we say we are going to try to get paid back.

Let's take a look at what we know is going to happen at the donor conference already. The Japanese are down for $1.5 billion, not an insubstantial amount of money; the British, $900 million; the Canadians, $224 million; the European Union, $234 million. These are all grants, not loans. The Japanese, the British, the Canadians, the European Union are not saying you have to pay us back. They know Iraq is on its back after 25 or 30 years of Saddam Hussein.

In addition to that, there are over 50 countries that have either already provided or have pledged humanitarian assistance; to name a few of them: Kuwait, Spain, Australia, Korea, Germany, Denmark, and the United Arab Emirates; and there are going to be others. They are all going to be at Madrid next week looking at this United Nations resolution that passed 15 to 0 today, with the support of the Russians, the French, the Germans and, for goodness' sake, the Syrians. This is the time to speak with a united voice.

The administration has united the world. They may have been divided about whether this war should have been fought in the first place, but on the issue of reconstruction of Iraq, we are moving toward world unity, and we ought not to disrupt that here tonight.

I had an opportunity last week, along with Senator THOMAS, whom I see in the Chamber, Senator BURNS, Senator CRAIG, and Senator CHAFEE, to go to Iraq and take a look firsthand at what is happening there. I must tell you, Mr. President, there is a lot of good news in Iraq. We have a hard time picking it up watching the evening news. They teach them in journalism school that good news is not news. I think you can accept that and still say that in Iraq good news is news because they had no good news for 30 years—no good news. Saddam Hussein murdered 300,000 of his own people during that quarter of a century. There was no good news in Iraq. Now 9 out of 10 things that are happening there are good: 13,000 construction projects completed; 1,500 schools renovated; local elections up in Mosul. They had a provincial election in the Ninawa province, and they have elected officials up there. We sat down with them and talked with them. They are brave people.

In the violence area where obviously there is still much to be done, the Iraqis themselves are providing a lot of security. The attack on the Baghdad Hotel was thwarted. Some people were killed, indeed, but the bomber wanted to get into the hotel and blow it all up. He was thwarted by Iraqi security.

Part of this Iraqi security force is up to 60,000 people now and growing on a daily basis. The attack on the Turkish Embassy was thwarted, not by us but by Iraqi security. We are on the way to putting the security force in place so that the Iraqis can carry this job forward.

Let's compare it to Bosnia. I was one of a minority of Republicans who supported President Clinton on Bosnia and Kosovo. I met the head of the 101st headquartered in Kentucky and Tennessee. He was in Bosnia, too. General Petraeus said we made more progress in Iraq in 6 months than we made in Bosnia in 6 years—more progress in 6 months than in Bosnia in 6 years. Great progress is being made.

This is a time to unify behind the reconstruction policy in Iraq. Now is the time to do that.

The last stumbling block is this amendment in the Senate tonight. The House is going to finish up tonight, and we are going to finish up tonight or tomorrow, and this is probably the last vote with any real drama attached to it. No matter how long you have been in the Senate, you haven't cast a more important vote than this one. We are casting votes all the time around here, and if you are in my job, you are twisting arms every day on some issue, but it reminds me of what Orwell said in ''Animal Farm.'' He said all pigs were equal, but then some pigs were more equal than others. All votes are equal, but some votes are more equal than others. This is a more equal vote. This is a big vote, one that makes a difference for America and for the world

and certainly for the Iraqis for whom this policy is so important.

There are 170 newspapers in Iraq. I do not think anybody in America knows that, but there are 170 newspapers in Iraq. They have by far more newspapers in Iraq than we have in my hometown. Some of them are even more credible than the New York Times, arguably. The streets are crowded with people engaged in commerce with their little businesses, which the Iraqis are quite good at when allowed to be. Just this week, they have a new currency. I happened to have picked up a souvenir, the last of the previous currency. It has a picture of Saddam Hussein on it. I can tell my colleagues this: The new currency being issued over the next few weeks in Iraq has no picture of Saddam Hussein on it.

Today we heard—Senator THOMAS and I were at the same meeting—that international bankers are interested in coming into Iraq. So everything is heading in the right direction. Let's not get off track tonight by leaving the impression with the Iraqi people that we came into the country to help them and then to send them a bill for it. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I congratulate all of my colleagues on a very important and well-conducted debate.

I strongly oppose the Bayh amendment because its enactment would undermine the central purpose of our mission in Iraq, which is to empower the Iraqi people to build a prosperous and secure future in which their country's natural resources support progressive government and economic prosperity, not additional debt payments to rich Western powers.

I oppose the amendment because I believe decisions on how to finance Iraq's reconstruction should be made in Washington, not in Moscow, Paris, Berlin, or Bonn, whose leaders' decisions, if this amendment were enacted, could determine what form United States assistance takes. I cannot accept the prospect that the United States, with our British allies, who liberated Iraq, would now cede our leadership on reconstructing it to Jacques Chirac and Gerhard Schroeder.

Let's talk about what is at stake. Things are not going as well in Iraq as we would hope. They are not going as poorly as some would allege. In the northern part of Iraq, in the southern part of Iraq, democracy and reconstruction are proceeding apace. As I said, things are not going as well in some parts of Iraq but they are going very well in other parts. The fact is that every few days, tragically, we lose additional American lives. This is the result primarily of a concerted effort in what we know of as the Sunni triangle, of a rare combustible mixture of ex-Baathists, criminals who were released from prison, terrorists from outside the country of Iraq who have infiltrated into the country, and former military people who really know that they will never attain their goals unless the United States is driven out of Iraq. These people have done very bad things. We know all about them. We hear about them or see them every single day.

What are they telling the people of Iraq? They are telling the people of Iraq the following: The United States of America is not on your side. The United States of America supported Saddam Hussein all during the 1980s. They propped up his regime, as a matter of fact. They turned a blind eye while he used weapons of mass destruction twice, once against the Iranians and once against his own people.

In 1991, the Americans told the people of Iraq that Saddam Hussein was on his way out the door. That turned out not to be the case. Saddam Hussein stayed in power and slaughtered thousands of people who rose up against him in places such as Basra. In the 1990s, the Iraqi economy was crippled by economic sanctions imposed by coalitions led by the United States of America, and now the United States of America is about to do what they came for, and that is to take your oil.

Now, I can rebut every single one of those arguments that these bad people are making to the people in the Sunni triangle, but, frankly, I am not there to talk to them. Nor is there much besides Al-Jazeera for them to watch.

The battle for the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people is not over by a long shot, and the passage of this amendment will send a clear signal that the United States is really there for the oil as they alleged all along.

The Washington Post, on October 15, 2003, stated that Iraq is already burdened with $200 billion in debt. Either much of that will be forgiven, in which case the United States reconstruction loan will prove mostly symbolic, or Iraq will struggle for years under a crushing debt burden—by the way, the estimates are that the interest on that debt is as high as $6 billion or $7 billion a year—in which case, another loan only adds to the memory. To make a loan in these circumstances is like swimming out to a drowning man and handing him a 10-pound weight. That is from the Washington Post on October 15, that well-known, conservative, right-wing periodical.

I do not know who is going to volunteer to go to the donors meeting if this amendment is passed. If we go to the donors meeting and say, my dear friends, we want you to give money for Iraq but, by the way, we are only going to loan it to them, the rest of you give the money but we are going to loan it to them, I am sure there is somebody who is highly paid in the State Department who will carry out that task, but it cannot be a pleasant one because it is hypocrisy. How can we ask other countries to give money when ours is in the form of a loan?

I would like to express a little sympathy for my colleagues who support this amendment. It is tough going home when people are without jobs and the economy is still stumbling along and say, we are going to give all this money to Iraq and, by the way, I know that the local highway needs to be fixed and a bridge needs to be built. It is tough, but I want to tell my colleagues what is at stake here.

The reason these bad guys came from all of these other countries into Iraq, the reason the Muslim extremists all over the Middle East are doing everything they can to incite people against America, the reason we are seeing such fierce opposition in some quarters, is that they know that the day democracy flourishes in Iraq, their day is over. The day of the Middle East despot is gone. The day of the Muslim extremist is gone. No longer will the madrasahs, funded by the Saudis, function anymore to train people who are terrorists who will then sacrifice their lives as well as taking others'.

The seminal event since the Vietnam war in American history is now, and there has never been more at stake. We paid a very heavy price for a long time for our failure in Vietnam. We should not pay that price here because we send a signal to the Iraqi people that our commitment to democracy and freedom is somehow contingent upon their ability to pay us back a loan which will then be gauged by the willingness of other countries. Are we going to be the Blanche DuBois of loans? Are we going to be dependent upon the generosity of others? Is it going to be Mr. Chirac and Mr. Schroeder who determine whether we give money to the Iraqis?

I don't think we should. I think this has been a fine debate. I hope we will vote to turn down this amendment. I hope we will vote to maintain the commitment we made when we sent our young men and women to fight and some to die in a conflict which is important, not only to the future of the Middle East but the future of the United States of America.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 14½ minutes on the majority side and 6½ on the minority side. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I will yield a minute and a half to my distinguished colleague from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise as an enthusiastic supporter of this wonderful bipartisan agreement, the

Bayh-Ensign amendment. I do it because it meets four of my principles on supplemental spending.

No. 1, there must be international burden sharing.

With international burden sharing, if the stability of Iraq is in the world's interest, then the world should help pay for the reconstruction. If we say we are going to go it alone, they are going to let us go it alone. If we say we are going to go grants, they will say fine with us.

We need a coalition of the willing. We need a coalition of the wallet.

No. 2, in helping Iraq, we should have loans, not giveaways.

Iraq has the world's largest oil reserves, capable of pumping out millions of barrels a day. These profits should help pay for reconstruction.

There are those who say Iraq has debt. Well, so does America. America has a lot of debt and we think that this debt, the very balanced approach of the Bayh-Ensign amendment, will provide 50 percent as a grant for $10 billion, including $5 billion for police and military, but the other will be converted to a grant only if 90 percent of Iraq's preliberation bilateral debts are absolved.

That is what I call burden sharing. We need the world's help. Iraq needs the world's help. I am glad we have a legislative framework to do it.

No. 3, is accountability to stop waste, cronyism contracting, and profiteering.

No. 4, the administration must lay out a plan to end the occupation of Iraq. There was a plan for the war. Now we need a plan for the peace.

What will this amendment do? Half the requested aid to Iraq will be provided as a grant, a total of $10 billion, including $5 billion to rebuild Iraq's police and military forces. The other half of the requested aid will be a loan.

So the President can lend up to $10 billion to Iraq. The loan would be converted to a grant and only if 90 percent of Iraq's pre-liberation bilateral debts are absolved.

The amendment also expresses the sense of the Senate that all countries should forgive the bilateral debts owed by Saddam Hussein's regime and provide robust levels of reconstruction aid at the Madrid Donors Conference.

Why is this amendment important? I support this amendment because it is consistent with my principles for aid to Iraq: No. 1, international burden-sharing; No. 2, loans, not give-aways.

The amendment clearly supports international burden-sharing, not just with words of encouragement but by providing an incentive for other countries to forgive Iraq's debts. Ambassador Bremer says Iraq can't afford to borrow more because it is already shackled with $200 billion in debt. I say America can't afford more debt, not when we're facing a $2 trillion deficit. The Iraqi debts were racked up by Saddam Hussein to pay for his wars against Iran. Most is owed to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and other Gulf states, and to Russia and France. Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and Russia and France should forgive Iraq's debt as their share of rebuilding costs. If these countries let Iraq start with a clean slate then Iraq's oil income can be used to pay for Iraq's reconstruction.

The amendment also promotes my principle that U.S. aid to Iraq should be loans, not giveaways. Until and unless 90 percent of Iraq's debts are forgiven, half of U.S. aid will be in the form of loans.

I supported Senator DORGAN's effort to make all of America's new aid to Iraq loans rather than grants—the full $20 billion.

Here's why. Iraq can afford to pay. Iraq oil sales can finance building Iraq's infrastructure so we can use American tax dollars to build America's infrastructure. Iraq already has a very developed infrastructure and suffered relatively little damage during the war.

> It's certainly the complete opposite of the situation in Afghanistan, where that's a country that has no prospect of being self-sufficient for quite some time to come . . . We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon.

That's not just me talking. That's the testimony of Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz back in March.

Iraq has the world's second-largest proven oil reserves and could have even more oil and natural gas. Iraqi oilfields are already producing close to 2 million barrels a day. That means billions of dollars a year in oil revenue. According to Ambassador Bremer, by 2005, Iraq will produce enough oil to take care of its basic needs and have additional funds.

I understand that Ambassador Bremer doesn't want to delay reconstruction in Iraq until after Iraq has a constitution and an elected government. I remind the Senate that we have already provided aid to meet Iraq's immediate needs. Just this April Congress provided $75 billion requested by the President. That supplemental bill covered ongoing military operations in Iraq. It also included $2.5 billion for Iraq Relief and Reconstruction. That was grant aid.

I believe the aid we provide now should be all loans, but half is better than none. America's taxpayers stand to get $10 billion back from Iraq's oil revenues under this amendment.

I appreciate the efforts of the cosponsors, my Republican colleagues, Senators ENSIGN, SNOWE, COLLINS, GRAHAM, and CHAMBLISS, and my Democratic colleagues, Senators BAYH and NELSON. They worked together on a bipartisan basis to improve this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this bipartisan amendment to promote burden-sharing and to provide loans, not giveaways.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of fiscal year 2004 supplemental appropriations request for military operations and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am also pleased to cosponsor this amendment with my colleagues Senator BAYH, BEN NELSON, CHAMBLISS, ENSIGN, DORGAN, LINDSEY GRAHAM, and my fellow Senator from Maine, Senator COLLINS. This amendment directs that $10 billion of the funds requested for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Iraq's infrastructure be provided as loans rather than grants.

It is incumbent upon us as stewards of the public trust to scrutinize this $87 billion supplemental legislation, to assure ourselves of the soundness of the proposals and to understand what it is the American people are being asked to provide. I believe that we all fundamentally agree that the $65.6 billion requested to support our military forces in the field must be made available immediately. As our troops continue to root out the remnants of Hussein's horrific regime and work to ensure stability in Iraq, we must do no less than provide them with the most advanced technology, the most reliable force protection equipment, and the best personal care available.

Rather, the amendment before us focuses on the $20.3 billion designated for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Iraq. I have maintained during this debate that a portion of these reconstruction funds should be in the form of loans, and this amendment designates $10 billion of the $20.3 billion toward that very end. At the same time, the amendment contains a ''trigger with a purpose''—designed to both encourage existing creditor countries to forgive at least 90 percent of the debt owned on loans that were made to the former regime of Saddam Hussein, and to foster within Iraq itself a greater sense of responsibility toward, and a stake in, their own long-term rebuilding success.

I know some have said that loans simply aren't feasible. But let's take a look at the totality of what we're talking about. While American men and women are putting themselves in harm's way day in and day out in securing the liberation of the people of Iraq, we are also in the process of spending $100 billion and more for that very same purpose.

And let there be no mistake—the American people aren't making a distinction between the money we are spending to support our troops and the additional funds being proposed to rebuild Iraq when it comes to the total measure of our Nation's sacrifice toward this cause. So asking Iraq to repay one-tenth of that $100 billion in the form of loans hardly seems unreasonable.

But what about those who have argued there is no legitimate government in Iraq that can obligate the nation to the repayment of loans? Well, just today, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1511 which specifically determines that the Governing

Council and its ministers are the principal bodies of the Iraqi interim administration which ''embodies the sovereignty of the State of Iraq during the transitional period until an internationally recognized, representative government is established.'' So this interim administration discussed in Resolution 1511 will be that legitimate government to which U.S. loans are made, while Iraq moves forward toward complete self-governance.

Still others say that providing loans to Iraq would run counter to the U.S. policy of shifting away from loans for development because of the ineffectiveness of such programs in the past. But that policy is predicated on the fact that many heavily-indebted, poor countries do not have the resources to both service debt and institute economic and social reform. Iraq, in contrast, is tremendously rich in resources to an extent sufficient to service this debt and continue to make future investments in their own infrastructure.

Of course, as I have mentioned, there is also that ''trigger with a purpose''. What exactly is that purpose? Well, I would hope we can all agree that long-term stability in Iraq is a global concern that requires global action and a global commitment. A secure, stable Iraq is not only in the best interests of the Middle East, it is also unquestionably in the best interest of freedom-loving nations everywhere.

What we are saying with this amendment is, we have been willing to send our American men and women to liberate Iraq . . . we have been willing to spend $100 billion—and undoubtedly that figure will only climb in the future—for that worthy cause . . . and we're even willing to make that ten percent we expend as loans into full fledged grants—if only those nations who loaned money to the horrific, corrupt Hussein regime in the past will forgive those loans. We are saying, the United States has been willing to accept the overwhelming responsibility for the liberation and rebuilding of Iraq—in money and in lives—now, all we ask is that you, as a creditor nation, contribute to the cause by forgiving loans that only ultimately enriched a criminal, self-aggrandizing regime we all agree we're better off without today.

The bottom line is, this amendment sends a message to these creditor nations that they can have a positive role in ensuring a better future for Iraq, not only by lessening Iraq's debt load by the forgiveness of their own loans, but also by triggering our provision that transitions our $10 billion loan into grants. This is a win-win for the international community and for Iraq—and in the long run, with the reduced debt burden for Iraq, it may even save some additional American taxpayer dollars that would have otherwise been expended for further Iraqi rebuilding.

Frankly, I don't believe for a moment that taxpayer money sent to Iraq for reconstruction should in any way, shape or form be used to pay back loans made to the heinous regime of Saddam Hussein. So I hope that with the passage of this amendment creditor nations will do the right thing and vitiate their claims against Iraq.

Moreover it should be noted that the amendment provides $5.1 billion in direct funding for the purpose of re-establishing the rule of law through the establishment fire and civil defense forces, police forces, a more fully developed judicial system, and the development and enforcement of public safety requirements.

The fact is, the sooner we can transfer the responsibility of providing basic police, fire and first responder services to the Iraqi people, the sooner we can begin to remove our troops from the front line and focus them on the missions they are trained for—conducting combat-type operations against the forces bent on attacking American interests at home and abroad. Additionally, as we have learned in Eastern Europe and Latin America, the rule of law is critical to the effective transition of a state-based economy to a free-market economy.

Finally, the amendment would provide $5.1 billion immediately to Ambassador Bremer as ''seed'' money for the infrastructure projects he identified in the request.

In closing, I do not believe that the provision of $10 billion in loans to the Iraqi people for the reconstruction of their nation will unduly burden them or their economy. Instead, by investing these loans in Iraq, we are working to restore their national pride and enhance their sense of responsibility as we work toward the common goal of a free and stable Iraq. Furthermore, I do not believe it is too much to ask that, as we stand willing to turn our loans into grants, creditor nations who loaned money to the Hussein regime help the cause by wiping their debt slate clean.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am an original cosponsor to the Bayh-Nelson amendment to this Supplemental Appropriations bill. This amendment would authorize the President to lend $10 billion in reconstruction funds to the Iraqi Governing Council or its recognized successor. These funds could be converted to grants provided that 90 percent of Iraq's pre-liberation bilateral debts are absolved, including loan forgiveness for any funds obligated as loans. It also provides the sense of the Senate that it is the strong preference of the United States that all countries forgive their pre-liberation bilateral debts owed by the Saddam regime and provide robust levels of reconstruction aid to post-liberation Iraq at the October 23 Madrid Donors Conference.

The American people are being asked to contribute over $20 billion of their taxpayer dollars for the reconstruction of Iraq. Before the war against Iraq, the administration was vague about how much security and reconstruction funding would be needed in Iraq. Instead, Congress was told by administration officials, as my colleague Senator DORGAN has pointed out, that we could expect Iraqi oil revenues to pay for Iraqi reconstruction or that other nations would join us in shouldering the burden of rebuilding Iraq.

Now the administration argues that it needs over $20 billion for Iraq's reconstruction. The administration argues that this money must be given as grants and not loans. However, once the money is used to rebuild Iraq's infrastructure and economy, the Iraqi government will then be obligated to pay back other nations who hold Iraqi debt. Nations like France and Russia, who loaned money to Saddam Hussein's regime, will receive debt payments off the backs of the U.S. taxpayer.

This amendment directly addresses this problem by requiring 90 percent of Iraqi debt to be forgiven before $10 billion can be converted to grants. It gives an incentive to the administration to engage in diplomacy with nations that hold Iraqi debt in order to encourage them to forgive it. And it will ensure that other nations' taxpayers are not treated more generously than U.S. taxpayers.

In these difficult economic times with U.S. deficits ballooning, the administration is asking the American people to increase the fiscal burden without any hope of recouping these funds. The American taxpayer should not be treated more shabbily than debtors from other nations and we should be encouraging other nations to help rebuild Iraq's economy.

Taxpayers are concerned that we are simply passing on the bill for this and other problems to our children. They are concerned that this Congress can find the resources for Iraq, but at the same time can't find the resources for after-school programs, for prescription drug benefits, and for rebuilding the infrastructure here at home.

We need to allay some of the very legitimate concerns of the American taxpayers. They are concerned about our ballooning debts and shrinking services while we send billions overseas. We need to address these concerns of every American. By ensuring that taxpayer funds are treated just as dearly as the debts owed to other nations, we can begin to address those concerns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. How much more time now remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 14½ minutes on your side.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I was prepared to yield time to another Senator who is not here.

Let me just say this. I am impressed with the debate. There is clearly a division in the Senate. But I do hope Senators will keep in mind that the President of the United States is traveling

abroad on a very important mission. We have been appealed to before, on this side, when Presidents have been traveling abroad, to honor the position of the Presidency and not to take positions that would embarrass him when he is abroad.

I believe there is no question that the problem we face in Iraq is the populace of Iraq that wants to be part of a new government, wants to have a new government, a new democratic government, really faces a quandary of what can they do? How can they be involved? How can they get their electricity back? How can they get their police service back? How can they get their banks open? How can they get their hospitals open? How can they get potable water? How can they be sure they have the capability to present a firm, new constitution that will be approved by their people?

That takes the money the President has requested. I believe if we do not take action to get this money into Iraq and get it moving so they can have the momentum of building a new government, the hearts and minds of those people will be hardened against us. As they are hardened against us, we will have more violence in the street and our soldiers, people in uniform, even the people who are there in civilian capacity now, will be at greater risk.

I think that is what the Senator from Arizona has been saying. The risk we face is, if we do not support these loans, our men and women in uniform are going to be in greater harm's way.

If you want to support the troops—and I have heard that from every Member of the Senate so far—if you want to support these troops, support the President on this issue and do not approve these loans. As to the concept of loans, I am sure, sometime, there will be some way the people of Iraq are going to under—see the debt they have to the United States when they become a real, strong government.

Look what happened to us after World War II. We did not saddle France and Germany with loans. We forgave all the indebtedness, even the indebtedness we had from prior to that war. We helped them through the Marshall Plan to get going.

These grants that we have in this part of this bill are absolutely essential to the continued safety, improvement of the safety of our men and women in uniform. I appeal to those who say they support the troops to support the President. He is the Commander in Chief of these troops and he has told us, his military commanders have told us, they need this money.

It goes hand in glove with the $66 billion here, to assure they have the right equipment, the right protection while they are there. But let's take the actions necessary to get them out of there.

I hope we would have the support of the Senate to do that tonight.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I will yield 2 minutes. I believe the leader is on his way to take the remainder of our time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I had the honor to travel last week with the Senator to Iraq and to Afghanistan. Frankly, it was a very interesting meeting, one that makes us feel a little differently, being on the ground, than it is when we hear what we hear.

I wish to make I think a fairly practical point, and that is that when we were there, obviously, we had a lot of security things to do. We have a lot of problems there.

On the other hand, they have a plan that is being put into place for the schools, for the hospitals, for the government. They are making great progress. So we are talking here about $87 billion, $67 of which goes to support the troops. The other goes to try to get Iraq on its own feet.

I have to suggest from a point of view of someone who is inclined not to want to spend a lot of money, if we really want to get them going on their own and get our troops out of there, the best way to do it is for us to take this money and to help them get on their feet.

The biggest cost is maintaining our troops there. We can move that much more quickly if this $20 billion is put in the hands of our folks who are there now and we can move to get the Iraqis on their own feet and get our troops home more quickly than if we have to do this again to support the troops.

I am talking about a very practical expenditure matter. I think we are much better off to go ahead and do this $20 billion as a grant, be able to have authority over how it is spent, and be able to get our troops home more quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the remainder of our time to the leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we have reached a point in this debate where each of us must make difficult decisions. We debated many amendments over the past 2 weeks and we have, in my view, come to a point about which most all of us agree; that is, we are at war against terrorists in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the assistance that we are considering is integral to our victory and the safe return of our soldiers, the men and women who represent us in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I am confident, when the final vote is taken on the $87 billion, that there will be an overwhelming bipartisan majority in favor of this commitment—in favor of this legislation. But now the Senate has moved on to consider the very best way, the very best manner in which to deliver this assistance, which we all know is so important.

How best can we stabilize the country in which our men and women right now are serving us right this very moment, risking their own lives so others and, indeed, we can live in safety.

I respectfully suggest the amendment which we will be voting upon shortly and which we are now considering simply does not help in this regard. In fact, I would argue it has the very real potential of complicating and, yes, even undermining our ability to do what we all want; that is, to successfully stabilize Iraq.

Let me suggest what this amendment is not. The amendment before us purports to save money for the American taxpayer by insisting upon foreign help and foreign assistance by making this a loan that will be paid back by the Iraqi people. But, as has been discussed on the floor already, the Congressional Budget Office, due to Iraq's already crushing burden, will score or value this amendment in the same way as if it were a grant. In other words, there is absolutely no savings to the American taxpayer, who might be listening right now, as a result of this amendment.

This amendment purports to provide an incentive for other countries to relieve that crushing burden, that $200 billion of debt that is already as we speak on the backs of the Iraqi people. This logic completely escapes me.

As we began this debate tonight, the newly liberated country of Iraq was $200 billion in debt. By the time this debate finishes tonight, if this amendment were to pass, Iraq would be $210 billion in debt.

By a single vote, we might—I hope and pray we don't—catapult the United States to the front of the line as Iraq's greatest creditor if this amendment were to pass. Iraq would owe more to us than to France, or to Germany, or to Russia.

The Washington Post I thought captured the essence in the editorial yesterday when it said it is the equivalent of swimming out to a drowning man and handing him a 10-pound weight.

If the idea is that by in some way adding to Iraq's debt we will create an incentive for other countries to move toward debt forgiveness, I am confused. How is seizing the moral low ground advantageous in that debate? If we want others to forgive Iraqi debt, we must stop piling that debt on.

I remain utterly unconvinced by the suggestion that by adding to this burden of Iraqi debt and then tying the forgiveness of our debt to the willingness of France and Russia and Germany to relieve 90 percent of their debt, that we will leverage the desired result. France, Russia, and Germany showed no shame whatsoever in loaning their money to prop up Saddam Hussein, one of the world's most brutal dictators. Despite the abundant evidence that he used weapons of mass destruction on his own people, invaded surrounding neighbors, and tortured and mass-murdered his own people, these three nations could not find the

resolve to support the coalition's successful effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power. They will find their conscience now?

Hope does spring eternal.

This amendment purports to talk about what the Iraqi people should do to help themselves, but it offers them less help than the President proposed. This amendment purports to talk about what our allies should do, but we do not and cannot govern their actions either.

What this amendment and this debate truly speaks to is who we are as a people. Throughout history, the American people have responded again and again to the tyranny of dictators, to defend the name of freedom, to liberate the oppressed, to relieve the plight of the downtrodden. We send our soldiers to fight and to die in foreign lands. We send the hard-earned tax dollars of our citizenry to the impoverished and sick around the world.

When communism collapsed in Europe, we were there with billions of dollars in assistance to heal the wounds of tyranny.

When Israel and Egypt found the courage to negotiate peace at Camp David, we were there with billions of dollars in assistance to make it a lasting peace.

Earlier this year, we approved $15 billion to treat and care for those who suffer from HIV/AIDS. Now we stand with billions more to help the people of Iraq to stand with the free nations of the world.

Why? We help others because it is good and it is right. We do so without the expectation of gratitude because that is who we are as a people. As the beneficiaries of the blessings of liberty, we understand freedom is not free. The American people are a generous and good people. We do not sell our commitment to liberty, and we do not loan our good will to the needy.

So what are we to do with this amendment and this vote tonight? What are we to do? For me it is an easy question. We vote no. There is nothing in this amendment that will make the President's job easier or our soldiers safer. Nothing in this amendment will save the taxpayers money or ease the burden upon the people of Iraq. Others of good conscience think otherwise, and that is their right as elected representatives to this body. For those who have not decided, I ask you to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am new to the Senate. This has been a terrific debate in the best traditions of the Senate. I come to this conclusion after having listened to people I admire and respect, such as our leader, the President, the Vice President, and Secretary Powell. I asked myself: Who are you to disagree?

I thought about it, and I came to this conclusion. I do disagree. I know they are genuine in their beliefs, but I just do not believe we are being unfair to the people of Iraq. We have lost 332 lives liberating Iraq. We are spending $1 billion a week, and all we are asking for is once the country gets something going—we are going to build schools and hospitals, we are going to do great things for the Iraqi people—but once the oil refineries are fixed, because that is what makes the money, and once we do other things to get you back in business, consider helping us because we are deep in debt. We borrowed every penny of this $87 billion. And I would vote tomorrow to borrow more money to make our country safe.

We have one of the highest deficits in our Nation's history because our economy has turned down. But we have to win this war. The only way we will lose this war—here is where I am tonight—is if the American people leave. It is very hard for me to go home and explain how you have to give $20 billion to a country that is sitting on $1 trillion worth of oil and the net result of this policy we are pursuing is the people who died to liberate Iraq are going to be left holding the bag, and the only people who will get paid back are the people who lent money to Saddam Hussein. If we follow that policy, people will leave us because it is not fair to the taxpayer. We need to make sure we don't divide ourselves here at home.

This is very important, not just for international politics but for domestic politics.

The French and the Germans voted today for a resolution, but in the same breath they said they would send no troops and no money.

We are pretty much alone for a while. Let us stay together and not ask more of the American people. It would be unfair to ask.

I really do love my country. We give $15 billion in aid to Africa and we don't want a penny back. We are giving $10 billion in grants, and we don't want a penny back. But if we are going to build your infrastructure to make you prosperous, help us because we are in debt. And if other countries will do the right thing, we will even forgive that.

The biggest thing we have done for Iraq is give our young men and women, and more are going to die. That is a fact.

Tonight is important. We need to stay together and look at the American taxpayer, and say, Yes, you can be helped too. Don't feel guilty to ask for some of your money back, because you have given and you have given, and there is more to give.

Please vote for this amendment for the sake of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Who yields time?

Mr. BAYH. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 40 seconds on your side and 1 minute 40 seconds on the other side.

Mr. BAYH. I thank all the cosponsors on both sides of the aisle for their support and say to my colleagues, all of us are committed to the success in Iraq. To achieve that success we must have the help of the rest the world and the help of the Iraqi people on their own behalf.

Several arguments have been offered in opposition to our amendment. Let me address them. First, there is no government in power to take on these obligations. Really? Was Saddam Hussein in power to burden the Iraqi people with these loans? I suggest the current council has at least as much legitimacy as Saddam Hussein. If his loans were legitimate, so are the actions of the council.

It is said this is a test of our resolve. That is true. But the surest way to assure the resolve of the American people is to do what is just and fair and right. How can we possibly say to the American people the French, the Germans, and the Russians may get repaid, those who propped up Saddam Hussein, but those who paid to liberate the country receive nothing. Is that fair? That would undermine the resolve.

There is a perception this is all about the oil. That is a lie. We know it is a lie. It is a demonstrable lie. I say to my colleagues, no great power, including our country, can base its policy upon falsehoods and lies. We must base our policy upon the truth and the facts. We know why we are in Iraq.

It is also said this will undermine our effort to achieve loan forgiveness. On the contrary. This will provide an incentive for others to forgive their loan and puts us in a position of maximum leverage to insist they do. If they drag their heels and refuse, it is said we will lose control of this money. No, my friends, we include a specific provision providing Ambassador Bremer with veto power over expenditures.

Finally, this is about American leadership. We lead when we do the right thing. I ask for your support for this amendment. It will accomplish our objectives in Iraq.

Mr. STEVENS. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1876

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes evenly divided prior to the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I urge our colleagues to vote in favor of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution which urges countries that currently hold Iraqi debt that was incurred by Saddam Hussein to forgive that debt. If they do not, the Iraqi people and the Iraqi economy will suffocate.

The Congressional Research Service says there is from $95 to $153 billion

worth of debt. They cannot service that debt and grow as an economy. That debt is owned or held by Saudi Arabia. They have $25 billion. It is held by Kuwait, $15 to $27 billion; Russia, $3 to $16 billion; Japan, $3 to $7 billion; Germany, $2 to $4 billion; France, $2 to $8 billion.

We urge the countries that took debt, made loans to Saddam Hussein's regime, to forgive that debt and allow the Iraqi people and their economy to grow.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. REID. We yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—''yeas'' 98, ''nays'' 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 388 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Dole	Lott
Alexander	Domenici	Lugar
Allard	Dorgan	McCain
Allen	Durbin	McConnell
Baucus	Edwards	Mikulski
Bayh	Ensign	Miller
Bennett	Enzi	Murkowski
Biden	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Frist	Nickles
Breaux	Graham (FL)	Pryor
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Reed
Bunning	Grassley	Reid
Burns	Gregg	Roberts
Campbell	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Harkin	Santorum
Carper	Hatch	Sarbanes
Chafee	Hollings	Schumer
Chambliss	Hutchison	Sessions
Clinton	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Inouye	Smith
Coleman	Jeffords	Snowe
Collins	Johnson	Specter
Conrad	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kerry	Stevens
Corzine	Kohl	Sununu
Craig	Kyl	Talent
Crapo	Landrieu	Thomas
Daschle	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Dayton	Leahy	Warner
DeWine	Levin	Wyden
Dodd	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	Lieberman

The amendment (No. 1876) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1871

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 2 minutes evenly divided in relation to the Bayh amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Is it 1 minute a side or 2 minutes a side? I thought I had a standing order there would be 2 minutes before every vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This order says 2 minutes evenly divided.

Mr. STEVENS. I am sorry. I ask unanimous consent that it be 2 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico and 1 minute to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I only have a minute. I want you to take a trip with me. I want you to take a trip to Iraq. The first thing we are going to do is walk up to a soldier. His name is Joe Chavis. We are going to say: Hi, Joe, how are you? I see that tank of yours. It needs repairing. Hey, Joe, that electric line isn't working and those kids don't have any electricity. Which do you think we ought to do: Fix your tank or fix the electricity?

Sergeant Chavis says: Fix the electricity, Senator.

I walked down the road a little bit and I saw another soldier, a woman who was there in military uniform.

I said: Ma'am, I understand that you don't have the vests that you need to protect yourself. But I also noticed over there a schoolhouse is broken down and it needs fixing. I said: What do you need most?

She said: Fix the schoolhouse.

I did that five times. Every time the soldier said: Fix whatever it is, give them whatever it is and wait on me. I can wait.

I think you should all understand that is what is going on. If we don't do that, they will be there forever. That is why they are saying, fix the other things and don't worry so much about us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this has been a very important debate. I congratulate all who took part. This is obviously a very important and critical vote. This vote is a message to our constituents about how we feel about foreign aid. It is a message to the Iraqis about what we expect from them and what they can expect from us. It is a message to our allies about their obligations to peace in the Middle East and our willingness to meet our own.

Ultimately, this vote speaks to who we are as a nation and as a people. We won the peace. Let's win the reconstruction and democracy and freedom for the Iraqi people. I ask you to vote no on this amendment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, how much time does our side have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. BAYH. I yield 1 minute of my time to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, everything that the Senator from New Mexico asked, this amendment doesn't take away any of that. The full $20 billion stays within this amendment. The difference is, do we give it all in a grant and does that strengthen the President's hand or do we give half of it in a grant and half of it in a loan? We believe if you give half in a loan, the President's hand is strengthened on getting other countries that are owed money from the previous Saddam Hussein regime to forgive that debt. I make no apologies for the American people to say, if France, Germany, and Russia can be paid back, then we should be paid back. I hope all of the debt is forgiven. I think that is best for Iraq. But if the rest of the countries don't forgive their debt, then the American taxpayer should be paid back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it has been said that our decision tonight will determine whether America is perceived as a leader in the world. What kind of message will we send after all the dying and treasure and blood we have expended in Iraq? Can there be any doubt about American leadership and about the message we send? When we removed Saddam Hussein, America sent a message that we lead to stand for freedom—the freedom to choose your own government, the freedom to run your own economy.

Tonight, again, we lead with $72 billion free and clear in grants for the security of Iraq; further, $5 billion for the immediate reconstruction needs, free and clear to Iraq; further, $10 billion for the long-term reconstruction needs for the people of Iraq is a loan to be forgiven if the rest of the world will join us in this cause.

That is American leadership. That is the message we send. That is why we ask for your support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be a 10-minute vote. A number of Senators still hope to offer amendments tonight, and that would save us some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am compelled to object because I think there are some people who have left the building already. I inquired whether it was going to be a 10-minute vote. I asked the Parliamentarian if we had agreed, and then I told them we had not. I urge the leader to leave it the normal 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 389 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Dorgan	Leahy
Baucus	Durbin	Levin
Bayh	Edwards	Lincoln
Bingaman	Ensign	Mikulski
Boxer	Feingold	Murkowski
Breaux	Feinstein	Murray
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Nelson (FL)
Campbell	Graham (SC)	Nelson (NE)
Carper	Harkin	Pryor
Chambliss	Hollings	Reed
Clinton	Jeffords	Reid
Collins	Johnson	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Corzine	Kerry	Schumer
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
Dayton	Landrieu	Stabenow
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden

NAYS—47

Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Miller
Allen	Enzi	Nickles
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Biden	Frist	Santorum
Bond	Grassley	Sessions
Bunning	Gregg	Shelby
Burns	Hagel	Smith
Cantwell	Hatch	Specter
Chafee	Hutchison	Stevens
Cochran	Inhofe	Sununu
Coleman	Inouye	Talent
Cornyn	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner
DeWine	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	Lieberman

The amendment (No. 1871) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there will be no further votes tonight. What we plan to do now is ask Members who still have amendments to be considered to consult with us. We are prepared to accept some of them. We will have an early session of the Senate tomorrow starting at 9. We will start voting on the amendments that are still pending that have not been resolved tonight. There are still a couple of amendments that Members wish to offer tomorrow, but first we will vote on the pending amendments. So all Senators should be on notice there will be votes starting immediately in the morning. After the first vote, I shall ask that the amendments be 10 minutes each so that there will be a series of probably 19 to 20 amendments, as I count them right now, that could well be voted on before we will then take up the several amendments, two to three amendments, that Members wish to debate.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I do yield.

Mr. REID. Senator BYRD has asked me to announce that tonight we would have Senator BOXER offer an amendment. She is going to just take a couple of minutes. Senator LEAHY has an important amendment. He will take a reasonably short period of time. Senator DURBIN has an amendment. He will take a short period of time, and then Senator CORZINE and Senator LANDRIEU, in that order.

Mr. STEVENS. I am not agreeing to any order, Mr. President. We have a list of amendments. We are going to go down the list of amendments and see who is here.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I do not know then how to operate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I am perfectly ready to start considering amendments, but I am not going to have any time agreement right now on any amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have not asked for any time agreement. I am trying to help. I am trying to move this along. I personally do not care if we ever finish this bill. I am trying to work and move this bill along. I was asked to have some people offer some amendments who have a vote. I have spent probably an hour and a half getting these people lined up to offer amendments.

If we are going to finish this bill tomorrow, then we have to do it this way. Otherwise, count me out of the ball game. Somebody else can figure out how to do it.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senators are at liberty to offer their amendments as they wish tonight. We will be glad to stay as long as Senators want to offer amendments and present them to us. We are trying to work out those amendments with people who want to settle amendments first, not those who want to bring up amendments and demand a vote tomorrow. There are a bunch of Senators willing to compromise on amendments and I want to let them proceed and have them go home before the other people who want to offer amendments, argue, and then have a vote tomorrow.

I think that is a logical progress.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield. I then say to Senator BOXER, Senator LEAHY, Senator DURBIN, Senator CORZINE, and Senator LANDRIEU, go home. We will do them tomorrow.

Mr. STEVENS. That is perfectly all right with me, Mr. President. I am here until Saturday, Sunday, whatever it takes. The bill will be finished sometime before the end of this week.

To stand up and say these people are going to come first before those we have been negotiating with, we told them we will accept amendments and can handle those, I think that is wrong. So if Senators want to go home, go home. If they want to stay here and settle this bill, stay.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska still has the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska still has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, has an amendment that has been cleared on both sides. She wants to make a few remarks on that amendment. I welcome her offering that amendment at this time and discussing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I am happy to work within the system. I have a sense-of-the-Senate amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I send up a modified amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Texas is entitled to be heard. If we could have order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order. Senators engaging in conversations, please take those conversations from the Senate floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate is not in order.

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. Conversations will be taken from the floor. The Senate will come to order.

AMENDMENT NO. 1877, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I send a modified version of my amendment No. 1877 to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] proposes an amendment numbered 1877, as modified.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on reconstruction efforts in Iraq)

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2313. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A coalition of allied countries led by the United States entered Iraq on March 19, 2003, to liberate the people of Iraq from the tyrannical rule of Saddam Hussein and the Baathist party and to remove a threat to global security and stability.

(2) Achieving stability in Iraq will require substantial monetary investments to develop a secure environment and improve the physical infrastructure.

(3) A stable and prosperous Iraq is important to peace and economic development in the Middle East and elsewhere.

(4) As of October 2003, the United States has provided the majority of the personnel and financial contributions to the effort to rebuild Iraq.

(5) Congress fully supports efforts to establish a stable economic, social, and political environment in Iraq.

(6) The President is currently seeking to increase global participation in the effort to stabilize and reconstruct Iraq.

(7) While the United States should aid the people of Iraq, the participation of the people of Iraq in the reconstruction effort is essential for the success of such effort.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the President should—

(1) make every effort to increase the level of financial commitment from other nations to improve the physical, political, economic, and social infrastructure of Iraq; and

(2) seek to provide aid from the United States to Iraq in a manner that promotes economic growth in Iraq and limits the long-term cost to taxpayers in the United States.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will be brief. The sense of the Senate says we support helping Iraq as it builds a new democracy and believe we need to finish what we have started there and in Afghanistan. It is critical that this reconstruction effort have a multilateral approach, that our allies would help us in the war on terrorism, because our allies are reaping the benefits of this war on terrorism. No one will be free in the world if we lose the war on terrorism. It is essential we have all of the support we need to finish this job. So we ask the administration to continue to seek commitments during the donors conference and afterward. It encourages the President to provide aid in a way that promotes economic growth in Iraq and limits the long-term cost to our taxpayers. The President is in the best position to determine how to accomplish this, and we must support him in every way.

That is my amendment, my sense of the Senate. I hope we can support it and vote for it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared on both sides. I ask the Senate consider and adopt this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mrs. BOXER. I object to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. STEVENS. I did not ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is whether there is further debate on the amendment.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I believe this is open for debate. I want to express myself tonight. I have not said this before, but I have to tell you that the Senator from Nevada has been working so diligently with his colleagues on the other side to move along the business of this body.

He suggested that four of us who have very brief amendments be allowed to go forward—not in advance of the other side. I don't have any problem with a few people going first or alternating back and forth. But I have to say, I feel very bad about this, and I am not going to be cooperating tonight if we are not going to allow this to take on some kind of comity at this late hour where we hear from Senator HUTCHISON, who has a very good amendment, and then we go to our side, and back and forth.

I want to speak just as one Senator to say I feel bad about the way things are deteriorating tonight and I am not going to cooperate.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. REID. The Senator from California and I came to Washington together many years ago. We are very close friends. I consider Senator BOXER a sister. I appreciate her saying a few words on my behalf. But I think probably part of the blame was mine. I know the Senator from Alaska very well, and I probably would have been well advised, when he was raising his voice a little bit, for me not to raise my voice. The fact of the matter is, we both have been working on this bill for hours and days, and probably we are both a little testy. So I think there is blame to go around on both sides. I do appreciate my friend from California defending me. She has made her point, at least as confirming our friendship, and I think Senator STEVENS and I can work this out and move the bill along.

I do appreciate very much my friend from California sticking up for me as she has done tonight and has done for the last 22 years we have been together.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Can we get this amendment adopted? May we adopt the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1877), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. The procedure we had, and I told people on this side we would do, we have two amendments on this side, one amendment on that side, that have been cleared and we will let them go home. I am perfectly willing to go to anyone else who wants to talk, but as the manager of the bill we have the right to say to people: Look, if you will agree to offer these and make these changes, we will take them up right away, as soon as this vote is over. That I did, so I don't apologize to anyone.

I would like to yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will be very brief. As I look around, there is only one person on this floor who has served longer than I have and that is the Senator from Alaska. I know the difficulties—both he and I have gone back and forth, sometimes one is chairman, sometimes the other is, on different committees—how difficult it is to keep a major bill going through. I understand his concern in doing it.

The senior Senator from Nevada has done the job of being whip for our side better than anybody I have ever known who served here. There is a great deal of respect for his integrity on both sides of the aisle, as there is for the senior Senator from Alaska. I know both have been trying to work this out. I hope we would just continue that way. It is not an easy process. There are differences of opinion on a number of these amendments. But I know both the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Nevada are two of the finest people I have served with, and I hope we would allow the two of them to work, as they do so very well, and Members on both sides of the aisle would work with them and allow them to work out the schedule.

The Senator from Vermont is perfectly satisfied with that kind of arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I said I wouldn't apologize. I do apologize to my friend from Nevada if I offended him. I did not intend to offend him. He is a valuable Member of the Senate and has worked, whether in the majority or minority, assiduously to see the Senate does its work. I don't argue with that at all. I have great fondness for the Senator from Nevada.

I wish I lived in Nevada. I might even vote for him if I lived there.

I see the current occupant of the chair is laughing at that, but it is true.

The difficulty I have is I think we don't communicate well enough across this aisle in terms of the plans we each make as manager of our side on this particular bill.

Right now the Senator from Nevada has an amendment by Senator NELSON we agreed to clear. I am pleased to yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1858, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REID. I send a modification of the Nelson amendment to the desk.

Mr. President, this is an amendment offered by Senator NELSON. He has been in negotiations with the majority staff for several days now.

Mr. STEVENS. It is acceptable.

Mr. REID. I urge its adoption.

Mr. STEVENS. I urge its adoption also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1858), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 316. Of the amounts appropriated by this title, $10,000,000 shall be available only for the Family Readiness Program of the National Guard.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1867

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have the amendment for Senator WARNER, for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. EDWARDS. It has been cleared on both sides. According to my information, it is amendment No. 1867.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

That amendment is currently pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1880 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1867

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I also have a second-degree amendment to that amendment. I ask that amendment be adopted. This is the hurricane flood damage amendment. We are taking out of the bill those items which were not relevant to the bill. I send that amendment to the desk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 1880 to amendment numbered 1867.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To designate the amount designated for disaster relief provided in connection with Department of Defense infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel as an emergency requirement.)

At the end of line 8, strike ''.'' and insert the following:

'': *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress): provided further that the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes the designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in House Concurrent Resolution 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.''

Mr. STEVENS. I ask consideration of the amendment, the adoption of the amendment, and consideration of the amendment as amended.

Mr. REID. This amendment is also one that has been reviewed by the two Senators from Maryland. They both think this is good. There has been tremendous damage at the Naval Academy. This covers that also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second-degree amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1880) was agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the first-degree amendment, as amended.

Without objection, that amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1867), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 1843

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senator from California that on amendment No. 1843 we sent a notice to the Senator that we are prepared to accept that retroactive assistance meal reimbursement amendment, if she is prepared to offer it tonight. That is Senator BOXER's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay the pending amendment aside, and I call up my amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 1843.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make retroactive the relief of hospitalized members of the uniformed services from the obligation to pay for food or subsistence while hospitalized; and to provide an offset for the additional cost)

On page 20, strike lines 9 through line 12, and insert the following:

(b) Section 1075(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect as of September 11, 2001, and shall apply with respect to injuries or diseases incurred on or after that date.

(c) The amount appropriated by chapter 2 of title II under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' is hereby reduced by $1,500,000, to be derived from the amount set aside under such heading for transportation and telecommunications for the Iraqi Postal Authority for the administration of a zip code system.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, I am offering an amendment that will help service members who have been hospitalized after being wounded or becoming ill during combat or other operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and during the war on terror since September 11, 2001.

Right now, when one of our soldiers is wounded, they are evacuated to a military hospital. When whey are discharged from the hospital, they receive a bill for their hospital food. The current daily rate for those charges is $8.10.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Florida, Senator BOB GRAHAM, for offering leadership on this issue. Accepted as part of the manager's package, his amendment exempts service members who are hospitalized from combat injuries and other conditions from having to pay for their meals. His amendment addresses the problem prospectively—in the future.

My amendment supplements his—by closing the loop. It will require the Department of Defense to reimburse troops who paid for meals while hospitalized as a result of either injury or illness while in combat or training for combat since September 11, 2001.

I recently learned about a Marine staff sergeant who was injured when an Iraqi dropped a grenade in the HUMVEE he was driving. As a result of the explosion, he lost part of his food, and spent 26 days in the hospital recovering. He was then discharged to return home and to his job as a sheriff's deputy. At the same time, he was handed a bill for $210.60 for his food.

Mr. President, $210.60 may not seem like a lot of money to some of us. But to an enlisted person with a family making under $20,000 a year—this is a serious financial burden.

When service members are discharged, we should express our gratitude for their profound personal sacrifice, not hand them a bill for their hospital food.

My amendment is simple and corrects this stunning injustice. It shows our strong support for the courageous men and women who fought in Afghanistan and Iraq and have returned, wounded, ill, missing limbs, too often permanently disabled.

The price to the Government for correcting this serious affront to our service members is very, very small indeed. This amendment costs just $1.5 million, with the offset found in the account to create new zip codes in Iraq, which the House eliminated in their bill last week.

I understand the Department of Defense has recouped only $1.5 million this year for hospital meals from all hospitalized service members worldwide. We are talking about just $1.5 million from over 2 million active and reserve forces across the globe.

What I am proposing is much more limited in scope. It would only reimburse service members who have been wounded or become ill due to combat or training for combat since September 11, 2001. According to the Defense Department, approximately 2,000 service members have been injured or wounded in action in Iraq. Considerably less were injured in our operations in Afghanistan. The Defense Department says the total for both conflicts may be roughly 3,500 people.

I am talking about giving back a small amount to our troops for their extraordinary sacrifice. It would mean a great deal to the service members and military families who face extended separations, financial hardship, and sometimes serious injury.

We were very fortunate that Representative BILL YOUNG from Florida discovered that our service men and women who are in hospitals were being asked to pay for meals as they checked out of the hospital. Some of them had horrible injuries and some lost limbs. Congressman YOUNG fixed the problem, and Senator GRAHAM, working with Senator STEVENS and others, fixed the problem. But the fix has only been for the future. It has not been fixed for those who actually went to war in Afghanistan and Iraq and are getting hit with these bills.

I recently learned about a marine staff sergeant who was injured when an Iraqi dropped a grenade on a Humvee he was driving, and he lost part of his foot. He spent 26 days in a hospital. When he was discharged to return home as a sheriff's deputy, he was handed a $210.60 bill for his food. That may not seem like a lot to some, but

when you are earning approximately $20,000 a year, it is a serious financial burden.

I know we all want to fix this. What we have done in the amendment is very simple. We pay back those who served in Afghanistan and in Iraq who wound up in hospitals and were billed for their food, and we pay for it with an offset. The amendment will cost $1.5 million. We pay for it in an offset found in the account for a new ZIP Code in Iraq. I think it is very important for us to do this. It is much more important than new ZIP Codes in Iraq.

I am very hopeful that tomorrow we will have an overwhelming vote in favor of this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment, there is not.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment. The Senator from California is absolutely right. If there is a saint in this town, it is Mrs. Bill Young. She has been extremely helpful to all of the soldiers and sailors at Walter Reed and at Bethesda. Just today, she called me and told me that the admiral at Bethesda told her he is under orders to send bills for about $5,000 to several different military people who are in the hospital for reimbursement of their meals. I told my staff to notify the admiral that we had fixed it in this bill, or I would personally guarantee the payment, and not just have standard garnishing of these kids' salaries.

I commend the Senator for the amendment. We attempted to fix that in one former bill. But that bill hasn't become law. I think the bill will become law very fast.

I support the Senator's amendment and urge its adoption.

AMENDMENT NO. 1843, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Boxer amendment be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1843), as modified, is as follows:

On page 20, strike lines 9 through line 12, and insert the following:

(b) Section 1075(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect as of September 11, 2001, and shall apply with respect to injuries or diseases incurred on or after that date.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment, if I could be heard briefly.

Mr. STEVENS. Is that modification of the amendment we just agreed to the yeas and nays on? I have no objection.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from California was concerned about the modification. This had been approved by staff. She wanted to make sure everyone understood that the money she is seeking would be paid for out of existing funds rather than offset. That is the purpose of the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wonder if I could ask the Senator from Alaska this question. We will not have an offset. I have agreed not to have an offset. Is it the chairman's understanding that the $1.5 million will come from——

Mr. STEVENS. From the funds that are in the bill. Those amounts are de minimis, really. There will be no budget point of order against that.

Mrs. BOXER. And it will happen.

Mr. STEVENS. It will happen. It is in another bill also. The question is which bill gets there first.

Mrs. BOXER. This is retroactive. We took care of it prospectively. This is to actually write checks to people.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is right. Our current amendment which we have out there somewhere goes through 2004. The Senator's amendment goes back to 2001.

We are happy to accept that, but the moneys are there. It is carryover money from past years.

Mrs. BOXER. As long as I am clear on that, I am very happy. I thank everyone.

Mr. STEVENS. I congratulate the Senator. It is a good amendment.

We have no objection to Senator DASCHLE's amendment, if it is cleared by Senator BYRD.

We have that, by the way, in the managers' package. We worked it out with Senator BYRD's staff and mine. We will be happy to adopt it now, if the Senator would like to do that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told by staff that in the usual fine work of Senators REID and STEVENS there has been a slight misstep. This was already approved earlier today.

Mr. REID. Unless Senator STEVENS has something else—I know it is in order—I call up the amendment of the Senator from Vermont who has been waiting around for a while. He has a short statement to make.

Mr. STEVENS. I have no objection. I would like to confer with the Senator and Members on that side on items we believe are subject to budget points of order and give notice of that.

Mr. REID. We will do that as he is speaking.

Mr. STEVENS. Very well.

AMENDMENT NO. 1807, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I call up amendment numbered 1807 on behalf of Senators LEAHY and CHAFEE and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 1807), as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for humanitarian assistance and reconstruction of Liberia)

Beginning on page 29, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 31, line 5, and insert the following:

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''International Disaster Assistance'' for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance for Liberia, and for an additional amount for military assistance programs for Liberia for which funds were appropriated by title III of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2003 (division E of Public Law 108–7; 117 Stat. 176), $200,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds appropriated in this title under the subheading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT''.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Senators COLEMAN, DASCHLE, BIDEN, LIEBERMAN, FEINGOLD, REED of Rhode Island, and LAUTENBERG be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. CHAFEE, for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. REED, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 1807, as modified.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. This amendment addresses the humanitarian crisis in Liberia. This is a bipartisan amendment, supported by Senators CHAFEE, COLEMAN, BIDEN, LIEBERMAN, FEINGOLD, REED, LAUTENBERG, and LANDRIEU.

Anyone who has read a newspaper or watched CNN over the past couple of months knows about the tremendous suffering in Liberia today.

Three-quarters of Liberians do not have access to safe drinking water.

Three-quarters are living in poverty.

Three-quarters do not have access to acceptable sanitation.

Eighty-five percent of Liberians are unemployed.

These numbers, provided by the U.N. are absolutely appalling. To me, this is more than enough reason to act.

We have deep historical ties to its people. Presidents James Monroe and Andrew Jackson, along with some of the most notable Senators ever to serve in this body, Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, helped create the nation of Liberia. Liberia's flag is nearly identical to our own.

We have heard urgent pleas from the Liberian people for the U.S. to help.

Archbishop Michael Francis of Monrovia, wrote a letter in support of this amendment. He wrote:

[W]e are at a critical juncture where an intervention by the United States, renewing its leadership role, will greatly help to ensure the stabilization of Liberia. It is for this reason that your amendment to include $200 million in the FY 2004 Supplemental Appropriations bill to address relief and reconstruction needs in Liberia is timely and must be supported by the Senate body.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 14, 2003.

Hon. BILL FRIST,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. THOMAS DASCHLE,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER FRIST AND MINORITY LEADER DASCHLE: Thank you for your leadership on the important issues that face the African continent each day. Your important voice on many of the issues such as infectious disease, conflict resolution, human rights, and democratic transition the continent is incredibly appreciated, particularly by those of us on the ground who are working daily to affect the change necessary to bring peace, justice, and stability to our respective nations.

As you know, the on-going human rights crisis in Liberia continues to require close examination and a comprehensive response so that the country does not spiral back to the days when Liberia was governed by warlord Charles Taylor. As this transition progresses, we are at a critical juncture where an intervention by the United States, renewing its leadership role, will greatly help to ensure the stabilization of Liberia. Thus, I write to strongly urge your support for the Chafee-Leahy amendment which would include $200 million in the FY2004 Supplemental Appropriations bill to address the relief and reconstruction needs of Liberia.

Liberia has endured years of a brutal conflict. The signing of a peace agreement in Accra, Ghana, as well as the deployment of peacekeeping troops to Liberia have paved the way for the best opportunity for peace and stability in the West African nation since the onset of civil strife in 1989.

We have seen that, despite a peace accord between rebel forces and the Government of Liberia, fighting continues in our war-ravaged nation. The inability of humanitarian organizations to safely deliver aid, given grave security problems, has precipitated a large-scale humanitarian crisis in the small West African nation. U.S. Agency for International Development estimates more than 500,000 Liberians are currently internally displaced. Many internally displaced and tens of thousands of refugees who fled to Liberia from other conflicts in the region have been cut off from outside assistance. Moreover, the country's physical infrastructure is in dire straits, and the peace process in Liberia is dependent on investments from the United States, which will help provide good governance, employment, law and order, and basic social services.

In testimony before the House International Relations Committee on October 2, 2003, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Walter Kansteiner, III, agreed that at least $200 million would be needed to address humanitarian and reconstruction needs in Liberia in FY2004. He also pledged to work with the Congress to include such funding in the supplemental bill.

Senators Lincoln Chafee (R–RI) and Patrick Leahy (D–VT) have introduced a corresponding amendment to address the humanitarian and reconstruction needs of Liberia in the supplemental. The $200 million would come from funds already in the supplemental and would not raise the total amount of the bill.

Additionally these resources would assist by sending a strong, clear and unequivocal message to all the parties, expressing the United States' determination to play an active and robust role in the initiative aimed at ameliorating the Liberian crisis. I appeal to you to ensure that this funding remain consistent with our desire to avoid any rush to quick fixes and semi-solutions. Rather our collective strategy should be aimed at achieving the following strategic objectives:

1. Consolidating the cease fire and stabilizing the security situation on the ground;
2. Ensuring the demobilization of the militia and their proper reintegration into the civil society;
3. Creating a secure environment over the entire country;
4. Contributing to consolidating national unity and assisting in establishing a viable transitional government;
5. Reestablishing the necessary state structures for effective governance and ensuring that they function in a proper and durable way; and
6. Once these pre-conditions have been met, we must further assist in the preparation of free, fair, transparent, and democratic elections.

As you know, the supplemental request, as it was sent to Congress, fails to identify any resources to meet these urgent needs in Liberia. Without adding money to the 2004 supplemental, Liberia will receive no significant funding until FY2005, a full year after the outbreak of a fragile peace. I implore you, on behalf of the Liberian people, to assist us in addressing Liberia's human rights, peace building, and reconstruction needs. Without strong U.S. support, Liberia threatens to fall once more into violence and chaos, possibly becoming a haven for criminal and terrorist activity on the African continent.

The critical human rights needs of our brothers and sisters in Liberia and West Africa require your uncompromising support of the Chafee-Leahy amendment to include $200 million for humanitarian and reconstruction needs in Liberia in the FY2004 Supplemental Appropriations bill when it comes to the Senate floor.

Sincerely,
ARCHBISHOP MICHAEL KPAKALA FRANCIS.

Mr. LEAHY. Archbishop Francis is said to be the only man in Liberia that Charles Taylor feared. This is because of the archbishop's tireless criticism of Charles Taylor and his brutal regime.

If we don't move decisively to help solidify the fragile peace in Liberia, fighting could easily resume and spread throughout the region. Guess who the world will look to help solve the crisis?

The United States. More lives will have been lost, more time will have been wasted and it will be more difficult and expensive to act.

Mr. President, this amendment gives the Senate a chance to take decisive action to address the crisis in Liberia. This amendment provides $200 million in badly needed aid, and it allows the administration to determine the best way to spend these funds.

How did we arrive at this figure? Two hundred million dollars is what the Bush administration says we should spend to respond to this crisis. On October 2, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa Walter Kansteiner told the House International Relations Committee that $200 million is what the U.S. should contribute to Liberia.

In other words, this is the administration's own number.

This amendment is fully offset—it does not add one dime to the total amount of the supplemental. It also allows the administration to use these funds for virtually any purpose: humanitarian, reconstruction, or security assistance.

We have an $87 billion bill before the Senate. But there is no money in this bill designated for Liberia.

We are already involved in Liberia. The United States worked to get rid of a despicable dictator who is wanted for war crimes. We sent the Marines to Liberia. The United States has deep historical ties to Liberia. We should do the job right—not just stick a band-aid on the problem and hope it goes away.

Mr. President, it is up to Congress to show leadership on this issue.

The House has acted. It has included $100 million of international disaster assistance for Liberia and Sudan. The Senate should build on this effort. This amendment does that.

There should be no question. We should join together and pass this bipartisan amendment and help the people of Liberia. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? At the moment, there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I withhold the quorum call.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside for the purpose of Senator DURBIN offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1837

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk on Reserve pay which I will be asking to be put in the queue for a vote tomorrow. This amendment I offered 2 days ago.

I am not going to belabor the issue other than to say to my colleagues, and for the record, that what it provides is that Federal employees who are members of the Guard and Reserves who are activated would have the difference in their pay—their military pay and their Federal pay—made up by the Federal agency for which they work. This is done by State governments and private companies and local units of government. It is not done by the Federal Government.

Frankly, this amendment was offered in good faith to have the Federal Government establish the standard so that activated Guard and Reserves who are Federal employees will receive this difference.

There are 1.2 million Guard and Reserves in America. Ten percent of them are Federal employees, 14,000 are now activated, and almost half of them have seen a cut in pay. Since activation has gone for an extended period of time, I will ask that that amendment be put in the queue tomorrow.

AMENDMENT NO. 1879

Mr. President, I have another amendment, but before I send the amendment to the desk, let me describe it to my colleagues.

I offered an amendment, earlier today, on the global AIDS epidemic, an amendment which said we have made a commitment as a nation to spend $15 billion over the next 5 years to deal with this epidemic. This is an epidemic which President Bush acknowledged in his State of the Union Message and one that he has spoken of extensively here in the United States and while traveling abroad.

Unfortunately, the administration did not come up, in the first year, with $3 billion to deal with the global AIDS epidemic.

We know there is a serious need across the world to spend the funds necessary. I would say to my colleagues who might ask, ''Why would you raise the global AIDS epidemic on this emergency appropriations bill,'' consider the statement made by Secretary of State Colin Powell to the United Nations just a few weeks ago. I quote:

> AIDS is more devastating than any terrorist attack, any conflict, or any weapon of mass destruction.

The extended quote will be made a part of the RECORD. But what I would like to say to my colleagues is this: I hope—as we consider what it takes to make this a safe world for future generations, as we consider what is necessary in the Middle East and Iraq—we also consider that we are living in a world devastated by AIDS, that AIDS is an epidemic destabilizing countries, making them vulnerable to terrorist takeovers, and creating the kind of instability that guarantees the United States must pay heed.

There is a way to deal with this, and the way to do it is to keep our word.

My earlier version of this amendment was objected to by Senator STEVENS. He argued it included legislative language. We have stricken all legislative language in this amendment.

Secondly, this would not be subject to a budget point of order because the foreign operations appropriations bill has not passed, and the set-off in the amendment comes in emergency appropriations, so there is no problem with either the budget or the spend-out rate.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 1879.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

> (Purpose: To provide funds for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS)
>
> At the appropriate place, insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. (a) GLOBAL HIV/AIDS FUNDING.—For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading ''Global AIDS Initiative'' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 2004, $879,700,000.
>
> (b) OFFSET.—The total amount appropriated under title II under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' (other than the amount appropriated for Iraqi border enforcement and enhanced security communications and the amount appropriated for the establishment of an Iraqi national security force and Iraqi Defense Corps) shall be reduced by $879,700,000.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as we consider this $87 billion supplemental—and what is truly in the interest of our national security, for this generation and generations to come—these words from the Secretary of State about the impact of AIDS have special resonance: ''more devastating than any terrorist attack, any conflict, or any weapon of mass destruction.''

AIDS is fast becoming the worst plague the world has ever encountered. Already, 25 million people have been killed by the disease.

Today, another 42 million people around the world face a death sentence from AIDS because they have no access to life-saving treatment that can cost as little as a dollar a day.

As parents are dying, 14 million AIDS orphans have been left without the care and support that they need. Unless we act soon, there will be 25 million AIDS orphans by the end of the decade.

Each year the world loses a population greater than the city of Chicago because of AIDS. Yet, we know how to stop these deaths.

Keeping our promises in the fight against AIDS is in America's interest. AIDS represents not only a humanitarian crisis on a scale the world has never seen. AIDS also presents a growing security threat around the world.

Living up to the President's promises on AIDS makes good sense for our national security. It is also important for showing the world that we make good on our commitments.

As the CIA Director recently said about AIDS:

> Is this a security issue? You bet it is. With more than 40 million people infected right now, a figure that—by 2010—may reach 100 million, AIDS is building dangerous momentum in regions beyond Africa.

As the disease spreads, it unravels social structures, decimates populations and destabilizes entire nations.

The National Intelligence Council found that in five of the world's most populous nations, the number of HIV-infected people will grow to an estimated 50 to 75 million by 2010.

AIDS is particularly devastating national armies around the world that ensure stability. In South Africa, according to the Rand Institute, some military units have infection rates as high as 90 percent.

Keeping our promises on AIDS is not only the compassionate thing to do, it is the smart thing to do in terms of our national security as well.

Today, we have a change to change the course of the AIDS pandemic and strengthen our national security by providing $3 billion in the coming year.

In this State of the Union address, the President made a 5-year pledge of $15 billion to help the millions of AIDS sufferers in Africa and around the world. We must keep that pledge today.

The President has said:

> We can turn our eyes away in resignation and despair, or we can take decisive, historic action to turn the tide against this disease and give the hope of life to millions who need our help.

Unfortunately the President's budget failed to live up to the President's rhetoric. His budget fell nearly $1 billion short of the $3 billion for the coming year.

The President's shortchanging on AIDS will cost lives. The additional funding which we seek to restore today can put 1 million people on treatment and prevent 2.5 million new infections.

In July, 78 members of this body voted for sense of the Senate language calling for fully funding the $3 billion to fight AIDS this year, even if it meant exceeding the levels authorized in the budget.

The President himself said that ''we care more about results than words.

We're interested in lives saved.'' Now is our opportunity to go beyond words and fulfill the pledge that the President made in the State of the Union and that we made in July.

The amendment I am putting forward will close the gap between the rhetoric and the real needs of AIDS sufferers by fully funding the $3 billion.

This amendment will provide the $879.7 million necessary to close the gap and fully fund the $3 billion pledge made in the authorizing legislation.

It will do so by reducing the $20.3 Billion Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund in the supplemental by a pro-rata $879.7 million. This allows the administration to choose where to take the reduction—and the options are many.

For example, the supplemental contains $2.1 billion for ''oil infrastructures''—$900 million for importation of petroleum products into Iraq. Perhaps instead of spending nearly a billion dollars to import oil into Iraq, a billion dollars might be better spent treating 1 million additional people with AIDS and preventing an additional 2.5 million new infections.

The stakes could not be higher. As Majority Leader FRIST said recently:

> History will judge whether a world led by America stood by and let transpire one of the greatest destructions of human life in recorded history—or performed one of its most heroic rescues.

Instead of fulfilling this pledge, the White House is claiming that the full amount cannot be spent in the coming year. All the leading development organizations and medical authorities reject this White House claim as baseless and have said so publicly.

Last month in Roll Call, all of the leading relief and development organizations in the United States placed an ad that endorsed the fact that the full $3 billion could be well spent.

The White House is also ignoring the capacity of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and malaria—the most effective tool we have to beat AIDS. The Global Fund, Chaired by Secretary of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson, is scaling up successful programs on the ground in Africa and is working to stop the next wave of the pandemic in places such as India and it needs hundreds of millions of dollars more by this fall to fund a new round of grants.

The White House is also forgetting the extraordinary needs of AIDS orphans. According to a soon to be released report by the Earth Institute at Columbia, orphans and vulnerable children need $15 billion each year for basic health, education and community services.

The Global HIV Prevention Working Group found that AIDS prevention spending falls $3.8 billion short of what is needed by 2005. Although we can spare babies a life with AIDS for the price of a Sunday newspaper, only 5 percent of women at risk have access to medication to prevent mother-to-child transmission.

I hope today that the 78 of my colleagues who committed to fully fund the $3 billion to fight AIDS will join me in supporting this amendment. We have a unique chance to change the future and save many lives. Today, a 15-year-old boy in Botswana faces an 80 percent chance of dying of AIDS. If we act now, we can change the future for these children before it is too late.

Mr. President, at this point it is my understanding this amendment will be put in the queue with the others for consideration tomorrow. With that understanding, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 1881

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment that has been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The pending amendments are set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. NELSON of Florida, proposes an amendment numbered 1881.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

> (Purpose: To require a report on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2020)
>
> At the end of title I, add the following:
>
> SEC. 316. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:
>
> (1) The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate specified in Senate Report 107–151 to accompany S. 2514 (107th Congress) that the Chief of Naval Operations submit to the congressional defense committees a report, not later than June 2, 2003, on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2015.
>
> (2) As of October 16, 2003, the report has not been submitted.
>
> (b) REPORT ON AIRCRAFT CARRIER BASING PLANS THROUGH 2020.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2020.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been advised by the majority that this amendment has been approved on both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. It has been approved on our side for Mr. NELSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1881) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Chair would allow, we now have two amendments we would like to offer tonight and debate tonight, one by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CORZINE, and the other by the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU. And we have been told that the mother of two small babies is going to go first, Senator LANDRIEU. I will yield to her if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the courtesies. The children have been long in bed and are sound asleep before this hour. But I appreciate the courtesies extended to allow me to take a few minutes to explain this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1859

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be temporarily laid aside and call up amendment No. 1859, which is at the desk, on behalf of myself, Senator DORGAN, and Senator LEVIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is already pending.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, this is a modified amendment based on a concept that Senator DORGAN, Senator LEVIN, and others have been working on now for several weeks. It is a very important amendment to consider in terms of shaping a sustainable aid package for Iraq.

It does not address or take any money away from the $20 billion. It simply establishes a framework whereby future reconstruction efforts in Iraq could be financed through a financing mechanism using the great oil wealth of that nation. It does not, in any way, affect the immediate $20 billion which the Chair and others and I were proud to cosponsor and which was shaped and crafted over an hour ago on the Bayh amendment.

This is about the future, not the present. It does not have an effect on the $20 billion.

Within an hour or two of this time, the Senate rose to the occasion. We had a very vigorous and enlightening, at times tough, but very good debate on the way we should put out our reconstruction efforts for Iraq. The Senate is fulfilling its role, shaping foreign policy, being a partner with the executive branch, and, in my opinion, since that amendment passed, improving the original plan.

As I said when I supported the Bayh amendment, the administration's original plan, which seems to people in Louisiana and to the American people to be billions of dollars of grants often, only, and alone will not work. Not only is it not popular, it is not sustainable in our democracy. Iraq doesn't have a democracy yet, but we do. In a democracy, we have to lay down plans that not only will the leadership support but the people support. Because without the people's support, no plan that

we lay down, either at the White House or in Congress, in the House or the Senate, is sustainable over a long period of time.

Why is that important? It is important because every study that has been conducted by independent think tanks and authorities has said that the task we have undertaken in Iraq is not going to be completed in the next 6 months or 1 year or 2 years. As the Presiding Officer knows, this is at a minimum a 5 to 7-year effort. Does that mean our troops will be there for 5 to 7 years? We hope not. Does it mean all the troops there now will have to be there in that number even 2 or 3 years? The effort itself of reconstruction—helping take a country that was cruelly administered by a dictator, taking it to a vibrant democracy with democratic institutions in place, based on the history and the region we are talking about—is not going to be easy.

Yes, I think the Iraqi people want that. Yes, we will be good partners. But it is not going to be easy. It is going to take time.

The amendment we spoke about earlier tonight, and voted on by a 52 or 53-vote margin, helps to take the original plan, which was not sustainable, and turn it into something that can be sustainable over time. It targeted the grants. It was strategic. It had strong incentives for debt forgiveness, which is a crucial aspect and principle of a strong reconstruction plan. And most importantly, it put up the $20 billion right now so we can get started and build a strong foundation for a successful reconstruction plan.

This amendment I am offering tonight, and hopefully we will vote on tomorrow, is a complementary piece. It says that because Iraq has some of the richest oil reserves in the world, most people think they are the second largest resource of oil in the world, they could be the first because not all of the fields have been explored and developed. In fact, it has in some instances been barely touched.

Let me show a picture of the country. As you can see, these are the oil fields that are outlined right here in the north, in the center, right outside of Baghdad, and in the southern portion of the country. But the geologists, the industry publications believe that there is as much oil in this section of Iraq, in the southwestern section, as there is here. As you can see, there is not one designation on this map because it has been totally unexplored.

The reserves we are calculating—and they are in the hundreds of millions, billions of barrels of oil, and not even counting the gas—are well underestimated.

The point of this is that when these oil fields come back on line—and they are coming back on rather quickly with the support of the communities and with the support of American ingenuity and technology and know-how, and, by the way, that technology is improving and has improved substantially—there is going to be even more oil and gas found, thus making the possibility of future construction and renovation and reconstruction definitely possible to be refinanced with these resources.

This amendment will help to ensure that the Iraqi people themselves are benefiting from their own oil reserves. It seeks to make that point in no uncertain terms. The reconstruction of Iraq for the benefit of the people of Iraq can be done and accomplished through a financing mechanism, allowing the oil reserves, which are plentiful and quite substantial, to be used in that way.

This is not Senator LANDRIEU's idea. I didn't come up with this idea. I heard about it. I heard administration officials speaking about it. In fact, Secretary Wolfowitz said just a year ago in an interview on this subject:

> On a rough recollection, the oil revenues of that country could bring between $50 and $100 billion over the course of the next two or three years. . . . We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon.

This is what our own Secretary said. This Senate voted a few minutes ago to decide that, no, we were not going to move to this system right now. We were going to vote for this amendment that Senator BAYH and others offered. We said we would not move to the reconstruction based on the oil reserves at this time. Let's lay down the $20 billion in the way that we did it, part in a loan that could be forgiven if other debts are forgiven, part immediately for the construction. But, in the future, my amendment says that establishing this financing mechanism could match what the administration originally said they wanted to do, which, of course, makes sense not only to me but to the American people.

The American people want us to be successful in Iraq. This is their challenge. It is not something that belongs only to the leaders here in Washington or the President or the White House. The American people are giving their own sons and daughters to the effort. They are sending their own family members to the effort. They want us to come up with a plan that can make sure they are not sending them in vain. It is not just a matter of getting the troops home. As a mother, as a parent, I can appreciate and understand that if we lost a child, I would want to make sure the death was not in vain, that we actually accomplished what we set out to do.

We have to get a plan that will work. The American people know one thing that won't work, and that is asking the American people to foot the bill, 100 percent of it, with limited help, with us carrying the burden of the troops and the finances over a long period of time. What the American people think would work, and I agree with them, is to jump-start it with some grants, do everything we can to make other nations relieve the debt, and then, over the long run, establish a financing mechanism that the country of Iraq can themselves begin the reconstruction. And let me just say that it is not often that the administration agrees with the U.N. or that the U.N. agrees with the administration. We have been trying to find common ground now for months. The U.N. thinks one way and this administration thinks a different way, so they cannot get together.

Let me tell you one thing they agree on. This is U.N. Security Council Resolution 1483 that lifted sanctions on Iraq right after we were successful in the war. Summarizing, it says the U.N. itself says the oil resources in Iraq should not be used to pay down debt owed to other countries. It should not be, basically, given away to anyone. But what should it be used for? The U.N. said it should be used for the reconstruction of Iraq. So the U.N. and members of the administration, including the Vice President—and I will show you what the Vice President said just a few months ago, in March. He said in answer to Tim Russert on one of the talk shows:

> In Iraq you've got a nation that's got the second largest oil reserves in the world, second only to Saudi Arabia. It will generate billions of dollars a year in cash flow if they get back to their production of roughly 3 million barrels of oil a day, and in the relatively near future.

He is saying, no, we are not going to have to pick up the $100 billion, which is estimated; the Iraqis have that ability to do so themselves. Mr. President, this is something the U.N. supports. It is something the administration told the American people would be part of the reconstruction effort. Now we are finding, for some reason, a tremendous amount of resistance to this. It is hard to understand, and so that is why I am putting forth this amendment, which has been modified.

It doesn't try to substitute the financing mechanisms for any part of the $20 billion. It says in the future, after we have allocated this $20 billion, it is the sense of the Senate that the future reconstruction could be paid for using the Iraqi resources, which are plentiful—oil and gas.

Let me make one other point. I know my time is almost up. A lot has been said about the Marshall plan. One of the principles of the Marshall plan, one of the foundations on which the Marshall plan rested was the fact that Germany had more coal reserves than any country in Europe, and that because Germany was rich in coal, in natural resources, the U.S. plan that was fashioned in a way that was sustainable over a long period of time and could be based on the riches and resources of that coal was not to take it from Germany but to help Germany use its resources to rebuild itself, to establish peace and prosperity for itself and its neighbors.

So I don't have any reason to understand or know why the same administration that would say this is the way

we should proceed is now objecting to even outlining a possibility to use these resources, not for the people of the United States, not for the people of Europe, but for the Iraqis themselves. So that is the essence of the amendment that Senator DORGAN and Senator LEVIN and I have sent to the desk and asked for the Senate to consider. Hopefully, we will have a vote tomorrow.

To summarize briefly, the most important thing that we need to do is to, together with the President and the Congress and in partnership with the American people, right now, today, tonight, tomorrow, fashion a reconstruction plan that brings our troops home safely, minimizes the loss of life, and actually achieves our objectives.

A tremendous amount is riding on America's reputation, our position in the world, our pride, our word. It is resting on how well we do this. We have to have a plan that will work. What will work in the long run is unleashing the tremendous wealth of that nation, not for anybody else but for themselves, to fashion a plan that is good for the people of Iraq and for the American taxpayers who have already sacrificed a great deal in terms of treasure, life, and American blood—to come up with a plan that works for both countries and actually has a chance of working, so that this long-range strategy of peace in the Mideast we could actually accomplish.

So we offer this in good faith. I am sorry the other side has not yet accepted this amendment, so we are going to have to vote on it tomorrow. I hope that perhaps overnight, through the early hours of the morning, we can consider the great benefit of establishing such a financing mechanism and, that way, we will send the right signal to the Iraqi people that America is there to stay; that we have a plan that we can sustain in partnership with them using our strength and our technology and our ingenuity, their natural resources, to accomplish what their leaders have not been able to accomplish for them and which they tried to take from them.

Saddam Hussein took the oil revenues and used it for himself and his family, to build palaces. I know a little bit about this because I come from a State where the oil revenues are not always used on behalf of the people. I am very familiar with what happens when leaders take the public's resources and use it for their own benefit and not the people's: Children don't read, they don't go to college, hospitals are not built, roads stay gravel, highways don't get built, and jobs are not created. I know about that. I am saying this as passionately as I can to try to explain this. The people of Iraq need help with unleashig these resources for themselves, and setting up this financing mechanism is one of the best things we can do for them. It sends the right signal, and I am positive the American people would think that this makes a lot of sense, it makes common sense. Instead of asking us to bring the troops home, or we cannot sustain it, they might say: Senator, we can do this, we can help and be there for as long as it takes because it is important for America to be successful.

That is the essence of the amendment. I thank my colleagues. The hour is late. I know others have to offer amendments. I thank the leader from Nevada. This will be in line for a vote tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to allow Senator CORZINE to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1882

(Purpose: To establish a National Commission on the Development and Use of Intelligence Related to Iraq.)

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, in a few minutes I will be sending an amendment to the desk. This amendment calls for a bipartisan commission to study the development and use of intelligence related to Iraq. The mission would examine several key issues, including intelligence related to the following questions: Whether Iraq possessed chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons; whether Iraq had a link to al-Qaida; whether they attempted to acquire uranium in Africa; whether Iraq attempted to procure aluminum tubes for the development of nuclear weapons; whether Iraq possessed mobile laboratories for the production of weapons of mass destruction; whether Iraq possessed delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, this is the same amendment I offered in July. At that time, 45 Senators joined in the effort to establish an independent commission, reflecting broad public concern about the potential misuse of intelligence information leading up to the war.

Since then, however, additional troubling information has come out and these concerns have grown considerably in many people's minds. These concerns also have grown in the context of a larger intelligence shortcoming. One need only look at our failure thus far to find Osama bin Laden or Saddam Hussein, to know that we have a long way to go to ensure that our intelligence capacities are as strong as they can be.

Time after time we have seen news stories about the administration's selective use of intelligence. Just last night, it was reported in a very troubling report on ''60 Minutes II'' that a former aide to Secretary of State Powell, Greg Thielmann, a senior career State Department official, made serious charges against the Secretary and the administration.

According to Mr. Thielmann, at the time of Secretary Powell's dramatic prewar presentation to the United Nations, Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability was so weak that it posed no threat to the United States and little threat even to its immediate neighbors.

According to Mr. Thielmann, the administration adopted a ''faith-based approach to intelligence.'' He went on to say:

> They knew what they wanted the intelligence to show. They were really blind and deaf to any kind of countervailing information the intelligence community would produce.

I have a full transcript of that interview which I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From 60 Minutes II, Oct. 15, 2003]

THE MAN WHO KNEW; FORMER POWELL CHIEF OF INTELLIGENCE AND OTHERS DISAGREE WITH EVIDENCE PRESENTED TO UN FOR WAR IN IRAQ

SCOTT PELLEY (co-host). In the run-up to the war in Iraq, one moment seemed to be a turning point: the day Secretary of State Colin Powell went to the United Nations to make the case for the invasion. Millions of us watched as he laid out the evidence and reached a damning conclusion: that Saddam Hussein was in possession of weapons of mass destruction. But the man you will hear from tonight says that key evidence in that speech was misrepresented and the public was deceived. Greg Thielmann should know. He had been Powell's own chief of intelligence when it came to Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

When you saw Secretary of State Powell make his presentation to the United Nations, what did you think?

Mr. GREG THIELMANN. I had a couple of initial reactions. Then I had a—a more mature reaction. I—I think my conclusion now is that it's probably one of the low points in his long and distinguished service to the nation.

PELLEY. At the end of the speech, the United Nations and the American people had been misinformed, in your opinion?

Mr. THIELMANN. I think so.

PELLEY. Greg Thielmann was a foreign service officer for 25 years. His last job at the State Department was acting director of the Office of Strategic Proliferation and Military Affairs, responsible for analyzing the Iraqi weapons threat for Secretary Powell.

You and your staff had the highest security clearances.

Mr. THIELMANN. That's right.

PELLEY. And you saw virtually everything.

Mr. THIELMANN. That's right.

PELLEY. Whether it came in to the CIA or the Defense Department, it all came through your office sooner or later.

Mr. THEILMANN. That's right, yes.

PELLEY. Thielmann was admired at State. One high-ranking official called him ''honorable, knowledgeable, very experienced.'' Thielmann took a long-planned retirement four months before Powell's big moment at the UN. February 5th was the day the world was waiting for: Secretary Powell would reveal evidence against Saddam. The speech represented a change in Powell's thinking. Before 9/11, he said that Saddam had not developed any significant capability in weapons of mass destruction. But now, two years later, he warned that Saddam had stockpiled those very weapons.

Sec. COLIN POWELL (State Department). (From UN Speech) The gravity of this moment is matched by the gravity of the threat that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction pose to the world.

PELLEY. Do you believe that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States of America at the point we went to war?

Mr. THIELMANN. No. I—I think it didn't even constitute an imminent threat to its neighbors at the time we went to war.

PELLEY. Theilmann says that's what the intelligence really showed. For example, he points to the evidence behind Powell's charge that Iraq was importing these aluminum tubes to use in a program to build nuclear weapons.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) Saddam Hussein is determined to get his hands on a nuclear bomb. He is so determined that he's made repeated covert attempts to acquire high-specification aluminum tubes from 11 different countries, even after inspections resumed.

Mr. THIELMANN. This is one of the most disturbing parts of Secretary Powell's speech for us.

PELLEY. The tubes were intercepted by intelligence agents in 2001. The CIA said that they were parts for a centrifuge to enrich uranium, fuel for an atom bomb. But Thielmann wasn't so sure. Experts at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the scientists who enriched uranium for American bombs, advised that the tubes were all wrong for a bomb program. At about the same time, Thielmann's office was working on another explanation. It turned out the tubes' dimensions perfectly matched an Iraqi conventional rocket.

Mr. THIELMANN. The aluminum was e—exactly, I think, what the Iraqis wanted for artillery.

PELLEY. And you sent that word up to the secretary of State——

Mr. THIELMANN. That's right.

PELLEY. Many months before.

Mr. THIELMANN. That's right.

Mr. HOUSTON WOOD: You'll see where it intersects. This is the velocity.

PELLEY. Houston Wood was a consultant who worked on the Oak Ridge analysis of the tubes. He watched Powell's speech, too.

When you saw the presentation in full wi—with regard to the aluminum tubes, what were you thinking?

Mr. WOOD. I guess I was angry. I think that's probably the best emotion that I—best way to describe my emotions. I was angry at that.

PELLEY. Wood is among the world's authorities on uranium enrichment by centrifuge. He found that the tubes couldn't be what the CIA thought they were. They were too heavy, three times too thick and certain to leak.

Mr. WOOD. It wasn't going to work. No, they would—they would have failed.

PELLEY. Wood reached that conclusion back in 2001. Thielmann reported to Secretary Powell's office that he was confident the tubes were not for a nuclear program. Then about a year later, when the administration was building a case for war, the tubes were resurrected on the front page of The New York Times.

Mr. WOOD. I thought when I read that, ''There must be some other tubes that people were talking about.'' I—I just wa—was flabbergasted that people were still pushing that those might be centrifuges.

PELLEY. Flabbergasted?

Mr. WOOD. Yeah. Yeah. So it just didn't—it didn't make any sense to me.

PELLEY. The New York Times reported that senior administration officials insisted the tubes were for an atom bomb program.

Was it clear to you that science wasn't pushing this forward?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. That's a very good way to put it. Science was not pushing this forward. Scientists had made their evaluation and made their determination, and now we didn't know what was happening.

PELLEY. In his UN speech, Secretary Powell acknowledged there was disagreement about the tubes, but he said most experts agreed with the nuclear theory.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) There is controversy about what these tubes are for. Most US experts think they are intended to serve as rotors in centrifuges used to enrich uranium.

Mr. WOOD. Most experts are located in Oak Ridge, and that was not the position there.

PELLEY. Do you know one in academia, in government, in a foreign country who disagrees with your appraisal, who says, ''Yes, these are for nuclear weapons?''

Mr. WOOD. I don't know a single one anywhere.

PELLEY. Greg Thielmann says the nuclear case was filled with half-truths.

If the secretary took the information that his own intelligence bureau had developed and turned it on its head, which is what you're saying, to what end?

Mr. THIELMANN. I can only assume that he was doing it to loyally support the president of the United States and build the strongest possible case for arguing that there was no alternative to the use of military force.

PELLEY. That was a case the president himself was making only eight days before Secretary Powell's speech, but the argument in the State of the Union address turned out to be too strong.

President GEORGE W. BUSH. From State of the Union) The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.

PELLEY. After the war, the White House said the African uranium claim was false and shouldn't have been in the president's address, but at the time, it was part of a campaign that painted the intelligence as irrefutable.

Vice President DICK CHENEY. There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt that he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies and against us.

PELLEY. But if there was no doubt in public, Greg Thielmann says there was plenty of doubt in the intelligence community. He says the administration took murky information out of the gray area and made it black and white.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) My colleagues, every statement I make today is backed up by sources—solid sources. These are not assertions. What we're giving you are facts and conclusions based on solid intelligence.

PELLEY. Solid intelligence, Powell said, that proved Saddam had amassed chemical and biological weapons.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) Our conservative estimate is that Iraq today has a stockpile of between 100 and 500 tons of chemical weapons agent. That is enough agent to fill 16,000 battlefield rockets.

PELLEY. And part of that stockpile, he said, was clearly in these bunkers.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) The four that are in red squares represent active chemical munitions bunkers. How do I know that? How can I say that? Let me give you a closer look.

PELLEY. Up close, Powell said, you could see a truck used for cleaning up chemical spills, a signature, he called it, for a chemical bunker.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) It's a decontamination vehicle in case something goes wrong.

Mr. THIELMANN. My understanding is that these particular vehicles were simply fire trucks that you cannot really describe as being a unique signature.

PELLEY. Satellite photos were notoriously misleading, according to Steve Allinson. He was a UN inspector in Iraq in the months leading up to the war.

Was there ever a time, in your experience, that American satellite intelligence provided you with something that was truly useful?

Mr. STEVE ALLINSON. No, n—no, not to me, not on—not on inspections that I participated in.

PELLEY. Not once?

Mr. ALLINSON. No.

PELLEY. Ever?

Mr. ALLINSON. No.

PELLEY. Allinson had been sent to find decontamination vehicles that turned out to be fire trucks. And another time a satellite spotted what they thought were trucks used for moving biological weapons.

Mr. ALLINSON. We were told that we were going to the site to look for refrigerated trucks specifically linked to biological agents.

PELLEY. And you found the trucks?

Mr. ALLINSON. We did. We found about seven or eight of them, I think, in total. And they were—they had cobwebs in them. Some samples were taken, and nothing was found.

PELLEY. Steve Allinson watched Powell's speech in Iraq with a dozen other UN inspectors. There was great anticipation in the room, something like waiting for the Super Bowl. They always suspected that the U.S. was holding back its most damning evidence for this moment.

And as you watched the speech unfold, what was the reaction among the inspectors?

Mr. ALLINSON. Various people would laugh at various times because the information he was presenting was just—you know, it didn't mean anything. It had—had no meaning.

PELLEY. When the secretary thanked everyone for listening and had finished the speech, you and the other inspectors turned to each other and said what?

Mr. ALLINSON. ''They have nothing.''

PELLEY. If Allinson doubted the satellite evidence, Thielmann watched with worry as Secretary Powell told the Security Council that human intelligence provided conclusive proof. Thielmann says that many of the human sources were defectors who came forward with an ax to grind.

Give me some sense of how reliable the defector information was across the board. You got bad information—What?—rarely?

Mr. THEILMANN. I guess I would say frequently we got bad information.

PELLEY. Some of it came from defectors supplied by the Iraqi National Congress, the leading exile group headed by Ahmed Chalabi.

Mr. THEILMANN. You had the Iraqi National Congress with a clear motive for presenting the worst possible picture of what was happening in Iraq to the American government.

PELLEY. That may have been the case with this man. Adnan Sayeed Haideiri was provided by the Iraqi National Congress to the US Government, the New York Times, and he appeared on CBS News. Haideiri said he was a civil engineer and he claimed to have visited many secret weapon production sites. The government thought he was so valuable they put him in a witness protection program, and the White House listed him first in its Web page on Iraqi weapons.

Mr. DAVID ALBRIGHT. He was, basically, an epoxy painter.

PELLEY. David Albright is a physicist who has investigated defectors for his work with the UN. He studied a transcript of Haideiri's claims.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Well, if you read a transcript of an interview that he went through, he has no knowledge of—of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons.

PELLEY. Based on Haideiri's statement, did UN inspectors go in and try to follow up on what he said?

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Certainly.

PELLEY. And what did they find from Haidieri's information?

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Nothing.

PELLEY. There was a good deal more in Secretary Powell's speech that bothered the analysts. For example, Powell claimed that Saddam still had a few dozen Scud missiles.

Mr. THIELMANN. I wondered what he was talking about. We did not have evidence that the Iraqis had those missiles, pure and simple.

PELLEY. Powell warned that empty chemical warheads found recently by the UN could be the 'tip of the iceberg.'

Mr. ALLINSON. They were shells that were left over from the Gulf War or pri—prior to the Gulf War from their past program.

PELLEY. Powell did make several points that day that turned out to be right. Among them, he was right when he said Iraqi labs were removing computer hard drives, he was right that Iraq had drawings for a new long-range missile, and he was right about Saddam's murder of thousands of Iraqi citizens. But an interim report by coalition inspectors say, ''So far there is no evidence of a uranium enrichment program, no chemical weapons, no biological weapons, no Scud missiles.'' The State Department told us Secretary Powell would not be available for an interview, but earlier this month, he said the jury on Iraqi is still out.

Sec. POWELL. And so I think one has to look at the whole report. Have we found a factory or a—a plant or a warehouse full of chemical rounds? No, not yet.

PELLEY. Powell added that Iraq was a danger to the world. He said, ''How clear and present a danger it was, people can judge.'' As for Greg Thielmann, he told us he's a reluctant witness. He ways the president's address worried him because he knew the African uranium story was false. And he watched Secretary Powell's speech with disappointment because, up until then, he said, he'd seen Powell bringing what he called ''reason'' to the administration's inner circle. Today, Thielmann believes the decision to go to war was made, and the intelligence was interpreted to fit that conclusion.

Mr. THIELMANN. There's plenty of blame to go around. But the main problem was the senior administration officials have what I've called faith-based intelligence. They know what they wanted the intelligence to show. They were really blind and deaf to any kind of countervailing information the intelligence community would produce. So I would a—I would assign some blame to the intelligence community and most of the blame to the senior administration officials.

PELLEY. The administration wants to spend several hundred millions dollars more to continue the search for evidence.

Mr. CORZINE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the administration's own search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq has borne out the concerns that Mr. Thielmann and others held. After months of searching throughout the country, inspectors still have not found any evidence of such weapons. Several times the administration tried to claim that such evidence had, in fact, been found. But each time the claims have proven empty.

Recently heard again from David Kay, the man leading the CIA's search, that no chemical or biological weapons have been found to date and that Iraq's alleged nuclear program—the one that administration officials regularly raised when discussing the specter of a mushroom cloud—was only at ''the very most rudimentary stage.''

Let me give a couple examples of other claims that may have been intentionally misleading.

Last September, President Bush, surrounded by Members of Congress in the White House Rose Garden, claimed that Iraq could launch a chemical or biological strike within 45 minutes. White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer cited this capability as the elusive ''smoking gun'' when it first came to light. Just 2 weeks later, Congress gave the President authority to go to war in Iraq. Yet this claim, the strongest evidence that Iraq represented an imminent threat, was dropped after the administration consulted with the CIA.

One has to ask: Why wasn't that consultation done with the CIA before making the claim and before Congress used the information in deliberations about the war resolution?

Similarly, President Bush and his top advisers repeatedly asserted Saddam and al-Qaida had a strong relationship. On September 25, 2002, President Bush said:

> You can't distinguish between al-Qaida and Saddam.

The implication was clear: There was a connection between Saddam and the terrorist attacks of September 11.

Only in the last month, after the Vice President repeated a similar assertion strongly disputed by the press and security analysts, did the President admit no such connection existed.

It is now clear that the administration has either been grossly wrong in its interpretation of intelligence or has intentionally misused the intelligence produced by the community.

When I offered this amendment in July, we were focused on a particular assertion that was made in the January State of the Union Address. That is:

> The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

At the time, there was a flurry of press interests in these words, though lately that seems to have largely been forgotten. The power of the President's allegation in those words is difficult to overstate. The Bush administration used legalistic language apparently intended to lead people to believe that Saddam Hussein had a nuclear program. The President didn't say the British were claiming anything. He didn't say they alleged anything. He said they learned Saddam was attempting to buy uranium, implicitly accepting the charge as fact.

Although just 16 words, it was a powerful statement that resonated throughout the Nation and the world. It became a key argument in the case of immediate use of force in Iraq. Only after many months did we learn the statement was based on information that the CIA had repeatedly flagged the White House as inaccurate.

We didn't learn about this from the administration. We learned about it from the International Atomic Energy Agency and the media. Only later did the administration spokesperson and the President admit the statement was inappropriate for the State of the Union Address. The administration has yet to fully explain how it got there.

Instead, the administration has turned on those who have reported the truth. Recently, unknown senior administration officials publicly disclosed the name of a covert CIA operative apparently in retaliation for public statements by the operative's spouse that contradicted the administration's claims about Iraqi attempts to obtain uranium from Niger.

This wasn't just any operative. It was one of the CIA's elite intelligence officers, a nonofficial cover agent. Releasing the agent's name was a betrayal of intelligence apparatus for political purposes, which has likely harmed our national security and has only contributed to a sense among many that the administration is uninterested in protecting the integrity and objectivity of our intelligence operations.

In this case, the administration continues to resist efforts to appoint a special counsel to investigate this criminal act.

Nor has this been the only example of opposition to independent, nonpartisan reviews on national security matters. The administration also seems unwilling to openly share information with the commission established by Congress to investigate the events of September 11. The commission was established on a bipartisan basis. It is charged not only with investigating the events leading up to 9/11 but with producing recommendations to prevent future terrorist attacks.

Their mission is critical. I can tell you as a Senator who comes from a State where 693 people died on September 11—10 in my hometown—this is a serious investigation and review of the failures that led to 9/11. Yet, according to recent statements by several commission members, the administration has been stonewalling. Too many of their requests are being ignored. Too much evidence is being withheld. And the commission has been frustrated in its efforts to get the information it needs to do the job.

Again, just yesterday, the commission was forced to issue subpoenas to officials at the FAA for documents that the administration should have been handing over voluntarily. By the way, this was not the CIA, not the Pentagon, but the FAA.

The question of accurate intelligence is central to Congress's ability to make decisions about national security. It is especially important now that the Bush administration has endorsed a doctrine of preemptive war, a doctrine the administration reiterated today preceding its trip to the Far East.

As we confront ongoing threats to U.S. interests, particularly with regard to weapons of mass destruction, we must be sure that what we are told is true.

Last October, for example, during the Iraqi debate, Secretary James Kelly was in Pyongyang meeting with the North Koreans. At that meeting—a meeting that occurred a full week prior to the Senate vote on the resolution authorizing force in Iraq—the North Koreans admitted to Mr. Kelly that they had an active nuclear program. Yet despite the importance of such information from the North Koreans, admitting a nuclear weapons program, and its relevance to debate regarding Iraq and America's national security posture generally, administration officials waited until after Congress had voted on the resolution to authorize the use of force before revealing the details of the North Korean disclosure to most Members of Congress and certainly the American people.

As I see it, that information was both relevant and timely to the debate on whether to go to war in Iraq. What should have our priorities been? What was the information that should have been factored in when we made that judgment?

Was the information withheld because it might affect Congress's debate on the war resolution? I cannot be sure. But the American people have a right to know.

While matters such as these may be beyond the scope of the commission I am proposing, a thorough review of intelligence questions related to Iraq is necessary if we are to successfully address other threats and we are to have credibility and confidence in those judgments—including North Korea, Iran, and other rogue states and international terrorist networks.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I hope some of those who initially opposed it will see that the time has come for a thorough, independent, nonpartisan review, structured so there would not be any partisan bias. David Kay's report finding no weapons of mass destruction after a 6-month search, the statements from former administration insiders charging that intelligence was misused, a willingness of administration officials to retaliate against one such insider by revealing the identity of a key CIA operative, the administration's refusal to appoint a special counsel to investigate the crime, the administration's failure to cooperate fully with the commission investigating the 9/11 terrorist attacks, all highlight the need for an independent, nonpartisan commission to examine what are already acknowledged deficiencies in how intelligence related to Iraq was presented to the American people prior to the war.

The goal of this commission is not to assign blame. The goal is to understand what happened and then use those findings to recommend improvements in our intelligence operations and make certain intelligence is used for policy formulation, not policy justification.

I say to my colleagues, why would anybody be afraid to let an independent commission find the truth? If the administration was acting in good faith, they should want the facts to come out. If there were systemic problems in our intelligence establishment, its relationship with the White House, we all have an interest in identifying them and correcting them. The commission would not prejudge anything. It would simply provide a mechanism to find the truth and bring it to light.

Again I hope my colleagues will support this amendment. In the end, the safety and security of the American people are at stake and so, by the way, is the safety and protection of our men and women in uniform. They deserve unbiased, nonpolitical, actionable intelligence to be able to do their job and do it well. Just as much as they need financial support, just as much as they need the support of all of America, they need to have unbiased, nonpolitical intelligence to do their job.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I can offer this amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CORZINE] proposes an amendment numbered 1882.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. CORZINE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 1848 WITHDRAWN

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1848 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1834

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent my notice of reconsideration on amendment No. 1834 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for a voice vote of the Reed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator referring to amendment 1834, the Reed of Rhode Island amendment?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 1834.

The amendment (No. 1834) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, in amendment No. 1834 the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, raises a number of good points about our global commitments, especially those in Iraq. The increased operational tempo is straining the Army, the National Guard, and the Reserves. We do run the risk of hurting recruitment and retention in both the Active and Reserve component. We are committing our troops to such an extent that we may not be able to sustain all of those commitments indefinitely. I am greatly concerned about these and other issues raised by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. However, I do not agree that increasing the end strength of the Army is the answer to these problems.

The increase in end strength does not necessarily solve our immediate problem of overextended troops. It will take years to get the 10,000 soldiers recruited, trained, equipped, and deployed. We need solutions now. We need more foreign troops in Iraq and we need to work with the international community toward that goal. We also need to work with our allies to fight against terrorism with more than just military might. Most importantly, we need to refocus ourselves on the fight against terrorism instead of diverting our focus to ideologically driven wars of our choosing.

Furthermore, according to rough estimates done by the CBO, increasing the end strength of the Army by 10,0000 will cost $409 million this year. Senator REED's amendment fully offsets that amount. However, the following year the cost of this end strength increase will jump to over $800 million a year, and it will continue to grow. By passing this amendment, we will either be locking in an increase in Department of Defense spending of over $800 million a year or asking the Army and/or the other military services to simply absorb that cost. Neither option seems good to me.

But the Senator from Rhode Island was right to bring this debate to the Senate. I agree with my colleague that the important issues he raised must be dealt with expeditiously and I look forward to working with him to address these problems.

AMENDMENT NO. 1852

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate amendment No. 1852.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. STEVENS. This is the Feingold military family leave amendment. I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1852) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m. this morning, the Senate proceed to a series of consecutive votes in relation to the following amendments; further, that there be no amendments in order to the amendments in the below stacked sequence prior to the votes, with 2 minutes equally divided before each vote, and that each vote in sequence after the first be limited to 10 minutes. The stacked sequence is: the Durbin amendment No. 1837, the Daschle amendment No. 1854, the Landrieu amendment No. 1859, the Boxer amendment No. 1843, the Leahy amendment No. 1807, and the Durbin amendment No. 1879.

I further ask unanimous consent that other than the above mentioned amendments, the only other amendments in order to the bill be the following, and they be subject to second-degree amendments that will be relevant to the first-degree amendment to which they are offered: Byrd amendment No. 1819; Corzine amendment No. 1882; Bond amendment No. 1825; Domenici amendment No. 1864; Senator BROWNBACK is to offer an amendment relative to rescission; Senator COLLINS will have an opportunity to offer an amendment relative to loans; Senator MCCONNELL, a sense of the Senate on troops; Senator SPECTER on loans; Senator BYRD, the remaining amendments on his list; Senator DORGAN, an amendment related to Iraqi oil; Senators BOXER and SCHUMER, shoulder-fired weapons; Senator DASCHLE, a relevant amendment; Senator FRIST, a relevant amendment; myself, a relevant amendment; Senator MCCONNELL, a relevant amendment; and Senator REID, a relevant amendment.

I further ask unanimous consent that budget points of order not be waived by virtue of this agreement and that no other points of order lie against any pending amendments at this time.

I state, as an explanation, that the order of the nonstacked amendments will be determined by when people arrive and they are called up. That second part is not a list of order in which they will necessarily be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, we were just notified by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, that he would prefer to have his amendment taken out of the stacked list and brought down to the second group in order for additional debate on the amendment. But we expect it is possible that something could be worked out. So I ask that modification be made in the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. STEVENS. That is acceptable to us, and we will be pleased to move amendment No. 1807 to be just prior to the Byrd amendment No. 1819. As I said, the amendments on the second list are not in any order of sequence.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, to clarify, we would like it to follow the Byrd amendment, not precede it.

Mr. STEVENS. That is not in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I stand today in support of the President's supplemental appropriations request. This request primarily funds ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, but it also provides reconstruction assistance to both of those countries, so that fundamental economic and civic infrastructure can be rebuilt. We must all recognize that providing for the initial reconstruction of the infrastructure is a practical requirement for us to succeed in the establishing the stability necessary—in both of those countries—before we can begin to withdraw our military forces.

I have not heard anyone here speak of a military failure in either Iraq or Afghanistan, but I have heard a great deal of speculation that we are failing to win the peace. It is not accurate to make this assertion. But I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the chances of winning a sustainable peace are directly related to the support we give this request before us.

We cannot support our troops, our mission, and our goal of a peaceful and stable Iraq without providing the funding necessary to achieve these goals, and providing that funding now.

For this reason, I would think—I would hope—that this request would receive unanimous support from my colleagues. I regret to see that this will not be the case. As best as I can understand, this is because many of my colleagues in the other party have declared the President's policy a failure. We have won the war, we seem to agree, but the peace is being lost.

As I review the many reports I receive on the situation in Iraq, I do not think we can declare that the peace is being lost. Yet I do not think we can rest assured that security has been achieved.

The President has a plan, and every Member in this body has had a chance to review the plan. I have heard the declarations of failure, but I have heard no alternatives to the detailed plan that the President has provided us. What do our opponents propose to do instead? The President's critics are silent here.

It is both unfair and unrealistic to take the reports of bombings and deaths coming out of Iraq and declare that our plan has failed. The President never said that it would be easy. Nobody in this body had reason to believe that it would be.

The President and our military had a brilliant battle plan. And we had the best post-conflict plans available, considering the dearth of analysis we had from inside this Arab Stalinist state. Would I have been pleased to have had more political intelligence on what was going on inside Iraq? Would I have been pleased to have a better assessment of the level of decay of Iraq's economic infrastructure? Of course. There is not a military planner in the history of mankind that has not, in retrospect, wished for better intelligence prior to a conflict. We always wish we had better intelligence.

But those questions should not be the basis for criticizing an ongoing policy. We are in Iraq. We must, as our critics agree, win the peace. And we do not have time to waste.

Some of the opponents of the President have criticized him for altering his policy during this occupation, as if altering a policy based on changing circumstances—or simply as a result of a better understanding of a fluid environment—should be seen as an admission of failure. I ask anyone here: What great undertaking occurs without changes in plan? Is it a sign of failure to shape your plans according to new discoveries, changes in the situation, and a shifting context? Of course, the answer is no.

Today, fewer than 6 months after the conclusion of major military operations in Iraq, the security situation is still dangerous. We are losing precious American lives every week, and we are suffering injuries every day. I see no good reason to downplay this grim reality, in this debate or anywhere else.

But the situation is far from dire: Iraqis, by almost all measure, are thankful for their liberation from the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. Few, very few, declare their wish to return to his dungeon state.

Instead, as we have heard from administration sources in the past weeks, more than 70,000 Iraqis are presently serving in police, border patrol, facilities protection and civil defense positions. Fewer than 6 months after the conclusion of the Coalition's major military operations, Iraqis are serving side by side with coalition forces, and they have already conducted thousands of joint patrols with our forces.

Their enemies are our enemies: The criminal Saddamite resistance and the international jihadists, the terrorist brethren of Osama bin Laden.

No one can argue that Iraq has currently become calling ground for terrorists. That presents us with a great

challenge, and an immediate security threat. We knew this was a possibility before we invaded Iraq. Saddam Hussein had long associated with almost all of the known terror organizations through the last decades, including, beginning in the 1990s, with Osama bin Laden and his associates.

I, for one, was not surprised when bin Laden called his followers to Iraq prior to our invasion. I was not surprised for a number of reasons, beginning with the reports we read through the years about bin Laden's associations with Saddam's Iraq.

But another reason I have not been surprised to see al-Qaida join the Saddamite resistance is that I have never believed al-Qaida is about ideology, religious or otherwise. I believe bin Laden seeks power, and he has hijacked his religion for his attempts to gain power. Bin Laden's use of religion as ideological appeal is as sincere as Saddam's use of Arab socialism, in the guise of Ba'athism. Both are about gaining and holding dictatorial power—for personal ends. And the joining of forces of bin Laden's terrorists and Saddam's thugs proves this point.

The tools of the Saddamite resistance are the tools of gangsters: car bombs and assassinations. Some of these recent horrific bombings have been committed by suicide terrorists, which, we know, is not a common gangster tactic. But in my years of studying international crime and terrorism, I have concluded this: You cannot remain an ideologue—religious or secular—while behaving like and coordinating with criminals.

Saddam's reign was a criminal dictatorship. There was no ideology but the one that made Saddam more powerful, that enriched his clan and cronies, that crushed all of his real or perceived opponents. When his sons, Uday and Qusay, were cornered and killed, they were not part of a well-organized resistance, protected by a dedicated network of ideologically motivated supporters. They were alone, and they were cornered and killed, like common gangsters, because an Iraqi dropped a dime on them.

By joining with the Saddamites, bin Laden and his fellow jihadists have exposed themselves to be gangsters. They are demonstrating this to all who wish to see: To the masses in the Middle East who bin Laden has tried to convert, they can now see him hand-in-hand with the corrupt butchers and jailors of Saddam's Tikriti clique, who the Iraqi people have roundly rejected and now publicly detest. Bin Laden and his supporters can now be seen allying with those who deny the Iraqis freedom.

Yes, the situation in Iraq is dangerous now, for the short term. But the defeat of the Saddamite-led resistance—which we will accomplish, and which we will accomplish with the active support of the Iraqi people—will provide a great victory in the war on terrorism, will bring peace to Iraq, will advance peace and stability in the region and will enhance the national security of this country.

Some of the Iraqi voices calling for our departure are not anti-American. Some Iraqis fear that we will overstay, that we will not move fast enough in transferring power and political legitimacy to the Iraqi people. I believe Ambassador Bremer's seven-point plan to move toward full sovereignty is sound and sensible. I am watching with great interest as the Iraqis begin to draft the constitution that will delineate their system of government, with all the protections of the freedoms they have been granted by coalition action and sacrifice.

I wish I could predict the future and declare here how long it will take for us to succeed. We can't give a finite number on costs, nor give a definite date of conclusion. To do so is to fall into one of the most partisan traps in Washington: If we can not say how much it will ultimately cost and we can not say when we will have achieved our goals, we are accused of having no plans; if we do, we will inevitably be wrong and the opposition naysayers will scream ''gotcha.''

Many state that the cost is high. I agree. America's ventures abroad have always been costly, never more so than when we pay in the lives of our men and women. The dollar figures pale in comparison.

I am not happy that we are faced with such a financial requirement today. Certainly many of our constituents are concerned about such a commitment when they worry about the national economy and the economies of their families.

But the budget proposed is not arbitrarily chosen. It is based on providing necessary resources that must be allocated to achieve the goals that the President outlined: to deny terrorists a new sanctuary by creating a secure and stable Iraq, by providing a minimal level of essential services and civic infrastructure which will enhance the stability we need to transfer sovereignty to the Iraqi people.

Over the past weeks, since the President first announced his request, the Senate Appropriations, Armed Services, Foreign Relations, Intelligence, and Joint Economic Committees have held numerous hearings. We have had reports from the Office of Management and Budget, from the White House, Pentagon, State Department, and Coalition Provisional Authority. Numerous witnesses from the administration have briefed both bodies of Congress.

The President's plan is broken into four parts, or core foundations: security; essential services; economy; and governance. As Ambassador Bremer, the Administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority, stated, ''These are intertwined: none can be pursued in isolation. Political and economic progress depends, in part, on security, but should itself help to create a safer environment.''

That is how I view the President's request. If we wish to protect our troops, the Iraq people must believe that our forces are there to improve their lives and that cooperation instead of confrontation is the road to a better future. The Iraqis are responding: More and more are working, and thousands are working with us.

To gain intelligence on the location of terrorists in Iraq, the local population must believe that we have their true interests at heart and not the terrorists. These goals cannot be achieved by funding just our military operations. We must assist the Iraqi people in developing an infrastructure that was allowed to fall into disrepair by a greedy tyrant.

During this debate, some have made a valid point in suggesting that Iraq's vast oil resources might be used for reconstruction costs. I have opposed all the amendments that have attempted to convert our grants to loans, however, and I have done so for the following reasons I will now outline.

First, Iraqi oil output while still low, is already being used by the Iraqi people to fund the resumption of their government costs.

Second, Iraq is weighed down by a staggering debt for a small country whose economy has been ravaged by years of Saddam's thievery and neglect. Paying this debt is something that the future Iraqi sovereign will have to negotiate. Certainly no U.S. funds should be used for such repayment. And it is my opinion that the future Iraqi sovereign should not be beholden to the debts incurred by its former torturer, nor the nation states who cynically loaned to the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. For the moment, however, incurring further debt while attempting to reconstruct a country without a basic economic foundation could seriously stifle necessary economic recovery. Any delay in rebuilding the economy only improves the chances of terrorists of taking root among the local population.

But I have a more basic reason for opposing all attempts to turn our grants into loans. This would be a radical departure in the conduct of American foreign policy. For the first time in our history, we would be occupying a country and forcing them to incur loans. Far more than a meager attempt to preserve financial capital with such misguided proposals, we would be seriously risking our moral capital.

I note to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that, despite the recriminations and accusations, this administration has done its best to work within the context of international law. I believe that we have been successful in respecting international law, while preserving our sovereign right to defend our national interests. I commend the administration for its successes here, from debates about preemption which has been hotly disputed but not discredited, under terms of international law to the herculean efforts going on to

this day, as our State Department works to craft resolutions that will build international support for our policies in the Security Council.

I believe that if the United States sets the precedent of occupying a country and then foisting debt upon them, we will have done our standing before the rest of the world long-term harm.

Soon enough, because of their oil resources, because of their human capital, and because of the assistance they will get from us and the rest of the international community, the Iraqi people will begin the process of paying for portions of the reconstruction themselves. This will become increasingly true as their oil infrastructure is repaired.

I believe that President Bush's proposal supports the long-term interests of the United States by addressing the short-term interests of the Iraqi people. By assisting the Iraqi people in developing these four core foundations identified in the President's plan, I believe we are undermining the Saddamite resistance, denying terrorists a sanctuary, and advancing our long-term security.

We have faced this challenge of winning a peace before. We won the First World War, and returned to isolationism while a fragile peace failed to take root in Europe. We won the Second World War, and stayed in Europe, making massive commitments which laid the foundation for winning the peace and the cold war that continued for nearly 50 years.

We must follow through on what we have begun, and we cannot delay. While the sums we are appropriating here are large, the costs of failing to succeed are larger. While the bill may seem big, we have already paid in measure far greater. Today I am thinking of: SSG James W. Cawley, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve; SSG Nino D. Livaudais of the Army's Ranger Regiment; SFC Randall S. Rehn, of the Army's 3rd Infantry Division; SGT Mason Whetstone, of the U.S. Army; and Brett Thorpe—a former Army special forces operator working with the State Department.

I understand if these names may be unfamiliar to others. They are not to me. These are the names of the sons of Utah that died defending us during this these operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. They followed through on their commitments. There job is done now. It is our turn to follow through.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of Senator CANTWELL's Truth in Deployment amendment. This amendment supports our reserve forces and corrects an error in our deployment process.

I am extremely proud of our reserve forces. The Arkansas Army National Guard's 39th Infantry Brigade is beginning their mobilization in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. The 39th Infantry Brigade consists of over 3,000 soldiers who are ready to serve their country.

The 39th Infantry Brigade soldiers are going to sacrifice time away from their family, place their civilian careers on hold, and place at risk the greatest gift provided by our Creator, their very life, to protect the freedoms and liberties we hold so dear.

If the 39th Infantry Brigade and other reserve forces are willing to do so much without complaint, I believe it is not too much to ask that we provide them as much opportunity as possible to minimize the impact of overseas deployments on themselves, their families and their employers. This amendment provides for this opportunity.

This amendment is straightforward. It starts the deployment period for members of the reserve component as the date of activation. This has always been the standard practice, prior to the administration's shift in policy on September 9th. This amendment simply asks our Nation to remain true to the standard practice, tradition of considering the date of activation as the date of deployment for reserve members.

Nothing in this amendment weakens our ability to employ our reserve forces. In fact the exact opposite is the case. This amendment enhances the ability and effectiveness of our reserve forces by enabling them to plan their lives to reduce the inherent adverse impact of overseas deployment on their families, employers, and community. I thank my fellow Senators for supporting this amendment. It will enhance the ability and effectiveness of our reserve forces and support the men and women like those who serve in the 39th Infantry Brigade.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate considered amendment No. 1811 offered by Senator CORZINE to lower the age at which members of the Reserve components can collect retirement pay from age 60 go age 55. This amendment had no offset and would have created a huge bill for the Department of Defense which we cannot afford to pay. For this reason, the floor manager of the bill raised a budget point of order against the amendment and I voted to uphold this point of order.

I believe the Congress should carefully review pay and benefits for members of the Reserve components, including lowering the age at which reservists and guardsmen can receive retirement pay. These men and women provide an invaluable service to our Nation and we should provide them pay and benefits which recognize their contributions and help retain them as citizen soldiers in the U.S. Armed Forces. However, I believe there are several options we should consider for lowering the retirement age, and that we should consider this issue alongside other benefits in order to offer a complete package that makes sense and accomplishes the goals we are trying to achieve. The Iraqi supplemental is not the right context to undertake a careful review or make long-term changes in this area, and for this reason I opposed the amendment.

As cochair of the Senate Reserve Caucus, these are issues that I take very seriously. I will continue to work with my colleagues in that caucus and in the Senate to ensure that we make wise financial decisions, and that our guardsmen and reservists receive the pay and benefits they deserve while recognizing their unique contribution to our Nation.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to report on the budgetary effect of S. 1689, the Emergency Supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan Security and Reconstruction for Fiscal Year 2004, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The pending bill provides $87 billion in budget authority and $36.7 billion in outlays for Fiscal Year 2004 for ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and reconstruction of Iraq. Since all funds contained in the reported bill are either emergencies or contingent emergencies, under section 502(c) of the 2004 budget resolution none of these funds count for purposes of section 302, 303, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and sections 504 and 505 of the 2004 Budget Resolution.

Additionally, I would like to remind my colleagues of the criteria for using the emergency designation. Section 502 of the 2004 budget resolution identifies the following criteria for the appropriate use of the emergency designation: that the funding is (1) necessary, essential, or vital, not merely useful or beneficial; (2) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time; (3) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action; (4) unforseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and (5) not permanent, temporary in nature.

The reported bill has satisfied these criteria. Given the fact that most of the regular appropriation bills have not yet been enacted, we ought to view any further use of the emergency designation with great skepticism.

I also note for my colleagues that we are in a highly unusual parliamentary situation with this supplemental. Instead of doing a 2004 supplemental after all regular appropriation bills have been enacted, we are considering an $87 billion supplemental before most of the regular bills have been enacted. While there is an allocation for each of the 13 regular bills, there is no additional or special allocation for a supplemental. Because this is such an unusual situation, I do not want people to think that the way the Senate deals with possible amendments on this bill sets a precedent for the way the Budget Committee will enforce the 302(b) allocations in the future.

If any amendments are adopted adding nonemergency spending to this bill, then members should know that the cost of such amendments will be counted against the appropriate subcommittee allocation. And I will remind the Senate at the appropriate time about any points of order that apply to subsequent bills and will insist that bills be changed to remedy

the situation or will raise the appropriate point of order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1689—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

[Fiscal Year 2004, $ millions]

	Discretionary spending
Emergencies in S. 1689, as reported: *	
Budget authority	87,004
Outlays	36,695
Non-Emergencies in S. 1689, as reported:	
Budget authority	0
Outlays	0

*Section 502(c) of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2004, states that any provision designated as an emergency requirement by both Congress and the President shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 504 (relating to discretionary spending limits in the Senate) and section 505 (paygo point of order) of H. Con. Res. 95.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR BELOVED CUBS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I beg the forgiveness of my colleagues for this statement which I wrote rather quickly this morning.

There is weeping on Waveland,
And Sheffield is dark,
Another sad ending
At Addison and Clark.
The Cubbies lost the big one
In the very last game.
A season so different
Has ended the same.
There's no joy in Wrigleyville
As the ivy turns brown,
But who can forget,
The Cubs lit up the town.
Our Boys of Summer
Were a loveable crew,
With Sosa, Lofton,
And Moises Alou.
Prior, Wood, and Zambrano
Threw fire at our foes,
And we counted Farnsworth
And Borowski to close.
Ramirez, Gonzales,
Grudzielanek, and Karros,
Joined Miller and Bako
To keep the games close.
Our skipper was new
From the city by the Bay
But ''In Dusty we Trusty''
From opener to closing day.
If Baker was the brains,
Each win had another part.
Our perfect 10, Ron Santo,
Was in every Cubby's heart.
America, we thank you
For loving the Cubs,
For cheering our long shots
In your living rooms and pubs.
Now in our despair
There's one thing to say.
Spring training is only
Four months away.
Next spring when the green
Is back on the vines,
Cubs fans will pour
Into the Friendly Confines.
America, don't give up,
Don't falter, don't grieve.
If you wanna be a Cub fan,
You gotta believe.

THE STATEN ISLAND FERRY DISASTER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I appreciate the thoughtful words of my colleague from Illinois. Many sports fans across my home state have known both joy and anguish from our sports teams, and I assure the Senator that I sympathize with the sorrow that Chicago Cubs fans are feeling today over last night's loss.

And now, Mr. President, I rise to speak on a matter that has caused much sadness in my home state of New York. It is with a heavy heart that I come to the floor today to speak about the tragedy on Staten Island that took 10 New Yorkers from us too soon, and changed the lives of dozens who were injured. As you know, the ferry in New York crashed into a pier adjacent to its terminal, with tragic and unforeseen and unprecedented results. We mourn for the families of those who were lost.

Staten Island has had a very difficult time in the last several years. We know, for instance, 286 Staten Islanders were lost on 9/11. Staten Island is 5.5 percent of New York City's population, but on that terrible day sustained nearly 20 percent of New York City's September 11 deaths. Many of those were police officers and firefighters. We had the refinery fire on Staten Island not too long ago, and now this terrible incident.

One thing I can tell you is the people of Staten Island are strong, they are resilient, they are self-reliant. Many of them come from my home borough of Brooklyn and have moved to pastures across the narrows. But they retain the same feistiness and the same ability to bounce back from tragedy their forebearers did, across the narrows in Brooklyn. So Staten Island will bounce back and be stronger and better than ever. But, right now, we mourn them.

The Staten Island ferry's history is so important to our city. It is as long as our Nation's history. It has existed in some form since 1713, and 70,000 New Yorkers, mostly from Staten Island, ride it every day. That would be enough people to fill a medium-sized city almost anywhere else in the United States.

It is one of the great symbols of New York City, up there with the Empire State Building, Brooklyn Bridge, Yankee Stadium. It is one of the best ways to see the great symbols of opportunity in New York, the Statue of Liberty—Ellis Island, and, sadly, until 2 years ago, the World Trade Center.

The view of lower Manhattan coming into the terminal at Whitehall or landing at St. George has been nothing short of breathtaking, although I must admit, having taken the ferry since 9/11, it now has some sadness to it as we see the empty space on the skyline where the towers once existed.

It is a necessity for many on Staten Island. It is also a great opportunity for tourists to see New York. I might say, also, it is a very good first date, particularly at its price. The Staten Island ferry is free.

I am proud to say this morning, due to the resilience of New Yorkers and their transportation commissioner, ferry service resumed at the St. George terminal at 5 a.m., the site of yesterday's tragedy, befitting the spirit of New York and the spirit of Staten Island, where we bounce back quickly. The terminal was packed, the boats were crowded, and the people to a one, it seemed, were determined not to shy away but to go on with their lives as best as possible, while remembering those families who were suffering in the wake of this terrible tragedy.

We remember the lives lost, but not to stop living. This attitude is at the heart of what it means to be a Staten Islander: grit, determination to survive and move on, but to never forget what has happened and to never stop trying to make a better world for our children.

I would like to mention the names of those who passed away, and send my condolences to each of their families: Joseph Bagarozza, Pio Canini, John T. Healy, Vincent Ferrante, Darios Marshall, Guillermo Pagvay, Louis Robinson, Frank Sullivan, John Valinski, and the woman—our condolences to her family, too, even though her name has not yet been released.

Today Congressman FOSSELLA of Staten Island and I are asking the United States Department of Transportation to pay for the repairs of this ferry. The Federal Government has been actively involved in the ferries. We have received money for them in the past and will ask once again that Washington rise to the occasion of another tragedy in New York. Our budget, as you know, is tight as a drum and these funds will not bring back a single loss of life and, in fact, pale before the loss of life.

We will move forward, hopefully, in whatever way, and make our city and Staten Island even greater than ever.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I also make a note of the fact that we, too, in New Jersey had two of our citizens perish in that terrible accident that took place yesterday, a Mr. John Healy from Middletown, NJ, and Frank Sullivan, from Red Bank, NJ. We send our sympathies to these families, but we are reminded at the same time that ferries play an important role in our region; that while the Staten Island ferry carries about 70,000 passengers a day, we have 60,000 people going from New Jersey to New York for their business requirements or their jobs on the

New York waterway ferries. It continues to remind us how much of a need we have to make certain that the ferries operate safely, as well as efficiently.

I ask, along with the distinguished Senator from New York who made his remarks a few minutes ago, that the Federal Government do whatever they can to understand what took place, and we understand and know the facts; that we take all the steps we can to make certain it should not happen again.

One of the questions I asked in the committee in which I serve, the Commerce Committee, is take a look and see what the Coast Guard requires by way of licensing for captains of these boats. The ferry that had the accident yesterday can carry as many as 6,000 people. We have to make certain in that travel they are not careless.

POPE JOHN PAUL II

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today Pope John Paul II and billions of faithful around the world celebrate the 25th anniversary of his election in 1978 to the papacy.

Born Karol Wojtyla on May 18, 1920 in Poland, John Paul II is the first non-Italian pope in 380 years. He has profoundly shaped the modern church and advanced its spiritual and moral influence across the globe. A poet, a playwright and a philosopher, Pope John Paul II has been an indefatigable champion of the poor and dispossessed.

In his 25 years of service to the church, he has also traveled more extensively than any pope before him. His historic trip to Poland in 1979 catalyzed the Solidarity Movement and led to the peaceful dissolution of the Soviet Empire. He is also the only pope ever to have visited a mosque or a synagogue.

Those who have studied the Pope's writings and biography say that the Pope was profoundly shaped by his early encounter with death and suffering.

As one expert observes, Professor Tony Judt for ''Frontline'', John Paul ''was born in 1920, shortly after World War I to an impoverished Poland, into a family, where, one by one, his closest relatives died around him—He was left before his 21st birthday with no family. At about the time of his father's death, shortly before, World War II broke out, and he lived in Poland under the worst dictatorship ever known—And then this man lives in post-war Poland for 20 years under Communist occupation when Poland was a grim, depressed, dishonest, duplicitous impoverished place.''

Out of all of this grimness and death, John Paul did not become despondent or embittered. No, indeed, his experience of profound loss and suffering seemed to have deepened his spirituality and his capacity to find strength first and foremost in God, but also in man's fragility.

Billions around the world have been blessed by the Pope's goodness and drive, his sincere love for the individual, and his determination to reconnect human endeavor to its higher purpose.

Pope John Paul has fought tirelessly against the culture of death, he has fought for man's dignity against tyranny and triviality. And if it is not too much to say, Pope John Paul has devoted his life to fighting for our souls.

I would like to close with a poem he wrote when he was only 19 years old. To me, it typifies his extraordinarily sensitive nature and perception of the divine mystery. It is called, ''Over This, Your White Grave''

Over this, your white grave
the flowers of life in white—
so many years without you—
how many have passed out of sight?
Over this your white grave
covered for years, there is a stir in the air, something uplifting
and, like death, beyond comprehension.
Over this your white grave
oh, mother, can such loving cease?
for all his filial adoration a prayer:
Give her eternal peace—
[Krakow, spring 1939]

God bless Pope John Paul II.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in Indianapolis, IN. In October 1999, Jamie C. Carson and two accomplices robbed and tortured two men who were targeted because they were gay. Police said that one victim was forced to drink a mixture of bleach and urine. Both men were tied up and burned with a steam iron.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

REPORT ON U.S.-INDONESIA RELATIONS

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I rise to commend to Senators the Report of the National Commission on U.S.-Indonesian Relations issued today by the United States-Indonesia Society. This report is the culmination of more than one year of work by the Commission, whose co-chairs are former Secretary of State George Shultz, my fellow Hoosier and former Congressman Lee Hamilton, and George Russell, Chairman Emeritus of the Frank Russell Company.

This report will be an important point of reference for members of Congress and the public as a whole as the future course of Indonesia-U.S. relations is debated. I, for one, believe that the significance of Indonesia to Asia and to the world is often underappreciated. A relatively new democracy, Indonesia is home to the world's largest Muslim population and overall is the world's fourth most populous nation. The U.S. trade deficit with Indonesia is decreasing. U.S. exports of goods to Indonesia in 2002 were $2.6 billion, up 2.4 percent from the previous year and U.S. imports from Indonesia were $9.6 billion, down 4.6 percent from 2001.

The Commission's report examines the U.S.-Indonesia relationship and outlines policies and programs that ''will help strengthen the nation's prospects for success.'' Education, democratization, economic growth and security are areas for emphasis highlighted by the Commission.

The report goes into considerable detail about many aspects of life inside Indonesia, citing the challenges and hopes of this fellow democracy. For example, the report notes that the roles of the military and police are changing, with the goal of the Indonesian government being to make the police, rather than the military, fully responsible for internal security.

Important reference is made to ongoing conflict in the province of Aceh as well as unrest in Papua connected to issues surrounding the special autonomy law. Of special significance to justice-seeking citizens in the United States and Indonesia, the Commission highlighted the need for a full and thorough investigation into the murder of an Indonesian and two Americans, and the wounding of eight others in an ambush last year near Timika in Papua.

My purpose today is not to concur in all of the report's findings, but rather to recommend it to my colleagues as a helpful point of reference in future deliberations by this body on a wide range of issues regarding Indonesia.

Those Members interested in viewing the full report may contact the United States—Indonesia Society for a copy. I conclude my remarks by commending the ongoing work of Paul Cleveland, President of the United States—Indonesia Society and Edward Masters, Co-Chair of the Society's Board of Trustees for their tireless and outstanding commitment to stronger Indonesia—U.S. relations.

I ask unanimous consent to print the Executive Summary in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON U.S.-INDONESIAN RELATIONS

STRENGTHENING U.S. RELATIONS WITH INDONESIA: TOWARD A PARTNERSHIP FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON U.S.-INDONESIAN RELATIONS

Honorable George P. Shultz, Co-Chairman—Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford

University; Honorable Lee Hamilton, Co-Chairman—Director, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Mr. George Russell, Co-Chairman—Chairman Emeritus, Russell Investment Group; Honorable Edward Masters, Vice Chairman—Co-Chair of the Board of Trustees, United States-Indonesia Society; Admiral Dennis C. Blair—Senior Fellow, Institute for Defense Analyses; Honorable Paul Cleveland—President, United States-Indonesia Society; Dr. Richard J. Ellings—President, The National Bureau of Asian Research; Professor Donald K. Emmerson—Director, Southeast Asia Forum, Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University; Dr. Ellen L. Frost—Visiting Fellow, Institute for International Economics; and Professor R. William Liddle—Professor of Political Science, Ohio State University.

PREFACE

This report is the culmination of more than one year of effort by members of the National Commission on U.S.-Indonesian Relations. We first assembled in September 2002 to discuss increasingly evident and pressing concerns: that Indonesia is a frontline state in the war on terrorism; that it is in the midst of one of the most significant political transitions and economic recoveries in its history; that, despite its size and strategic location in Southeast Asia, it is one of the least well-known or understood countries in the United States; and that it would be enormously beneficial for the U.S.-Indonesia bilateral relationship, which has become strained in recent years, to move to a more balanced and sustainable footing.

The members of the National Commission on U.S.-Indonesian Relations represent a diverse range of backgrounds, interests, and opinions from the worlds of policymaking and diplomacy, the military, business, and academic. We were charged with drafting a consensus report that reflects the breadth of U.S. interests in Indonesia, of consulting widely with current and former policymakers, and others, in Washington and Jakarta, and of suggesting ways that the U.S. Congress and Administration might move toward a relationship which over the longer term will serve the interest of both countries.

In our work, we have been supported by the hardworking staff and representatives of the three institutions sponsoring this initiative—the Asia-Pacific research Center at Stanford University, The National Bureau of Asian Research, and the United States-Indonesia Society—to whom we offer our sincere appreciation. Thanks are also due to our colleagues on the Commission, who gave freely of their time and expertise, as well as for the valuable counsel of a large number of Americans and Indonesians who contributed their insights to this report. In particular, we wish to acknowledge and commend the work of Edward Masters, former U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia, Co-Chairman of USINDO, and Vice Chairman of this Commission, who has expended great effort over many months on the unenviable task of drafting a report that reflects our general consensus of opinion.

Two final notes: First, although it reflects the views of various public and private Indonesians with whom the general concept of a ''partnership'' has been discussed, this report is written from a U.S. standpoint. If the partnership concept is formally accepted by the two governments, we hope this report can serve as the basis for more detailed discussions to ensure that both sides have an equal opportunity to express their views, and that any programs adopted have the full support of the two governments and relevant private organizations.

Second, the National Commission and this report represent a non-governmental effort to explore ways to improve relations between the third and fourth most populous countries in the world. In an international environment driven by the challenges and opportunities of globalization and beset by the problems of global terrorism, we are convinced that strong and positive relations between the United States and Indonesia are, and will remain, a key component of a prosperous and peaceful future.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Indonesia, the world's fourth most populous nation and third largest democracy, is the pivotal state in Southeast Asia. It has exercised major influence in the region and plays an active and constructive international role. It has vast natural resources and is strategically located astride major lines of communication between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Half of the world's merchant fleet capacity passes through straits with Indonesian territory on one or both shores. Including its oil and mineral sectors, Indonesia is home to about $25 billion in U.S. investment, with more than 300 major U.S. firms represented there.

Two additional factors are of particular importance today: Indonesia has the world's largest Muslim population—more than all the Middle Eastern Arab states combined. The vast majority of Indonesia's Muslims have historically been noted for their moderation. Theirs is one of the few Muslim-majority nations in which Islam is not the state religion; and given its size and importance, Indonesia is critical to stability in Southeast Asia. It has been the anchor of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and a key player in the ASEAN Regional Forum, the only organization in the Asia-Pacific region that brings the United States together with Japan, China, ASEAN and others to discuss security issues.

Today Indonesia faces major faces major problems: a difficult transition from authoritarian rule to democracy; slow economic growth combined with inadequate job creation; capital outflow; endemic corruption; ethnic and sectarian violence; a weak judiciary; and a serious threat from domestic and international terrorists. The October 12, 2002 bombings in Bali were the most grievous instance of terrorism since the September 2001 attacks on the United States. The carnage in Bali was a wake-up call for Indonesians and their government, and Indonesia joined the fight against terrorism. Local police arrested more than 90 suspected terrorists, but more are still at large as shown by the August 5, 2003 attack on the J.W. Marriott Hotel in the heart of the capital city Jakarta. Fourteen people (all but one were Indonesians) died as a result of that attack and 150 were injured.

There are continuing problems, but the news from Indonesia has not by any means been all bad. Since 1999 the country has had a free and fair national election and two peaceful presidential successions. Its media are among the most free in Southeast Asia. Civil society is flourishing, and more than 5,000 non-governmental organizations are active across a broad range of sectors. Constitutional reform and decentralization have made the government less top-down. For the first time, beginning in 2004, the president and vice president will be directly elected. In this process of reform, the leaders of major Muslim organizations have played a constructive role in defining relations between religion and the state. The ceasefire agreement in Aceh has failed, but those between hostile ethno-religious groups in the eastern islands are holding. And the Indonesian economy, despite its vulnerabilities, has stabilized in important respects.

The country is now at a critical juncture in its democratic transition and economic recovery. This is therefore an opportune time for the United States to rethink its approach to Indonesia. A failure of democracy there would hurt not only Indonesians. It would reinforce the stereotype that a Muslim-majority nation cannot manage a democratic system. Given the size and importance of Indonesia, we believe that success of that nation's democracy would not only provide a better life for its people but also reduce vulnerabilities to radicalism and have an impact beyond Indonesia's borders.

For these multiple reasons, the National Commission on U.S.-Indonesian Relations recommends that the United States and Indonesia enter into a ''Partnership for Human Resource Development'' in which the two nations pledge to work together on joint programs to promote in Indonesia an effective democracy, sustainable development, and the rule of law. The idea of a formal partnership is new to this important bilateral relationship. We believe this concept is essential to increase the prospects for success and to ensure that both nations buy into these programs and are committed to make them succeed. In other words, that both accept ownership.

Events in the coming five years, including national elections in 2004 and their consequences, will determine the fate of Indonesia's democracy and the nature of the new leadership generation expected to emerge before the following elections in 2009. Accordingly, we recommend that the United States pledge $200 million annually in additional assistance funds to this partnership during this five-year period. The Commission believes that Indonesia would be a good candidate for funding under the Millennium Challenge Account. Whatever the source, it is important that these be add-on funds that do not disrupt important ongoing assistance programs.

These additional funds would be used to strengthen existing programs and initiate new programs in four critical fields:

1. Education—work with Indonesian officials to strengthen the nation's educational system at all levels, including Islamic schools, and rebuild ties with U.S. educational institutions. Before the fall of Suharto, Indonesia's experience with democratic systems and practices was limited to a few years in the 1950s, so that most Indonesians living today have had no direct experience with democracy. As a result, Indonesia's democracy must be built from the ground up. A key prerequisite for success is an informed electorate. Education is the key to success and is also essential to give greater depth to the management level in virtually all sectors. We therefore attach special importance to education and urge prompt, large-scale U.S. support.

2. Democratization—improve governance, speed and deepen legal reform, strengthen parliament and the electoral system, and help ensure the effectiveness of decentralization.

3. Economic Growth—improve the investment climate, strengthen Indonesia's private sector, expand trade, facilitate the resumption of full debt servicing.

4. Security—strengthen the police and, when practicable, resume carefully crafted military education programs that will strengthen those elements willing to promote reform.

In addition to these funding priorities, ongoing U.S. assistance for emergency relief and improved health should be continued. Bolstering the ethical rationale for such support is the contribution it can make to reducing hardship and thus limiting the grievances that can be used to incite cycles of violence and repression.

Indonesia today offers a unique but temporary window of opportunity for the United

States to help this nation of 230 million people build an effective democracy based on a civil society and a market economy under the rule of law. The time to rise to the occasion is now.

STRENGTHING U.S. RELATIONS WITH INDONESIA: TOWARD A PARTNERSHIP FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

Congressman Jim Leach, head of the East Asia Subcommittee in the House of Representatives International Relations Committee, said in a 2001 Congressional hearing that ''there is no country in the world of such vital importance that is less understood than Indonesia.'' He went on to say that ''it is strongly in the interest of America and the world for Indonesia to succeed.'' As members of the National Commission on U.S.-Indonesian Relations, we share this view.

This important nation of 220 million people, occupying some of the world's most strategic real estate, faces formidable problems: a complicated political transition which has produced three governments in as many years; complex and politically sensitive economic problems left from the 1997–98 financial crisis; ethnic and religious strife resulting in thousands of deaths and hundreds of thousands of displaced persons; continued armed rebellion in Aceh and Papau; and a significant increase in violence by radical Muslims. The October 2002 bombing in Bali, in which more than 200 people were killed, was the most serious terrorist attack worldwide since the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States. To show their continuing capability, Indonesian militants attacked the J.W. Marriott Hotel in Jakarta in early August 2003 resulting in 14 deaths and 150 injured.

In coping with these problems, Indonesia is handicapped by the legacy of more than 40 years of authoritarian rule—weak institutions and poor administrative capabilities. Nonetheless, the nation has made important progress. It has shown a commitment to openness, development, political stability, economic reform, and, since the Bali bombings, to rooting out terrorists. This progress, the remaining challenges, the stakes for U.S. national interests, and our recommendations for U.S. policymakers are outlined in this report.

Our broad conclusion is that the United States and Indonesia should enter into a ''partnership'' to strengthen Indonesia's fragile democracy, reduce the problems that lead to radicalism, and improve this important bilateral relationship. The basic development decisions must be made by the Indonesians themselves, but U.S. assistance can be critical to their success. Under the partnership the two nations can work together on programs where their national interests converge. This will enable U.S. policymakers to recognize Indonesia's priorities, understand what the Indonesians are willing to do, determine how the United States might best assist, and monitor progress. The partnership will also give Indonesia ''ownership'' of the agreed programs and ensure that these programs have the full support of both governments.

We believe there are few better investments for the United States at this critical time than to help strengthen democratic behavior and institutions in the world's largest Muslim-majority nation and one which is striving to build a viable democracy. The price of failure would be serious for Indonesia, for the region, for the Muslim world, and, not least, for the United States.

U.S.-INDONESIAN RELATIONS IN PERSPECTIVE

Why is Indonesia important to the United States?

Indonesia is the pivotal state in Southeast Asia. The world's fifteenth largest and fourth most populous nation, it exercises strong influence in Southeast Asia and plays a constructive international role. It has huge natural resources and a strategic location astride major sea lines of communication—half of the world's merchant fleet capacity passes through the Straits of Malacca, Sunda, and Lombok. Including the oil and mineral sectors, Indonesia is home to an estimated $25 billion in U.S. investment, with more than 300 major U.S. firms represented in the country.

There are two additional factors of great importance today: Indonesia has by far the world's largest Muslim population, and historically Indonesia's Muslims have been noted for their moderation. It has the two largest Muslim social and educational organizations in the world—the Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah—each of which is moderate and has more than 30 million members. Indonesia is one of the very few Muslim-majority nations in which Islam is not the state religion. Indonesian Islamic scholars have had a moderating impact on debate within the Muslim world on the relationship between religion and the state. This influence will be enhanced if Indonesia succeeds in its efforts to develop a viable and nonsectarian democratic system; and a stable and responsible Indonesia is critical to regional stability. It is the anchor of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and a key player in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the only organization in the Asia-Pacific region that brings the United States together with Japan, China, the ASEAN nations, and others to discuss security issues. The cohesion and effectiveness of ASEAN have eroded significantly due to Indonesia's preoccupation with domestic crises. Instability in Southeast Asia has already provided openings for Islamic radicalism.

In short, an unstable, hostile or unpredictable Indonesia would adversely affect U.S. interests and objectives, tilt the international balance toward radical Islam, complicate transit through strategic sea and air routes, hamper efforts to combat piracy and drug trafficking, and weaken a potentially constructive regional counterpoint to China.

What is the current U.S.–Indonesian relationship?

U.S. relations with Indonesia have been close for much of the country's history. The United States played an important and supportive role in Indonesia's transition to independence, and the country was a reliable strategic partner from the mid-1960s through the end of the Cold War. Bilateral relations suffered during the late 1950s when the United States intervened in domestic strife in Indonesia and during the post-Suharto transition, which saw three presidents in as many years. Although relations are generally good today, there are negative undercurrents stemming from differing demands and expectations over the war in Iraq and its aftermath, priorities in the war on terrorism, and the most appropriate steps in Indonesia's democratic transition.

Since September 11, 2001, U.S. strategic priorities have been driven by the demands of the war on terrorism. Washington was frustrated through much of 2002 by the limited extent of Jakarta's commitment to support this war in Southeast Asia and the reluctance of many Indonesians to recognize that terrorism was an urgent internal problem. Such frustrations were not unique to the U.S.–Indonesian relationship, but similarly affected Jakarta's relations with its neighbors in Southeast Asia.

The initial reaction of many Indonesians to the Bali terrorist attacks of October 12, 2002, was that their countrymen were incapable of such a horrible act. Some blamed outsiders, including the CIA, which was accused of precipitating the bombings in an effort to draw Indonesia into the war on terrorism. The well-conducted police investigation into the bombings and their aftermath (which by mid-September 2003 had led to the arrest of more than 90 suspected Indonesian terrorists) clearly showed that terrorism is an Indonesian as well as an American problem.

The August 5, 2003 attack on the J.W. Marriott Hotel in Jakarta by an Indonesian terrorist drove home the point. Thirteen Indonesians and one foreigner were killed and 150 people were injured in this noon-time car bomb attack on a hotel in Indonesia's financial district known to be frequented by Americans. The Indonesian reaction was one of shock and anger perhaps even greater than the earlier terrorist attack in distant Bali. The two largest Muslim social and educational organizations in Indonesia, the Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah, promptly issued a joint statement strongly condemning this ''heinous, ruthless and uncivilized crime against humanity'' and called it an action which ''belies religious values.'' The two organizations called on the government to ''further strengthen the capacity of security officials'' to combat terrorism. These themes were also echoed in the press. Like the Bali attack, this terrorist act was carried out by Indonesians, probably, according to government officials, with encouragement and support from the regional terrorist organization Jemaah Islamiyah.

Indonesia's growing awareness of the problem and its increased cooperation with U.S. and regional security counterparts, plus the willingness of moderate Muslims to speak out against radical extremists, have helped improve bilateral relations. Improved communications between the U.S. embassy and the Indonesian government are also helping, as is the fact that the U.S. ambassador is successfully developing contacts with a broad cross-section of opinion leaders, including more traditional Muslim elements.

Despite such progress, there are at least two notable areas where significant problems in the relationship remain: The August 2002 murder of two Americans and an Indonesian working for a U.S. company in an ambush near Timika in Papua is a major issue. The Indonesian police have implicated military elements in the attack. The long-running investigation into this deplorable incident, in which US FBI agents have participated, has not led to any charges or prosecutions. This will plague the relationship until a credible investigation is completed and appropriate follow-on actions are taken; and this incident is symptomatic of broader U.S. concerns on acountability—a problem that requires special attention. The Leahy Amendment and various U.S. policy statements stress the need for accountability by senior Indonesian military and police officers for human rights abuses in East Timor and elsewhere. The amendment bans U.S. military education and training programs (IMET) for Indonesian officers until there is an accounting for these actions. A small IMET program was included in the 2003 Defense Department budget, which is not subject to the Leahy Amendment, but there were indications in September 2003 that these funds would not be used because of continued concern over the slow pace of the Timika investigation.

The war in Iraq led to large demonstrations against the United States and official and private criticism, but government authorities took strong measures to prevent outbreaks of violence. President Megawati, while criticizing the coalition's lack of UN

support, stressed that this U.S. action did not represent an attack on Islam. Indonesians can be expected to continue to watch developments in Iraq closely, but unless large-scale fighting resumes or there is a prolonged and difficult direct U.S. occupation, we do not expect this to become a major issue in the bilateral relationship. Indonesians have in the past complained about a perceived ''lack of balance'' in the Middle East policy of the United States. They hope that, with the end of the Saddam Hussein regime, the United States will take a more active role in resolving basic problems in the Middle East, particularly the plight of the Palestinians, and that the U.S. government will strongly pursue implementation of the ''roadmap.''

Other sticking points in the relationship from the Indonesian perspective include: The January 16, 2003 announcement that Indonesia had been added to the list of nations whose males over 16 visiting the United States must register with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and be fingerprinted and photographed. Indonesians see this as further evidence of religious profiling by the United States. They also object strongly to what they see as the failure of the U.S. government adequately to discuss the matter before the rules were published in the Federal Register. This is likely to be a continuing source of friction which will discourage travel to the United States by students, business representatives, and others, and add fuel to anti-American sentiment; and Indonesian perceptions of U.S. ''unilateralism'' and ''bellicosity.'' While agreement with many U.S. criticisms of the problems facing Indonesia, Indonesians resent what they see as America's heavy-handed style and its demands that Indonesia must take certain actions. One well-informed American scholar has said the United States should ''demustify'' its approach. It is important that the United States work with the Indonesians to identify problems and agree on approaches to solve those problems. A joint approach is likely to be more effective than public exhortations or the imposition of sanctions.

Top Indonesian officials have expressed deep appreciation for quiet U.S. assistance in working out the Aceh ceasefire in December 2002. Unfortunately, that agreement has not held and fighting has resumed. Nonetheless, we believe that Aceh should continue to have a high priority for the United States, and that the U.S. government should be prepared to offer additional help in ending the violence if this is requested by the Indonesians. Similarly, recognizing that responsibility for Papua lies with the Indonesian government, we recommend that the United States also assist in reducing tensions and violence in that area.

Why do we need to rethink U.S.-Indonesian relations now?

We hear a great deal about Indonesia's continuing problems but much less about the real progress that has been achieved during the past several years. This progress provides a good base for expanded U.S. assistance in areas where Indonesia wants and can effectively use our help to consolidate the gains already made and to strengthen the base for democracy and continued economic growth. The Commission sees encouraging progress in five important areas:

The nation had a free and fair national election in 1999 and peaceful political transitions in 1999 and 2001. Many key elements necessary for a successfully democratic system are in place—an active and independent legislature, a functioning party system, a free and active press, and a growing civil society.

Constitutional reform has gone much further than most observers anticipated. Sovereignty for the first time is vested in the people, a system of checks and balances has been introduced, appointed seats for the military in elected bodies will be eliminated at the time of the 2004 elections, and in these elections the president and vice president will for the first time be directly elected. A new Regional Representative Council has been created to advance the interests of the provinces, and a new Constitutional Court and a Judicial Commission have been formed to strengthen the legal structure.

Indonesia's decentralization—the largest in history—transferred many central powers and two million civil servants to some 400 local districts and towns on January 1, 2001. Despite initial misgivings, the process has gone reasonably well, and some of the concerns about the potential problems—increased corruption, double taxation—have proved to be exaggerated. Moreover, while the process is still in its early stages, there are already sign in some areas of grassroots democracy and local leadership.

Macroeconomic conditions have improved significantly. The rupiah is relatively stable, interest rates are down to manageable levels, monetary policy is sound, the banking system has been strengthened, asset recovery is proceeding, and inflation has fallen from 80 percent at the peak of the financial crisis to less than 10 percent. There has also been progress in reducing the debt ratio, which is down from 102 percent of GDP in 1999 to 67 percent in late 2003 according to Indonesian official sources. Per capita income is approaching 1997 pre-crisis levels, and the 13 percent of the population living in absolute poverty, while still excessive, is less than half the level in 1998. Citing ''good progress'' in June 2003, the IMF announced a further release of $486 million, raising the amount released under the Extended Fund Facility arrangement to about $4 billion out of the $5 billion total.

The government moved quickly after the Bali bombings to revise internal security regulations to give the authorities greater flexibility in moving against suspected terrorists. The police, who welcomed support from Australia, the United States and others, have arrested more than 90 Indonesians suspected of complicity in terrorist activities, and international cooperation is continuing following the Marriott Hotel attack.

In short, Indonesia has made progress and is now at a critical juncture in its democratic transition and economic recovery. This is an opportune time for the United States to rethink its approach to the relationship. If the democratic transition is unsuccessful, Indonesia's political situation will become less predictable, with increased risk of exaggerated nationalism and/or Muslim radicalism. Less likely, although impossible to discount, is a return to authoritarian rule.

Such negative scenarios are by no means inevitable, and it is therefore important for the United States to identify policies and programs that will help strengthen the nation's prospects for success. As members of the National Commission on U.S.-Indonesian Relations, we see a need for broad, consistent U.S. engagement with Indonesia in four priority areas (while anticipating that the significant U.S. health and humanitarian assistance programs will continue):

Education. Underlying all other areas is the urgent need to help develop Indonesia's poorly functioning educational system and significantly expand the pool of trained administrators. This is an essential underpinning for a successful democracy and for continued domestic economic and social reform. Support for education was an important component of U.S. policy in the 1960s and it made a major contribution to Indonesia's rapid economic growth in the 1970s and 1980s. It is now time for a similar effort to strengthen the country's democratization programs and administrative capabilities.

Democratization. The United States is well placed to assist Indonesia in its efforts to strengthen the electoral system, improve civil governance, pursue legal reform, and extend decentralization. Helping to ensure the emergency of Indonesia as a democratic, moderate, Muslim-majority state directly serves the long-term national interests of the United States.

Economic growth. There are a variety of measures that the U.S. government could undertake to alleviate Indonesia's financial burden, help improve the climate for investment and trade, and facilitate economic recovery. Encouraging a resumption of foreign investment will be a major boost to Indonesia's economy and contribute to social and political stability.

Security. The United States can help improve the Indonesian authorities' capabilities to guarantee security through education for the police and, when conditions are appropriate, for the military. Doing so will help reduce abuses and will also contribute to social and political stability, improve the investment climate, and coincide with U.S. strategic objectives in the war on terrorism.

The Joint Statement issued by Presidents Bush and Megawati following the Indonesian president's September 19, 2001 visit to Washington provides a good basis for future relations between the two nations. President Bush ''expressed his conviction that Indonesia's transition to democracy is one of the most significant developments of this era . . . [and] he pledged his support for President Megawati's efforts to build a stable, united, democratic and prosperous Indonesia.'' He announced that the United States, in the ''spirit of their shared commitment to promote reform and professionalization of the military . . . would lift its embargo on commercial sales of non-lethal defense articles for Indonesia'' subject to the usual case-by-case review. The two presidents also noted ''the importance of open markets and expanded trade for economic growth . . . .''

For her part, President Megawati ''condemned the barbaric and indiscriminate acts'' of September 11 and ''pledged to cooperate with the international community in combating terrorism.'' She also ''reaffirmed her determination to pursue a multidimensional approach'' to separatism in Aceh and Papua and ''underscored her determination to improve Indonesia's investment climate'' by ''strengthening the rule of law, resolving outstanding investment disputes, and protecting investors' assets and property.''

THE PARTNERSHIP FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Ensuring a successful transition to democracy, stability, and growth in Indonesia is not something that the United States can do. The basic parameters must be set by Indonesia, and the programs must be those with high priority for them as well as for the United States. Open communication and regular consultations are central to this. To ensure that both countries are in full agreement on the course ahead, we recommend creation of a formal coordinating mechanism to facilitate dialogue on the wide range of concerns in the bilateral relationship and to guide programs in the priority areas outlined above. This mechanism—which might be

termed a ''Partnership for Human Resource Development''—would be a standing body of senior officials from both nations which would meet at least once a year, alternating between the two capitals. The basic purpose would be to ensure that both countries accept ''ownership'' of the agreed programs and understand their responsibilities.

Membership in the partnership on the U.S. government side should come from the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Commerce, USAID, USTR, Members of Congress or their staff, and other appropriate agencies. Specialists could be brought in as needed on specific issues. Indonesian representation should be comparable. To ensure that the designated members participate fully and actively, we suggest participation not be at the cabinet level but perhaps at the deputy assistant secretary level, but the actual level should be set by the two governments.

It has been suggested that the private sector also be included in the partnership. To avoid the group becoming unwieldy and the need to make difficult choices regarding participation, we suggest that permanent private membership in the partnership be limited to several broad organizations focusing on the bilateral relationship such as the American Chamber of Commerce in Jakarta, the Indonesia Committee of the U.S.—ASEAN Business Council, the American-Indonesian Chamber of Commerce in New York, and the United States-Indonesia Society. The Indonesian side may wish to invite participation by a similar Indonesian organization or organizations. As issues requiring additional expertise arise, other private sector representatives (teachers, lawyers, NGO members and others) could be invited to participate in partnership meetings on a case-by-case basis.

We do not envisage the creation of a large bureaucracy, but we suggest it would be useful to have several working groups, located in Jakarta, to handle day-to-day liaison. These might include working groups on: civil governance and legal reform; trade and investment; education and public affairs; military relations; and police programs. USAID and the public diplomacy section of the U.S. embassy could provide leadership and continuity to these groups.

If the United States agrees to pursue such a partnership, it should be aware of three basic factors:

1. Fixing Indonesia's problems will take many years. In most cases it is not a matter of simply repairing something which is broken. Many of Indonesia's problems go back to the country's independence. The Indonesian military has been engaged in politics, civilian activities, and independent fund raising since the early days of the republic. Except possibly for a few years in the 1950s, the nation has never had an honest or credible legal or court system. The bureaucracy has been inefficient from the start and there has always been corruption, although it reached new heights under Suharto. Knowledgeable Indonesians estimate that it will take 10 to 15 years to get the military and the legal system on track. We agree.

2. What the United States can do directly is limited. Many of the basic reforms will have to come from within Indonesia, and this underscores the need for a partnership. U.S. exhortations, threats, and penalties are of minimal effect and can be counter-productive. What the United States can do, and do very well, is to train, encourage and support Indonesians who can reform from within. This underscores our strong emphasis in this report on education.

3. Indonesians are in a state of heightened sensitivity at present because of what they view as U.S. ''unilateralism,'' ''arrogance,'' and a tendency to lecture or threaten others. They resent Congressional restrictions and demands that they ''must'' take certain actions. It is important that the United States consider the public diplomacy aspects of all bilateral assistance programs.

Monitoring arrangements. As we are recommending a substantial increase in the American commitment to Indonesia, so too should Indonesia demonstrate its commitment to internal reform and partnership with the United States in order to ensure maximum effectiveness of the additional U.S. assistance. As the details of U.S. assistance are worked out, we believe benchmarks should be established by the partnership to provide for verification of progress. The ''Partnership for Human Resource Development'' can serve as a forum for Americans and Indonesians to evaluate the progress of the various programs and identify areas of success or underperformance.

CONCLUSIONS

Indonesia faces three critical challenges: (1) It is striving to consolidate a fragile democratic system with little experience and limited resources. If it fails it could revert to authoritarianism or chaos. Some Indonesians already speak nostalgically of the stability and economic progress of the Suharto era; (2) Moderate Muslims, still a substantial majority, are under challenge from a radical fringe which has grown significantly during the past five years. The goal of the radicals is to capitalize on domestic vulnerabilities and international issues to win over or intimidate the moderate majority; (3) The nation is striving, in the face of rising economic nationalism, to work its way out of the economic mess left by the Suharto regime. The outcome of these three contests will be crucial to the future of Southeast Asia and U.S. relations with the region.

The National Commission on U.S.-Indonesian Relations recommends that the United States enter into a five-year ''Partnership for Human Resource Development'' with Indonesia in which the two nations agree to work together in the following areas:

We strongly believe that our top priority should be to help Indonesia in the field of education. We need urgently to help train the trainers and reformers. We leave to experts on both sides to work out specific programs, but we favor a major effort to help improve Indonesia's educational system and expand opportunities for education and training in Indonesia and the United States.

The United States should support expanded programs for legal reform.

The two nations should explore ways in which the United States could help strengthen the Indonesian parliament, including the establishment of cooperative arrangements with the U.S. Congress.

The United States and Indonesia should cooperate on programs to strengthen Indonesia's administrative services through support to Indonesia's civil service and other bodies.

The United States should initiate discussions with other major donors to encourage the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank to increase fast-disbursing loans tied primarily to macroeconomic performance rather than to structural reforms.

The United States should work with Indonesia to reduce obstacles to foreign direct investment and, by offering technical assistance and lowering barriers to key Indonesian products, help Indonesia expand its exports to the United States. It should press other developed countries to do the same.

Indonesia, with U.S. cooperation, should revive the U.S.-Indonesia Energy Dialogue and other forums that will strengthen cooperation between the private sectors in the two countries.

Working with Indonesian counterparts, the United States should expand support for the Indonesian police, with particular emphasis on education and training, and the establishment of long-term institutional relationships.

The United States should set aside plans to resume the International Military Education and Training program for Indonesia until the political climate is more conducive on both sides. The government should, however, continue to be alert to ways to expand contacts with the TNI in order to reduce its isolation.

If Indonesia wants U.S. help, the United States should provide appropriate assistance and support in seeking peaceful settlements in disputed or troubled areas.

U.S. public affairs should be significantly expanded to create additional opportunities for information and cultural programs.

The United States should take all possible measures to reduce the delay in issuing visas for Indonesian students, business representatives, scholars, and others with legitimate reasons to visit the United States.

The Commission sees this new relationship as a partnership and hopes accordingly that the Indonesian government, for its part, will take steps to make these programs successful.

The Commission commends the U.S. embassy and USAID in Jakarta and Washington for the excellent programs underway to strengthen civil governance, decentralization, and the electoral system. A good base has been built and the Commission recommends that these programs be expanded and augmented as noted in this report.

The Commission also recognizes and commends the efforts of the U.S. diplomatic mission to broaden the mission's contacts with political, media, religious and other leaders. We congratulate the ambassador in particular for his efforts to open dialogue with Muslim leaders, an area that has been neglected. These programs are of increasing importance in these difficult times, and the Commission calls on the U.S. government to provide full support.

TROOP MORALE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today two news articles came to my attention regarding the recent survey conducted by the Stars and Stripes newspaper on the level of troop morale in Iraq. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stars and Stripes, Oct. 16, 2003]

GROUND TRUTH, DAY 2: IN SURVEY, MANY IN IRAQ CALL MORALE LOW; LEADERS SAY JOB IS GETTING DONE

(By Ward Sanderson)

What is the morale of U.S. troops in Iraq?

Answers vary. High-ranking visitors to the country, including Department of Defense and congressional officials, have said it is outstanding.

Some troops on the ground have begged to differ, writing to Stars and Stripes and to others about what they call low morale on their part and on the part of their units.

There was a correlation between such things as local services and release dates on the one hand, and morale on the other.

Stars and Stripes sent a team of reporters to Iraq to try to ascertain the states of both conditions and morale. Troops were asked about morale, among many other issues, in a

17-point questionnaire, which was filled out and returned by nearly 2,000 persons.

The results varied; sometimes dramatically:

Among the largest group surveyed, Army troops, the results looked much like a bell curve. Twenty-seven percent said their personal moral was ''high'' or ''very high.'' Thirty-three percent said it was ''low'' or ''very low.'' The largest percentage fell in the middle, saying it was ''average.''

Among the second largest group, reservists and National Guard members, the differences were much starker. Only 15 percent said their own morale was ''high'' or ''very high,'' while 48 percent said it was ''low'' or ''very low.''

Among the Marines, the next largest group 44 percent said their morale was ''high'' or ''very high,'' and only 14 percent said it was ''low'' or ''very low.''

Among airmen, the smallest of the four major groups surveyed because fewer questionnaires were allowed to be circulated to them, the results were also very positive. Thirty-nine percent said their morale was ''high'' or ''very high,'' and only 6 percent said it was ''low'' or ''very low.''

Very few Navy servicemembers could be found to question in Iraq.

The questionnaire findings can't be projected to all the servicemembers in Iraq. Still, the reporting of ''lows'' among the two largest groups surveyed, Army and Reserve/National Guard, seemed significant. The views of these troops, at least, appeared to contrast sharply with those of the visiting VIPs.

Respondents to the survey were not given a definition of morale. They responded according to what they interpreted the word to mean. Some believe morale reflects the degree of well-being felt by the servicemember. On the other hand, commanders say that in measuring morale, they want to know if the servicemember is following orders and getting the job done.

Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, the top U.S. officer in Iraq, said that low morale isn't an issue because troops are fulfilling the mission.

''Morale is . . . not necessarily giving them Baskin-Robbins,'' he said in a Stars and Stripes interview. ''Sometimes it's being able to train them hard and keep them focused in a combat environment so they can survive.

''So at its most fundamental level within our Army, taking care of soldiers and their morale could have very few worldly comforts. But the morale of the soldier is good. He's being taken care of, he's accomplishing his mission, he's being successful in the warfighting.''

Other military leaders say they are always looking at ways to improve the morale of their troops. ''Morale begins with caring leaders looking their soldiers in the eye,'' said Lt. Col. Jim Cassella, a Pentagon spokesman. ''When senior leaders visit the troops in Iraq, they relate that the troops tell them that morale is good, a fact that's backed up by re-enlistment and retention rates.''

(These rates have been acceptable or good for the services overall. Figures for re-enlistments in Iraq are not available yet, officials said. In the Stripes survey, half or more respondents from the Army, Marines and Reserves said they were unlikely to stay in the service. Officials say re-enlistments normally drop after conflicts.)

Cassella said that leaders visiting Iraq seek out the opinions of troops. Some say the views expressed may be distorted as a result of the nature of the get-togethers, ''dog and pony shows,'' in the words of combat engineer Pfc. Roger Hunsaker.

''When congressional delegations came through,'' said one 36-year-old artillery master sergeant who asked not to be identified, commanders ''hand-picked the soldiers who would go. They stacked the deck.''

Others on the ground in Iraq think top leaders are right more times than they are given credit for.

''I heard that reporters/politicians were trying to say morale was down out here,'' Petty Officer Matthew W. Early wrote on his questionnaire at Camp Get Some in southern Iraq. ''What do people back home expect us to feel after a war? Are we supposed to be as happy here as we are with our friends and families back home? Hell no.

''Of course, when confronted by reporters, we're going to voice out opinions about our situation. Unfortunately, some people like to complain about how they live or what they don't have. The complaint concerning morale is the voice of the minority, not the majority.''

In the Stripes survey, troops consistently rated their unit's morale as lower than their own. John Kay, marketing director for the Army Research Institute, said, ''Soldiers always rate self [personal] morale higher than unit moral. This is nothing new.''

Troops may wish to report what they perceive as the true morale situation without getting themselves into trouble, a way of saying, ''I'm OK, but the unit's not.''

Some of the gap can also be the result of hearing other troops complain, compounding the impression that unit morale is low, even if each complainer believes his or her own morale is better.

''Both are true,'' said Charles Moskos, a military sociologist with Northwestern University.

The military studies morale regularly, but ''the further you go up the chain in the officer corps, the reality of day-to-day morale cannot register completely,'' said Lt. Col. Daniel Smith, retired chief of research for the Center for Defense Information. ''Whereas when you talk to the platoon sergeants, platoon leaders and even company commanders, you get a better sense of the true state of affairs. Do the weapons work? Are they getting hot meals? Are they getting enough rest? Are their leaders competent and not taking unnecessary risks?''

Unlike some officials who have visited Iraq, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, during a September stop in Iraq, spoke not about morale per se, but about the importance of the mission and about sacrifice.

''You're people . . . who weren't drafted, you weren't conscripted, you searched your souls and decided that you wanted to step forward and serve your country,'' he told the 4th Infantry Division, according to a Pentagon transcript.

Another speech to air assault soldiers of the 101st Airborne division echoed the sentiment:

''The important thing I would also add is that every one of you is a volunteer. You all asked to do this, and that is impressive and it's appreciated.''

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 2003]

MANY TROOPS DISSATISFIED, IRAQ POLL FINDS

(By Bradley Graham and Dana Milbank)

A broad survey of U.S. troops in Iraq by a Pentagon-funded newspaper found that half of those questioned described their unit's morale as low and their training as insufficient, and said they do not plan to reenlist.

The survey, conducted by the Stars and Stripes newspaper, also recorded about a third of the respondents complaining that their mission lacks clear definition and characterizing the war in Iraq as of little or no value. Fully 40 percent said the jobs they were doing had little or nothing to do with their training.

The findings, drawn from 1,935 questionnaires presented to U.S. service members throughout Iraq, conflict with statements by military commanders and Bush administration officials that portray the deployed troops as high-spirited and generally well-prepared. Though not obtained through scientific methods, the survey results suggest that a combination of difficult conditions, complex missions and prolonged tours in Iraq is wearing down a significant portion of the U.S. force and threatening to provoke a sizable exodus from military service.

In the first of a week-long series of articles, Stars and Stripes said yesterday that it undertook the survey in August after receiving scores of letters from troops who were upset with one aspect or another of the Iraq operation. The newspaper, which receives some funding from the Defense Department but functions without editorial control by the Pentagon, prepared 17 questions and sent three teams of reporters to Iraq to conduct the survey and related interviews at nearly 50 camps.

''We conducted a 'convenience survey,' meaning we gave it to those who happened to be available at the time rather than to a randomly selected cross section, so the results cannot necessarily be projected as representing the whole population,'' said David Mazzarella, the paper's editorial director in Washington. ''But we still think the findings are significant and make clear that the troops have a different idea of things than what their leaders have been saying.''

Experts in public opinion and the military concurred that the poll was not necessarily representative, but they characterized it as a useful gauge of troops' sentiment. ''The numbers are consistent with what I suspect is going on there,'' said David Segal, a military sociologist at the University of Maryland at College Park. ''I am getting a sense that there is a high and increasing level of demoralization and a growing sense of being in something they don't understand and aren't sure the American people understand.''

The paper quoted Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, saying in a Sept. 9 interview for the series that ''there is no morale problem.'' He said complaints among troops are ''expected'' and part of ''the Army's normal posture,'' whether the soldiers are deployed or not.

''We haven't had time to study the survey, but we take all indicators of morale seriously,'' said Bryan Whitman, a senior Pentagon spokesman. ''It's the reason we've instituted several programs to address morale and welfare issues.'' A White House spokesman had no comment.

Some military experts pointed to good news for the administration in the survey. Military historian Eliot Cohen, who serves on a Pentagon advisory panel, noted that the proportion that said the war was worthwhile—67 percent—and the proportion of troops that said they have a clearly defined mission—64 percent—is amazingly high.'' He added that complaints are typical. ''American troops have a God-given right and tradition of grumbling,'' he said.

In the survey, 34 percent described their morale as low, compared with 27 percent who described it as high and 37 percent who said it was average; 49 percent described their unit's morale as low, while 16 percent called it high.

In recent days, the Bush administration has launched a campaign to blame the news media for portraying the situation in Iraq in a negative light. Last week, Bush described the military spirit as high and said that life in Iraq is ''a lot better than you probably think. Just ask people who have been there.''

But Stars and Stripes raised questions about what those visiting dignitaries saw in Iraq. ''Many soldiers, including several officers, allege that VIP visits from the Pentagon and Capitol Hill are only given handpicked troops to meet with during their tours of Iraq,'' the newspaper said in its interview with Sanchez. ''The phrase 'Dog and Pony Show' is usually used. Some troops even go so far as to say they've been ordered not to talk to VIPs because leaders are afraid of what they might say.''

The newspaper also noted in that interview that its reporters were told that some soldiers who had complained of morale problems had faced disciplinary actions known as Article 15s, which can result in reprimand, extra duties and forfeiture of pay. Sanchez said he did not know of any such punishments, but he added that they would have been handled at a lower level.

The paper's project recorded significant differences in the morale of various units, but overall found that Army troops tended to sound more dissatisfied than Air Force personnel and Marines, and that reservists were the most troubled.

Uncertainty about when they are returning home was a major factor in dampening morale, according to the newspaper. The interviews were conducted at a time when some reserve and regular Army units were learning that their tours had been extended. The Pentagon has since sought to provide a clearer rotation plan and has begun granting troops two-week home leaves.

Although Pentagon officials say they have seen no sign yet of a rise in the number of troops deciding against reenlisting, the survey suggested that such a surge may be coming soon. A total of 49 percent of those questioned said it was ''very unlikely'' or ''not likely'' that they would remain in the military after they complete their current obligations. In the past, enlistment rates tended to drop after conflicts, but many defense experts and noncommissioned officers have warned of the potential for a historically high exodus, particularly of reservists.

HONORING ALBERTSON'S INCORPORATED OF BOISE, ID

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a quiet patriot from Idaho. Our National Guard and Reserve troops who have been called up to fight in Afghanistan and Iraq have left behind not only families, but in many cases, full-time jobs. Many employers go the extra mile to provide support to their deployed employees, their families, and communities. One such employer-patriot is Albertson's Incorporated, headquartered in Boise, ID.

Albertson's Incorporated recently received recognition from the Department of Defense for its extraordinary ongoing efforts in support of deployed employees, and those employees' families. The National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, ESGR, has chosen Albertson's Incorporated as one of only four companies nationwide to receive the 2003 ESGR Home Front Award. The Department of Defense recognizes the efforts of these companies to take steps such as providing pay differential, the continuation of benefits when their employees are mobilized, and a willingness to advocate Guard and Reserve service among their industry peers. With many employees currently stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan, Albertson's has shown dedication to the values of freedom and democracy, and perseverance in light of limited personnel resources. Albertson's has translated patriotic words into action, and shown that corporations as well as individuals can lend a helping hand to the men and women of the Armed Forces, their families, and our Nation as a whole.

IN HONOR OF OFFICER JASON PRATT

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I honor one of Nebraska's finest who recently gave his life in the line of duty. His service and sacrifice are an inspiration to us all and a reminder of the appreciation we have for our law enforcement officers and first responders.

Officer Jason Pratt began his career with the Omaha Police Department in 1996 at the age of 23. He served honorably for 7 years and 2 days before being tragically killed in the line of duty on September 11, 2003. During his years on the force, his commitment and energy were recognized several times by his fellow officers, community members and superiors.

In February of 1997, Officer Pratt began work as a patrol officer. By April of that year—less than a year on the job—members of the Leavenworth Neighborhood Association were already noticing Jason for the work he and his crew did in the area. Jason's dedication to service did not wane and in May of 2001, he was recognized by the Neighborhood Association again for his efforts.

Jason followed that service with a year in the vice squad, a division of the intelligence unit. During this time, he kept family areas, such as neighborhood parks, safer for our families. Finally, he also spent time in the emergency response unit, placing himself in extreme danger on numerous occasions by taking high-risk offenders off the street.

Officer Pratt will be well remembered for being an officer who always came as back up to help out other officers. In September of 2001, he assisted bike officers with a traffic stop that ultimately led to the suspect being booked on a number of felony charges. In another instance, in April of 2003, he was responding to a house fire where an adult and two children were trapped. Poor weather conditions delayed a second fire unit so Officer Pratt assisted firefighters in carrying gear up to the house. Because of his actions, there were no further injuries that day.

Officer Pratt lost his life while trying to make our city safer. His sacrifices, and those of his family, are another reminder of the risks taken by police officers across the Nation to keep our cities and towns safe. Americans honor their commitment and we stand shoulder to shoulder with them when one is struck down.

I am proud to have witnessed the outpouring of support for his family given by the people of Omaha. His two children, Madison and Jordyn, and his wife Stacy, have lost their father and husband and he can never be replaced. But the people of Omaha have shown again and again that they will do whatever necessary to help the Pratt family in the weeks, months and years to come. Officer Pratt will not be forgotten and all of Omaha will work to ensure his family is safe.

Jason Pratt died doing what he always wanted to do. He died protecting his and our community through public service alongside his friends and fellow officers. In his memory, those officers will continue to serve every day knowing that if he were still alive; he would be standing at their side. I join with my fellow Nebraskans in thanking Officer Pratt and his family for all they have given to us and pledging to remember his work and his life and the difference he made in our community.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF MOTHER TERESA

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Mother Teresa and to acknowledge her upcoming beatification of the Vatican. The process leading up to her beatification has been the shortest in modern history. In early 1999—less than 2 years after Mother Teresa's death—Pope John Paul II waived the normal 5-year waiting period and allowed the immediate opening of her canonization process. The rule has traditionally been used to allow for a more objective look at a person's life and achievements. However, the life and works of Mother Teresa were so astounding that Pope John Paul II was convinced that he did not need 5 years to objectively determine that she should be beatified.

Mother Teresa, the ''Saint of the Gutters,'' was born in what is now Macedonia in 1910. She took her final vows as a nun in 1937, and in 1946, while riding a train to the mountain town of Darjeeling to recover from suspected tuberculosis, she received, as she says ''a call within a call'' from God to, ''serve Him among the poorest of the poor.'' And it is in this capacity that the world came to know of Mother Teresa's endless charity and love for all human life. She confronted this monumental task one hovel at a time. She created a religious order to help the aged, the poor, the hungry, the sick, and the disabled to live and die with dignity. She received approval from the Pope to establish the Missionaries of Charity, which focused much of its attention on giving comfort to the dying. The year before she died, Mother Teresa's Missionaries of Charity were operating 517 missions in more than 100 countries. In addition, she opened schools, orphanages, and homes for the needy, as well as homes for AIDS victims, and hospices.

Mother Teresa was a woman who fought passionately for dignity for all

human life—from the leper on the streets of Calcutta, to the ailing AIDS victim in New York, to the unborn child inside a mother's womb. Her passion for protecting all human life was clear when she spoke to Members of Congress at the National Prayer Breakfast in February 1994. She said,

> I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself. And if we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another?

She continuously reminded people around the world of the plight of those weakest in the world; those least able to protect themselves. In 1979, she received the Nobel Peace Prize and accepted the award ''in the name of the hungry, the naked, the homeless, of the crippled, of the blind, of the lepers, of all those people who feel unwanted, unloved, uncared-for throughout society, people that have become a burden to society and are shunned by everyone.''

Mother Teresa touched the lives of those most in need in this world and she inspired others to service in every corner of the globe. Certainly the work she performed in her life was miraculous, and I have no doubt that those in need will continue to find solace and comfort in Mother Teresa and the continuing work that her missions still perform.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY FOR IRAQIS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to discuss something that I consider a major cornerstone to any free society—religious freedom.

I recently offered an amendment during the markup that would condition the money going to the Coalition Provisional Authority, CPA, by ensuring the preservation of ''full rights to religious freedom for all individuals, including a prohibition on laws which would criminalize blasphemy and apostasy.'' The first part of that phrase, ''full rights to religious freedom for all individuals,'' is extremely important given the recent historical record on constitutions that established Islam as the official religion of the state. Pakistan is an Islamic Republic in which the constitution extends some rights to groups to engage in their religious practices.

However, the constitution does not allow for the freedom of conscience of individual believers, either within different sects of Islam or for those wishing to convert. Therefore, the biggest danger may be to those who do not subscribe to the prevailing interpretation of Islam. With the Afghan constitution just now coming to light, the international community and the Afghan people are slowly becoming aware that their constitution will not preserve their individual right to believe what they wish.

On October 1, 2003, the New York Times published an op-ed piece written by members of the United States Commission on Religious Freedom which precisely outlined the significant importance of only supporting a constitution that, and I quote, ''clearly and unequivocally enshrines human rights and religious freedom.'' We must not settle for anything less and we must not encourage the Afghan people to settle for any less. As stated in the article, ''After all, it is not just Afghanistan's future that is at stake. Iraqis are watching to see what minimum standards of individual rights will be acceptable to the United States.''

In addition, the last part of the phrase which would prohibit criminalization of blasphemy and apostasy is equally as important. As much as the constitution must be absolutely secular, those who would freely renounce their faith, apostasy, or those who would speak out profanely against religion, blasphemy, must have their rights preserved. The freedom of religion is more than just the ability to practice one's faith, but is central to other rights and freedoms, including a free press, public assembly, free speech or the right to petition the government. All of these freedoms will be circumscribed if religious freedom is not part of an Iraqi constitution and a reconstituted Iraq.

My amendment, which also appears in the House language, would also require the President to submit a report to the Congress every 90 days detailing efforts to make religious freedom a major tenet of the Iraqi constitution. If Secretary Powell's recent statement is correct, then there should be a constitution in six months. That would, at most, require two reports on the status of the constitution if completed within 6 months.

In my view, religious freedom is the bedrock on which freedom, hope and progress rest and should be a top priority as we discuss the many foreign policy issues at hand.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times op-ed article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 2003]

SILENCED AGAIN IN KABUL

(By Preeta D. Bansal and Felice D. Gaer)

WASHINGTON.—American efforts to build a democratic, tolerant Afghanistan are facing a serious challenge: the draft of the Afghan constitution, which may be made public as early as this week, does not yet provide for crucial human rights protections, including freedom of thought, conscience and religion. The United States and the international community should insist that the draft presented by the constitutional commission explicitly protect these core human rights for all Afghans.

Despite reports to the contrary, the current draft versions of the constitution enshrine particular schools of Islamic law, or Shariah, that criminalize dissent and criticism of Islam through blasphemy laws.

If this draft is ratified in December by the loya jirga, or grand council, the freedoms of Afghan citizens would continue to be in the hands of judges educated in Islamic law, rather than in civil law. Official charges of blasphemy, apostasy or other religious crimes could still be used to suppress debate, just as they were under the Taliban.

Making changes in the draft is all the more important because, as Afghanistan's Human Rights Commission and the United Nations' Assistance Mission in Afghanistan have reported, Afghan reformers seeking to express their views on their new constitution have been hindered by threats, harassment and even imprisonment. In one case, an editor and a reporter have been charged with blasphemy for publishing an article questioning the role of Islam in the state.

On our recent trip to Kabul as members of the bipartisan United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, we met many Muslims who recognize the compatibility of Islam with human rights. Yet these Muslims are being intimidated into silence by vocal and well-armed extremists.

Freedom-loving Afghans won't be able to rely on conscientious judges to protect religious freedom without an explicit reference to it in the constitution. Afghanistan's chief justice, Fazl Hadi Shinwari, for example, has shown little regard for those who disagree with his hard-line interpretation of Islam. He told us that he accepted the international standards protected by the Universal Declaration on Human Rights—with three exceptions: freedom of expression, freedom of religion and equality of the sexes. ''This is the only law,'' the chief justice told us, pointing to the Koran on his desk.

Even in a self-proclaimed Islamic republic, however, all citizens, Muslims as well as non-Muslims, must be free to debate the role of religion and to question prevailing orthodoxies without fear of being subjected to trials, prison or death. At a minimum, Afghan leaders should amend the draft constitution to specifically ensure the human rights guarantees that Afghanistan has already accepted and ratified in six international treaties. Afterward, the United States must ensure the safety of reformers who want to speak out at the loya jirga to ensure that the constitution of Afghanistan makes possible a free and just society based on the rule of law.

While respecting that Afghans should determine their own future, United States officials must not let a ''hands off'' policy lead to political conditions that will embolden repression and enable a few to hijack the future from the many Afghans who hope to embrace freedom.

After all, it is not just Afghanistan's future that is at stake. Iraqis are watching to see what minimum standards of individual rights will be acceptable to the United States. Unfortunately, the message that the Afghan draft constitution is giving Iraq is the wrong one. We should instead send our own message to President Hamid Karzai, to Afghan officials and to the Afghan people: Americans will only support a state with a constitution that clearly and unequivocally enshrines human rights and religious freedom.

COST ESTIMATE FOR S. 300

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for S. 300, the Jackie Robinson Congressional Gold Medal bill, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 300—A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the nation, and to express the sense of Congress that there should be a national day in recognition of Jackie Robinson

S. 300 would authorize the President to present a gold medal to the family of Jackie Robinson in recognition of his contributions to the nation as an athlete, business leader, and citizen. The legislation would authorize the U.S. Mint to spend up to $30,000 to produce the gold medal. To help recover the costs of the medal, S. 300 would authorize the Mint to strike and sell bronze duplicates of the medal at a price that covers production costs for both the medal and the duplicates.

Based on the costs of recent medals produced by the Mint, CBO estimates that the bill would not significantly increase direct spending from the U.S. Mint Public Enterprise Fund. We estimate that the gold medal would cost about $25,000 to produce in fiscal year 2004, including around $5,000 for the cost of the gold and about $20,000 for the costs to design, engrave, and manufacture the medal. CBO expects that the Mint would recoup little of its costs by selling bronze duplicates to the public.

S. 300 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would have no effect on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Matthew Pickford, who can be reached at 226–2860. This estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to thank my colleagues for designating the week of October 19–25, 2003 as National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week. S. Res. 243, the resolution making next week National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week, was cosponsored by 44 of my colleagues and passed the Senate last night by unanimous consent.

The need to combat the severe threat of lead poisoning to our children's health has never been greater. It is estimated that 25 million homes nationwide have lead hazards. Many of those homes were built before 1950, when paint contained as much as 50 percent lead. Peeling chips and dust from deteriorating lead-based paint is one of the most common sources of childhood lead poisoning. According to the latest national health estimates, nearly one-half of a million children under the age of 6 suffer from lead poisoning, with these children 8 times more likely to come from low-income working families than wealthy families.

Unfortunately, except for severely poisoned children, there is no medical treatment for this disease. Even then, treatment may only reduce the level of lead present in the body, not reverse the harm already caused. Research shows that children with elevated blood lead levels are seven times more likely to drop our of high school and 6 times more likely to have reading disabilities. And it costs an average of $10,000 more a year to educate a lead poisoned child.

We need to find the will and the resources to eradicate childhood lead poisoning in this country. Designating the last full week in October as National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week will help shine a light on this terrible problem, energize the Federal Government into playing a more effective role, and improve local, State and Federal cooperation in the process. With concerted effort, we can eliminate the tragedy of childhood lead poisoning so that no family in our country has to live in unsafe housing. I am committed to addressing this crisis, and believe this resolution can encourage communities to focus on solving the problem.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. ADEWALE TROUTMAN

• Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Adewale Troutman. Dr. Troutman was recently appointed to the position of Louisville Metro Health Director. Dr. Troutman, who formerly served as head of the health department in Fulton, GA, will also serve Kentucky as a faculty member of the University of Louisville's School of Public Health.

Dr. Troutman hails from New York City's South Bronx and has considerable health care experience in both the United States and Nigeria. In addition to serving as head of the health department in Fulton, GA, he has also served as a senior scientist at Morehouse University College of Medicine with former U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher.

Dr. Troutman brings vision and leadership to a position that will influence the well-being and livelihoods of many Kentuckians. Some of the issues Dr. Troutman endeavors to undertake include access to health care for the uninsured and the disparity in health services based on race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.

I am pleased to honor Dr. Troutman as a new addition to Kentucky's health care leadership. We are fortunate to have his direction and look forward to the considerable progress his tenure and administration promises to produce. I thank the Senate for allowing me to pay tribute to our newest Kentuckian.•

MARYLAND WATERMEN'S ASSOCIATION

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to the Maryland Watermen's Association which is celebrating its 30th anniversary this year. I have had the opportunity to work closely with the MWA and its members over the years on a number of important issues—from improving our commercial harbors and historic seaports to restoring oyster reefs in Chesapeake Bay—and I have great respect for the men and women who make their living working Maryland's waters.

For many people, Maryland's watermen conjure up romantic images of solitary oystermen sailing the Chesapeake Bay in skipjacks and harvesting the Bay's bounty. Their independent lifestyle in the outdoors represents a significant part of the culture of the Chesapeake Bay. But a Maryland waterman's life is not easy. It is arduous work harvesting crabs, clams, oysters and charter fishing. Watermen are dependent upon good weather and when storms prevent harvesting, there is no paycheck. Watermen also depend upon pollution-free water and disease-free finfish and shellfish. The number of licensed, active watermen has decreased by over 2,000 in 30 years. These stark realities make Maryland's watermen strong and persistent advocates for the restoration of Chesapeake Bay.

Representing the independent and hardworking watermen is no easy task particularly in these times when their way of life is buffeted by so many forces. However, since it was first established in 1973, the Maryland Watermen's Association has done a great job of representing the interests of commercial watermen to the Maryland General Assembly and our congressional delegation. Under the leadership of Larry Simns, its president since 1973, and Betty Duty, its administrator, the association has been a forceful and effective advocate for Maryland's commercial finfish and shellfish industries.

I extend an invitation for all to attend Chesapeake Appreciation Days, to be held at Sandy Point State Park, Saturday and Sunday, November 1 and 2. This celebration of the Chesapeake Bay and the watermen who depend upon it is sponsored by the Maryland Watermen's Association. Chesapeake Appreciation Days is an excellent opportunity for everyone to see exhibits and events which will teach about the Bay's importance to all of us. It is a terrific way to gain an appreciation of the hard working members of the Maryland Watermen's Association over the last 30 years.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:54 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1092. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain parcels of Federal land in Carson City and Douglas County, Nevada.

H.R. 1442. An act to authorize the design and construction of a visitor center for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

H.R. 1521. An act to provide for additional lands to be included within the boundary of the Johnstown Flood National Memorial in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1598. An act to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in projects within the San Diego Creek Watershed, California, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1821. An act to award a congressional gold medal to Dr. Dorothy Height in recognition of her many contributions to the Nation.

H.R. 1828. An act to halt Syrian support for terrorism, end its occupation of Lebanon, and stop its development of weapons of mass destruction, and by so doing hold Syria accountable for the serious international security problems it has caused in the Middle East, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1883. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1601–1 Main Street in Jacksonville, Florida, as the ''Eddie Mae Steward Post Office''.

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution recognizing Inspectors General for their efforts to prevent and detect waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement, and to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the Federal Government during the past 25 years.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary, supporting the designation of an ''American Jewish History Month'', and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of College Savings Month.

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution recognizing and congratulating the East Boynton Beach, Florida, Little League team as the 2003 United States Little League Champions.

The message further announced that the House had passed S. 1680, a bill to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1092. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain parcels of Federal land in Carson City and Douglas County, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1521. An act to provide for additional lands to be included within the boundary of the Johnstown Flood National Memorial in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1598. An act to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in projects within the San Diego Creek Watershed, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1883. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1601–1 Main Street in Jacksonville, Florida, as the ''Eddie Mae Steward Post Office''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution recognizing Inspectors General for their efforts to prevent and detect waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement, and to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the Federal Government during the past 25 years; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

The following concurrent resolutions were read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary, supporting the designation of an ''American Jewish History Month'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of College Savings Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution recognizing and congratulating the East Boynton Beach, Florida, Little League team as the 2003 United States Little League Champions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1442. An act to authorize the design and construction of a visitor center for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1751. A bill to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4779. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Banking and Finance, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Terrorism Risk Insurance'' (RIN1505–AA98) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4780. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Banking and Finance, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program'' (RIN1505–AA99) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4781. A communication from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Interim Capital Treatment of Consolidated Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Program Assets'' (RIN3064–AC74) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4782. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Outer Continental Shelf Facility Security (USCG–2003–14759'' (RIN1625–AA68) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4783. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Area Maritime Security (USCG–2003–14733)'' (RIN1625–AA42) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4784. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Automatic Identification System; Vessel Carriage Requirement (USCG–2003–14757)'' (RIN1625–AA67) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4785. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vessel Security (USCG–2003–14749)'' (RIN1625–AA46) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4786. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Facility Security (USCG–2003–14732)'' (RIN1625–AA43) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4787. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of National Maritime Security Initiatives (USCG–2003–14792)'' (RIN1625–AA69) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4788. A communication from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Government Performance and Results Act Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2003–2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4789. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report required by PL 107–243: ''Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4790. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of the Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15–155, ''Cooperative Purchasing Agreements Amendment Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4791. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of the Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15–156, ''Revised Closing of a Portion of a Public Alley in Square 209, S.O. 02–1019, Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4792. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of the Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15–157, ''Tax Abatement for

New Residential Developments Definition Clarification Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4793. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of the Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15–160, ''Board of Veterinary Examiners Temporary Amendment Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4794. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of the Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15–159, ''Food Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4795. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of the Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15–161, ''Domestic Violence Protection Orders Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4796. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of the Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15–162, ''Freeze of Within-Grade Salary Increase Repeal Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4797. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-163, ''Superior Court of the District of Columbia Master Jury List Clarification Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4798. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-164, ''Make a Difference Amendment Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4799. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-165, ''Comprehensive Housing Strategy Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4800. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-177, ''Retail Incentive Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4801. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-178, ''Veterans of Foreign Wars Real Property Tax Exemption and Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4802. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-179, ''Office of Property Management Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4803. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-166, ''Unified Communications Center Lease Agreement Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4804. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-167, ''Health Care Privatization Rulemaking Temporary Amendment Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4805. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-168, ''Presidential Primary Petition Waiver and Democratic State Committee Elections Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4806. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-151, ''Fiscal Year 2003 Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4807. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-150, ''National Guard Association of the United States Real Property Tax Exemption Reconfirmation and Modification Temporary Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4808. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 15-175, ''Department of Insurance and Securities Regulation Merger Review Amendment Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4809. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Public Service Commission Agency Fund; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4810. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Public Service Commission Agency Fund; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4811. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Fiscal Year 2003 Revenue Estimate in Support of the District's General Obligation Bonds; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4812. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of direct spending or receipts legislation dated October 2, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4813. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a comparative analysis of actual cash collections to revised revenue estimates through the 2nd quarter of fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4814. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Water and Sewer Authority; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4815. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Evidence Requirements for Assignment of Social Security Numbers (SSNs); Assignment of SSNs for Nonwork Purposes'' (RIN0960-AF05) received on October 7, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4816. A communication from the Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transition plan to implement the provisions of the Family Court Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4817. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Office of Labor-Management Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Labor Organizations Annual Financial Reports; Final Rule'' (RIN1215-AB34) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4818. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4819. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Orthopedic Devices; Classification for the Resorable Calcium Salt Bone Void Filler Device'' (Doc. No. 01N–0411) received on October 7, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4820. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anorectal Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use'' (RIN0910–AA01) received on October 7, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4821. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Registration of Food Facilities Under the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002'' (RIN0910–AC40) received on October 14, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4822. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prior Notice of Imported Food Under the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002'' (RIN0910–AC41) received on October 14, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4823. A communication from the Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing an Paying Benefits'' received on October 14, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4824. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4825. A communication from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4826. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Procedures Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Elimination of Statistical Classes for Large Cigars'' (RIN1513–AA18) received on October 15, 2003; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4827. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of a Threshold for Gamma-Butyrolactone'' (RIN1117–AA52) received on October 7, 2003; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4828. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to improve veterans' benefits programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–4829. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to the authority of the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to promulgate regulations relating to staff adjustments of employees appointed under chapter 74 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–4830. A communication from the Director, Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Compensation and Pension Provisions of the Veterans Benefits Act of 2002'' (RIN2900–AL62) received on October 8, 2003; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 300. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation, and to express the sense of Congress that there should be a national day in recognition of Jackie Robinson.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1691. A bill to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on the Judiciary.

George W. Miller, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for the term of fifteen years.

Deborah Ann Spagnoli, of California, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of six years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1739. A bill to provide duty-free treatment for certain tuna; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. CORZINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. DODD):

S. 1740. A bill to amend the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 (Public Law 107–42; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note) to provide compensation for the United States Citizens who were victims of a terrorist-related laboratory-confirmed anthrax infection in the United States during the period beginning on September 13, 2001, through November 30, 2001, on the same basis as compensation is provided to victims of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1741. A bill to provide a site for the National Women's History Museum in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1742. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for variable interest rates on student loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 1743. A bill to permit reviews of criminal records of applicants for private security officer employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 1744. A bill to prevent abuse of Government credit cards; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1745. A bill to designate a Prisoner of War/Missing in Action National Memorial at Riverside National Cemetery in Riverside, California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1746. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 339 Hicksville Road in Bethpage, New York, as the ''Brian C. Hickey Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DODD):

S. 1747. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of all contact lenses as medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 1748. A bill to establish a program to award grants to improve and maintain sites honoring Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 1749. A bill to amend various provisions of the Consumer Credit Protection Act to relief for victims of identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1750. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the nutrition and health of children in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1751. A bill to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution recognizing Commodore John Barry as the first flag officer of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. Res. 244. A resolution congratulating Shirin Ebadi for winning the 2003 Nobel Peace Prize and commending her for her lifetime of work to promote democracy and human rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. Res. 245. A resolution designating the week beginning October 19, 2003, as ''National Character Counts Week''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 767

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 767, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the tax on social security benefits.

S. 970

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 970, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to preserve jobs and production activities in the United States.

S. 1033

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1033, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to expand or add coverage of pregnant women under the medicaid and State children's health insurance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1037

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the medicare program of all oral anticancer drugs.

S. 1095

At the request of Mr. SUNUNU, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1095, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve outpatient vision services under part B of the medicare program.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1144, a bill to name the health care facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 820 South Damen Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Jesse Brown Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''.

S. 1180

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1180, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the

work opportunity credit and the welfare-to-work credit.

S. 1208

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to amend the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to establish a program to provide assistance to States and nonprofit organizations to preserve suburban forest land and open space and contain suburban sprawl, and for other purposes.

S. 1218

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1218, a bill to provide for Presidential support and coordination of interagency ocean science programs and development and coordination of a comprehensive and integrated United States research and monitoring program.

S. 1223

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1223, a bill to increase the number of well-trained mental health service professionals (including those based in schools) providing clinical mental health care to children and adolescents, and for other purposes.

S. 1326

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1326, a bill to establish the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Manufacturing in the Department of Commerce.

S. 1397

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1397, a bill to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities.

S. 1447

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1447, a bill to establish grant programs to improve the health of border area residents and for bioterrorism preparedness in the border area, and for other purposes.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to protect privacy by limiting the access of the government to library, bookseller, and other personal records for foreign intelligence and counterintelligence purposes.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1531, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Chief Justice John Marshall.

S. 1545

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1545, a bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to permit States to determine State residency for higher education purposes and to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents.

S. 1573

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1573, a bill to redesignate the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Louisiana as the ''Theodore Roosevelt-Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge''.

S. 1597

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1597, a bill to provide mortgage payment assistance for employees who are separated from employment.

S. 1612

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1612, a bill to establish a technology, equipment, and information transfer within the Department of Homeland Security.

S. 1630

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1630, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2–1–1 telephone service for information and referral services, and for other purposes.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1645, a bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain foreign agricultural workers, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the H–2A worker program under that Act, to provide a stable, legal agricultural workforce, to extend basic legal protections and better working conditions to more workers, and for other purposes.

S. 1664

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1664, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to provide for the enhanced review of covered pesticide products, to authorize fees for certain pesticide products, and to extend and improve the collection of maintenance fees.

S. 1684

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1684, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissections performed for the treatment of breast cancer.

S. 1717

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1717, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Cord Blood Stem Cell Bank Network to prepare, store, and distribute human umbilical cord blood stems cells for the treatment of patients and to support peer-reviewed research using such cells.

S. 1726

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1726, a bill to reduce the preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

S. CON. RES. 58

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 58, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and encouraging prevention of stalking in the United States and supporting the goals and ideals of National Stalking Awareness Month.

S. CON. RES. 67

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 67, a concurrent resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and supporting the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month.

S. CON. RES. 73

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 73, a concurrent resolution expressing the deep concern of Congress regarding the failure of the Islamic Republic of Iran to adhere to its obligations under a safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency and the engagement by Iran in activities that appear to be designed to develop nuclear weapons.

S. RES. 202

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 202, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the genocidal Ukraine Famine of 1932–33.

AMENDMENT NO. 1807

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1807 proposed to S. 1689, an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1825

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1825 proposed to S. 1689, an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1837

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1837 proposed to S. 1689, an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1852

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1852 proposed to S. 1689, an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1853

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1853 proposed to S. 1689, an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1858

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1858 proposed to S. 1689, an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1859

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1859 proposed to S. 1689, an original bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. CORZINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. DODD):

S. 1740. A bill to amend the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 (Public Law 107–42; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note) to provide compensation for the United States Citizens who were victims of a terrorist-related laboratory-confirmed anthrax infection in the United States during the period beginning on September 13, 2001, through November 30, 2001, on the same basis as compensation is provided to victims of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, the senior Senator from South Dakota and Democratic leader. I thank him for his concern and his work on this issue.

Two years have passed since several anthrax letters were sent to a few journalists and, obviously, to public officials, killing inadvertent victims. These are victims whose only sin, apparently, was doing their jobs, and these attacks have left several other people sick and out of work.

The Senate and all who work here—the Senate family—are still adjusting to the aftermath of these attacks 2 years later. We see it in new layers of security. We see it in new mail-handling procedures in which mail to Capitol Hill now is screened and irradiated before it is delivered.

The U.S. Postal Service has had to develop and implement new safety measures to protect its customers and its workers. Meanwhile, nearly two dozen of our fellow Americans who merely came into contact with these anthrax-laden letters have become the forgotten victims of terror. Some have suffered poor health, and some have not been able to return to work.

I am pleased to join with Senator DASCHLE and my other good friends, Senators LAUTENBERG, NELSON of Florida, FEINGOLD, CORZINE, MIKULSKI, SARBANES, and CLINTON, to introduce the Anthrax Victims Fund Fairness Act of 2003. This will allow these forgotten victims of terror and their families to seek help through the September 11 Victims Compensation Fund.

They need this help to pay for medical expenses and to provide for themselves and their families if they have been unable to return to work. They are our fellow citizens, and they were unwittingly on the front lines when our new, shadowy struggle against terrorism began.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, we learned that the United States was not impervious to acts of terrorism of the kinds that have rained death and destruction on other societies far away. The attacks shocked the world and left the American people with the terrible knowledge that we could once again become victims, targets of terrorists at any time.

Only a few days after September 11, our worst fears were confirmed. Between September 22 and November 14, nearly two dozen Americans from five States and the District of Columbia became casualties of a sinister bioterrorism attack. Twenty-two Americans ranging in age from 7 months to 94 years were stricken in these attacks of anthrax. It is a rare disease that had only afflicted a handful of Americans in the last century. We would ultimately learn that 11 people had been infected with cutaneous or skin anthrax, and 11 contracted the more serious form of the disease called inhalation or pulmonary anthrax. Five of our fellow Americans died from these attacks.

The victims of the anthrax attacks vary in gender, race, religion, age, economic status, and locale. But they all have one thing in common: Everyone suffered. The targets were members of the news media, and two Members of the Senate, myself and Senator DASCHLE, but the victims—not the targets, but the victims—who suffered the most were employees of the U.S. Postal Service, the Department of State, news organizations, the Senate, and the aides, the children, and the senior citizens whose mail came in contact with the anthrax-laden letters.

In the fall of 2001, I worked with Speaker HASTERT, Senator DASCHLE, Senator LOTT, Congressman GEPHARDT, Senators HATCH, KOHL, DEWINE, SCHUMER, and CLINTON to establish the September 11 Victims Compensation Fund of 2001. This fund ensured that victims of the September 11 attacks would be eligible for compensation for the horrific losses they suffered. After extensive negotiations with the Bush administration, we established the September 11 fund to provide victims an alternative to what would have been a lengthy battle in court.

Under the stewardship of Ken Feinberg, the Special Master of the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund, and with the supervision of the Department of Justice, more than 1,000 of the 3,016 families of those who died in the September 11 attacks and more than 1,000 of the unknown number who were injured have filed claims.

The fund, which has no cap, had paid out $633 million by September 10, 2003, with an average award of about $1.6 million for death claims. It is a dignified way of doing it.

As we reach the 2-year anniversary of the anthrax attacks, Congress should do the same for those whose lives were harmed by these acts of bioterrorism

as we did for the victims of September 11. While we have taken significant steps to compensate the victims of the September 11 attacks and their families, no such action has been taken on behalf of the anthrax victims. Our legislation would remedy this.

Our bill would extend the deadline for filing claims with the fund by a year and expand the eligibility to include laboratory-confirmed anthrax tests.

As we reach the two-year anniversary of the anthrax attacks, Congress should do the same for those whose lives were harmed by these acts of bioterrorism as it did for the victims of September 11, 2001. While we have taken significant steps to compensate the victims of the September 11 attacks and their families, no such action has been taken on behalf of the anthrax victims. Our legislation would remedy this.

Our bill would extend the deadline for filing claims with the fund by 1-year and expand the eligibility to include laboratory-confirmed anthrax cases.

The Centers for Disease Control, CDC, have confirmed 18 anthrax infections, and an additional four are considered to have been confirmed through other methods. Applicants would be subject to the same criteria and restrictions as were set for the September 11 victims. Eligible individuals who choose to file claims would then be considered by the Special Master who would make a final determination on level of compensation within 120 days of receiving the claim. Compensation will be targeted to help the neediest victims and their families. Any life insurance, death benefit, or other Government payment previously received by victims and their families would be taken into account, and filing a claim would preclude other civil remedies.

Yesterday marked the 2-year anniversary of the opening of the letter that spread anthrax throughout the Hart Senate Office Building, exposing 31 Senate employees to a highly potent and aerosolized form of anthrax and shutting down the Dirksen Senate Office Building for 2 weeks, the Hart Senate Office Building for 3 months and briefly closing the United States Capitol, the symbol of democracy. Our staffs were fortunate to receive excellent care and guidance from the Sergeant at Arms, the CDC, the attending physician, his dedicated staff of men and women and the Environmental Protection Agency, and none of the employees of the Senate were ultimately infected. Those days are indelibly etched in our memories.

To this day—and this is the first time I have ever spoken on the floor about the anthrax attack. I have to be honest, it is something that has been on my mind, on the mind of my wife, our children, our families, ever since that day.

Senator DASCHLE and I do not know what motivates somebody to target us and to endanger our staffs and so many others. Senator DASCHLE and I were the targets of the Senate letters, but we were not stricken with anthrax, and we have made very clear that we would not be covered by the terms of this legislation.

We will never know why we were singled out, but we do know what happened to people who were totally innocent. The letters were not addressed to them as they were to us.

Eighteen of the victims were not as fortunate as were most of us in the Senate family. While some did recover after receiving antibiotics, others have had their lives changed forever. Some are stricken with ailments, such as post-traumatic stress, depression and fatigue. They continue to suffer from the after-effects of the disease.

One postal worker who was infected with anthrax filed a $100 million suit against the U.S. Postal Service in January 2003. He did not want to have to take his case to court, but he says he felt he had to after repeated attempts to receive compensation and assistance in treating his illness. Last month, on September 24, the widow of the first anthrax victim in Florida filed lawsuits seeking more than $50 million and alleging that insufficient security at the Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases at Fort Detrick, MD, and negligent actions by companies with military contracts, caused her husband's death. This bill would help these and other victims without forcing them to take their cases to the legal system.

The perpetrator or perpetrators of these acts of terrorism remain at large. I have no idea who directed these letters to Senator DASCHLE and myself. The F.B.I. continues its search. These victims cannot wait until the search is over. They deserve help now and we owe it to them to provide it.

Yesterday I joined with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, both Senators from New York, and with others in introducing separate legislation to extend and broaden the fund's coverage to cover the victims of the 1993 World Trade Center attacks, the 1998 East African embassy attacks and the 2000 U.S.S. Cole attacks. I applaud Senator SPECTER for his leadership in this area. All Americans who have been victimized by acts of terrorism deserve our sympathy, our respect and our support.

Our hearts went out to the victims of these acts of terrorism and to their loved ones. Now they also need our help, and it is my hope that we will do the right thing by these victims of terrorism.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, 2 years ago, a letter containing about 1 gram of highly concentrated anthrax was opened in my office in the Hart Senate Office Building. Potentially deadly anthrax letters were also mailed, apparently by the same person or persons, to my dear friend and colleague, Senator PATRICK LEAHY, and to several news organizations. Two years later, all of those crimes remain unsolved.

The anthrax attack on the Senate remains the largest bioterrorism attack ever on U.S. soil. Here in the Senate my staff and members of Senator FEINGOLD's staff were exposed to up to 3,000 times the lethal dose of anthrax.

The entire Hart Senate Office Building was closed for 3 months while scientists searched for a way to do something that had never been done before: To reclaim a building that had been badly contaminated by anthrax.

We all remember those times. Coming less than 5 weeks after the September 11 terrorist attacks, the anthrax attacks of 2001 sometimes made it seem as if none of us was safe anywhere.

As traumatic as the anthrax attacks were for the people of Capitol Hill, we were actually the fortunate ones. Before those deadly letters arrived in the Senate, they traveled through the U.S. mail where they left a deadly trail.

Five innocent people died and still more innocent people suffer today from serious health and debilitating problems resulting from their exposure to the anthrax letters. All too often, they are the forgotten victims of the anthrax attacks on America. They are victims of terrorism, just as surely as are all of those who were killed or injured in the September 11 terrorist attacks on America. This bill that Senator LEAHY are I are introducing today acknowledges that fact by allowing the victims of the anthrax attacks to participate in the September 11 Victims Compensation Fund.

The rules for anthrax victims would be the same as the rules for victims of the September 11 attacks: Before they can receive any compensation from the fund, anthrax victims must first waive their right to file or participate in any lawsuit in State or Federal court for damages relating to the anthrax attacks.

The legislation that my colleague and I are introducing today, and that I am very proud to cosponsor, is narrow and specific: Only persons who were exposed to anthrax during the attacks of 2001 and who have been diagnosed with a ''laboratory-confirmed anthrax infection'' may be compensated from the fund. A ''laboratory-confirmed'' case may include one in which elevated anthrax antibody levels are present, even if the anthrax bacteria cannot be detected. In at least one case, the anthrax diagnosis was made late when, after introduction of antibiotics, the actual bacteria was no longer detectable in the bloodstream. In such cases, the highly elevated anthrax antibody levels confirm both the exposure and the diagnosis.

Thomas Morris and Joseph Curseen worked for the U.S. Postal Service. They were decent, hard-working men who pushed themselves and continued to go to work and church even as anthrax infections were killing them. They and Robert Stevens, Kathy Nguyen, and Ottilie Lundgren all lost their lives in the anthrax attacks.

Their families have suffered a devastating blow. This bill would allow them to receive some small compensation for their losses without having to suffer through the additional trauma and long delays associated with a lawsuit.

Leroy Richmond, Norma Wallace, and Ernesto Blanco should be spared a long and difficult legal ordeal, too. They and others who suffered laboratory-confirmed anthrax infections as a result of the 2001 attacks deserve justice. They deserve the opportunity to participate in the same compensation fund as the victims of September 11, as long as they are willing to abide by the same rules. This bill gives them that right, that option, if they choose to exercise it.

After that letter was opened in my office, the Senate put in place new mail-screening procedures to prevent another similar attack on the Capitol complex. Nearly 2 years later, we no longer have to worry that terrorism can slip in here through the mail. Some days we even forget about the anthrax attacks. But there are victims and victims' families who cannot forget. The anthrax attacks of 2001 still haunt them every day. This bill will not restore their strength or return their loved ones, but it will give them a small measure of compensation and perhaps a small measure of peace. It will say clearly that whether it happens in September, October, or any other month, terrorism is terrorism and here in America its victims will not have to suffer alone.

I thank my colleague and friend, Senator LEAHY, with whom I have been working on this bill now for nearly 2 years, for his remarkable commitment to this cause. I urge all of our colleagues to join us in seeking justice for these forgotten victims of terrorism.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1742. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for variable interest rates on student loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which would change the student borrower interest rate structure by continuing or establishing variable rates for all student loans on a going-forward basis. More specifically, it would tie all future loan interest rates for student loan borrowers to the bond equivalent rate for 91-day Treasury bills and would cap the loans at 7.75 percent. PLUS loans would be capped at 8.5 percent.

Briefly, variable rates for all student loan borrowers would provide the following: They will automatically ''refinance'' outstanding loans to current rates on a routine basis, thereby, avoiding the problems associated with the refinancing of old loans under new rate structures. They will mitigate the extraordinary costs to the Federal Government currently associated with the consolidation of student loans under a fixed rate structure. They will ensure that consolidation loans are offered to those borrowers who need them rather than as a loan of convenience for those who no longer need Federal subsidies. They will allow savings which will ensure that Federal resources can be directed to those who have not yet had an opportunity to pursue or to complete an educational program thereby ensuring future access to higher education. They will provide borrowers with the best rates available in the market while also capping those rates to ensure that borrowers are not adversely affected if rates rise beyond an acceptable level. And, they will protect the Federal Treasury against extraordinary subsidies as interest rates rise above a preset fixed rate structure.

The Federal student loan programs have made it possible for millions of American students to attend college. The current program structure has resulted in a highly reliable, low-cost source of funds for students and their families. But, the recent consolidation-reconsolidation loan situation shows that changes are needed.

The intent of the consolidation loan program was to provide an opportunity for borrowers with multiple loan holders and a high debt level to consolidate that debt with one holder and allow for a single monthly payment. However, with recent interest rate drops, the number and volume of consolidation loans has increased dramatically. Some borrowers have consolidated their loans and locked in at a fixed rate only to see the rates drop further and leave them with no way to access the lower rates. And, recently, the well-publicized growth in the Federal consolidation loan program prompted the Congressional Budget Office to project the estimated program costs for the current fiscal year to triple from $3 billion to $9 billion.

There has been much talk about allowing borrowers to reconsolidate their loans at a lower rate. However, it appears that retroactive changes to the law could undermine the predictability that makes it possible for lenders and investors to offer efficient pricing to students who need loans. Reconsolidation could diminish the quality and the stability of the overall loan program which would hurt future student borrowers.

Currently, student loans, known as Stafford Loans, are payable on a variable rate basis, a program feature that protects the Federal Treasury from sharp increases in costs. However, consolidation loans are made on a fixed rate basis, creating an incentive for borrowers to ''consolidate'' their student loans even when they are not experiencing repayment problems.

My legislation would prevent future borrowers from facing the situation which confronts many of our borrowers today. It would establish a variable interest rate and establish a reasonable cap on all student loans. It would level the playing field for future students and borrowers.

It appears clear that changes are needed. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and move forward with a plan that would preserve the integrity of the overall loan program while protecting all future student borrowers from the vagaries of fluctuating interest rates.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the additional material ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1742

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. INTEREST RATES ON STUDENT LOANS.

(a) INTEREST RATE CHANGES.—Section 427A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1077a) is amended by striking subsections (k) and (*l*) and inserting the following:

[''(k) INTEREST RATES FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER OCTOBER 1, 1998, AND BEFORE THE DATE OF ENACTMENT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN PLAN ACT OF 2003.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (h) and subject to paragraph (2), with respect to any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this part (other than a loan made pursuant to section 428B or 428C) for which the first disbursement is made on or after October 1, 1998, and before the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest shall, during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to—

''(A) the bond equivalent rate of 91-day Treasury bills auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1; plus

''(B) 2.3 percent,

except that such rate shall not exceed 8.25 percent.

''(2) IN SCHOOL AND GRACE PERIOD RULES.—Notwithstanding subsection (h), with respect to any loan under this part (other than a loan made pursuant to section 428B or 428C) for which the first disbursement is made on or after October 1, 1998, and before the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest for interest which accrues—

''(A) prior to the beginning of the repayment period of the loan; or

''(B) during the period in which principal need not be paid (whether or not such principal is in fact paid) by reason of a provision described in section 427(a)(2)(C) or 428(b)(1)(M),

shall be determined under paragraph (1) by substituting '1.7 percent' for '2.3 percent'.

''(3) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding subsection (h), with respect to any loan under section 428B for which the first disbursement is made on or after October 1, 1998, and before the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest shall be determined under paragraph (1)—

''(A) by substituting '3.1 percent' for '2.3 percent'; and

''(B) by substituting '9.0 percent' for '8.25 percent'.

''(4) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—With respect to any consolidation loan under section 428C

for which the application is received by an eligible lender on or after October 1, 1998, and before the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest shall be at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the lesser of—

''(A) the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of 1 percent; or

''(B) 8.25 percent.

''(5) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall determine the applicable rate of interest under this subsection after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and shall publish such rate in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the date of determination.

''(l) INTEREST RATES FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER THE DATE OF ENACTMENT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN PLAN ACT OF 2003.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (h) and subject to paragraph (2), with respect to any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this part (other than a loan made pursuant to section 428B or 428C) for which the first disbursement is made on or after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest shall, during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to—

''(A) the bond equivalent rate of 91-day Treasury bills auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1; plus

''(B) 2.3 percent,

except that such rate shall not exceed [7.75] percent.

''(2) IN SCHOOL AND GRACE PERIOD RULES.—Notwithstanding subsection (h), with respect to any loan under this part (other than a loan made pursuant to section 428B or 428C) for which the first disbursement is made on or after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest for interest which accrues—

''(A) prior to the beginning of the repayment period of the loan; or

''(B) during the period in which principal need not be paid (whether or not such principal is in fact paid) by reason of a provision described in section 427(a)(2)(C) or 428(b)(1)(M),

shall be determined under paragraph (1) by substituting '[1.7] percent' for '[2.3] percent'.

''(3) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding subsection (h), with respect to any loan under section 428B for which the first disbursement is made on or after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest shall be determined under paragraph (1)—

''(A) by substituting '3.1 percent' for '2.3 percent'; and

''(B) by substituting '8.5 percent' for '[7.75] percent'.

''(4) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—With respect to any consolidation loan under section 428C for which the application is received by an eligible lender on or after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003, the applicable rate of interest shall, during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to—

''(A) the bond equivalent rate of 91-day Treasury bills auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1; plus

''(B) 2.3 percent,

except that such rate shall not exceed [7.75] percent.''.

(b) SPECIAL ALLOWANCE CONFORMING CHANGES.—Section 438(b)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087–1(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''July 1, 2006'' each place it appears in clauses (ii), (v), and (vii) of subparagraph (I), including in the headings of such clauses, and inserting ''the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003''.

(c) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 428C(c)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078–3(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''July 1, 2006'' each place it appears and inserting ''the date of enactment of the Higher Education Loan Plan Act of 2003''.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 1744. A bill to prevent abuse of Government credit cards; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to help curtail abuses of government-issued credit cards throughout the Federal Government. I am pleased to join Representative WILSON who is introducing an identical measure in the House today and I thank him for his interest and work on this important issue. I am also very glad to have Senator BYRD co-sponsor my bill. He has been a staunch advocate for improved management of government credit programs and I have been honored to work with him on this issue in the past.

As many of my colleagues are aware, I have been working for several years to expose abuses of government purchase cards and travel cards, starting with the largest user of government charge cards, the Department of Defense. Working with the GAO, former subcommittee Chairman Horn in the House, and others, we have been able to uncover a disturbing number of instances where DOD-issued credit cards have been abused. When I say abused, I mean government credit cards were used to pay for everything from cars to Caribbean cruises. The list also includes furniture, breast implants, and gentleman's clubs.

So what does all of this mean for the American taxpayer? In the case of government purchase cards, it means that hardworking Americans are paying for government employees' Christmas shopping. Purchase cards are intended to be used to purchase supplies or other items needed by a government agency and are paid directly by the agency with taxpayer money. However, it is hard to justify payments on a sapphire ring, kitchen appliances, and gift certificates to department stores as necessary office expenses. Astoundingly, these are examples of charges that have been made and paid for out of the taxpayer's pocket with no questions asked.

Government travel cards work differently, but are still subject to abuses that negatively impact the American public. They are issued to individual employees for use on official travel. The employee must pay the bill and is reimbursed by the agency. Unfortunately, government travel cards are routinely issued to individuals who have a bad credit history or even a record of credit card fraud. This opens up the door for abuse. Not only have travel cards been used for questionable travel expenses, but travel cards have been used when employees are not on official travel to pay for items from gambling and prostitution to tickets for a pop music concert by the Backstreet Boys. Some employees have committed fraud by repeatedly writing bad checks to pay travel card bills and some have taken government funds in reimbursement for travel expenses and not paid off their travel card bills.

When a travel card bill is not paid on time, the agency loses out on rebates that the agency would otherwise receive from the credit card company. These rebates add up. In fact, in fiscal year 2001, the Federal Government received $71 million in rebates, but this amount declined in fiscal year 2002 to $69.2 million mainly due to delinquencies in paying off travel cards. We're talking real money and, especially in a time of budgetary belt-tightening, this trend cannot be allowed to continue. In addition, since Bank of America took over the DOD charge card contract in 1998, it had to ''charge off'' over $61 million dollars in bad debt. The military service branches have recovered less than $24 million of that amount, leaving almost $40 million in losses to the credit card company. In fact, the situation got so bad that Bank of America considered dropping its account with DOD. Although actions by DOD to reduce delinquencies and recover bad debt through methods like salary offsets have now improved the situation somewhat, this scandal has left a black mark on the reputation of the Federal Government. Furthermore, these losses inflicted on credit card companies by Federal employees hurt the millions of innocent Americans who are credit card customers by raising the interest rates and fees the company must charge.

What we have learned through our investigation of the travel card and purchase card programs in the Department of Defense is that these abuses were allowed to occur as a result of weak internal controls. The revelations about DOD sparked questions about the possibility of similar deficiencies in other departments. In fact, subsequent work with the GAO and agency Inspectors General has uncovered weak internal controls in the travel card and purchase card programs of agencies like the Department of Education, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture leading to wasteful and questionable purchases with taxpayer dollars. We know about HUD employees using agency purchase cards for personal shopping sprees at stores like Best Buy and JC Penny, FAA employees purchasing individual subscriptions to Internet providers and gift cards from Home Depot, and Department of Agriculture employees using travel cards to buy a car and enroll in bartending school. The list goes on.

Clearly, this is a problem that needs to be addressed government-wide. Ideally, Federal agencies would get their own houses in order. Unfortunately, the atrocious abuses that have been uncovered in the charge card programs of agency after agency would likely never have come to light without congressional oversight. In fact, the positive developments we have seen so far in curtailing government credit card abuses have been the result of Congress cajoling the bureaucracy to put controls in place. The bill I am introducing today would require all agencies to promulgate regulations to establish safeguards and internal controls to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse of Federal purchase cards and travel cards.

The GAO has now issued an Audit Guide for auditing and investigating the internal control of government purchase card programs, which it developed based on its experiences auditing various agencies purchase card programs. This excellent guide outlines five standards for internal control to curtail fraudulent, improper, and abusive purchases. These include: establishing a positive control environment among agency management and employees, providing for a risk assessment, implementing control activities to enforce management directives and help ensure actions are taken to reduce risks, recording and communicating information to program managers and others who need it, and ongoing monitoring. My bill would go a long way to push agencies toward the effective management approach GAO has outlined.

In fact, my bill requires agencies to establish policies for purchase card programs, and travel card programs where applicable, that incorporate many of the specific recommendations GAO has made to various agencies as a result of its investigations. These include: training for cardholders as well as approving officials and agency program coordinators, establishing who is eligible to be a cardholder and limits on how much they can charge, limiting the number of cards distributed to those who really need them, establishing requirements for documentation and records to support each purchase, cancelling cards for employees who leave or transfer, and establishing penalties to hold card holders and approving officials accountable for misuse.

My bill also requires that credit checks be performed before issuing a government charge card and that no one found to be not creditworthy be issued a government credit card. In my opinion, it is absurb that this is not standard practice. Government employees who could never get a private credit card due to bad credit, bankrupty, or history of fraud will no longer be handed a government charge card with no questions asked.

Finally, my bill would provide that the each agency Inspector General will periodically conduct risk assessments of agency purchase card and travel card programs and perform periodic audits to identify potential fraudulent, improper, and abusive use of cards. We have had great success working with Inspectors General using techniques like data mining to reveal instances of improper use of government charge cards. The information continually provided to the head of each executive agency as well as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General by each agency IG will be an enormous help in strengthening and maintaining a rigious system of internal controls to prevent future instances of waste, fraud, and abuse with government charge cards.

Due to aggressive congressional oversight and the efforts of talented investigators working for the GAO and agency IG's, we now know that weak internal control over agency purchase and travel card programs has lead to waste, fraud, and abuse across the Federal Government. It has come to the point that Congress must intervene to require agencies to put in place the policies and procedures necessary to stop the misuse of taxpayer dollars and the abuse of the public trust. I wish I could say this bill is a silver bullet and that once enacted, all the problems with government credit cards will disappear, but I don't pretend this is the case. Ultimately, it is up to agency officials and program managers to implement best practices for managing purchase card and travel card programs. To that end, I would encourage all agencies to take a close look at the GAO Audit Guide and use its approach. Meanwhile, continued congressional oversight will still be necessary. Nevertheless, my bill will serve to kick-start the bureaucracy into taking this problem seriously and I believe it will be a big step toward putting the lid back on the Federal cookie jar. I know many of my colleagues are equally appalled by the many tales of credit card fraud and abuse perpetrated on the American public and I would urge senators to join me in this effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1744

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Credit Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. MANAGEMENT OF PURCHASE CARDS.

(a) REQUIRED SAFEGUARDS AND INTERNAL CONTROLS.—The head of each executive agency that issues and uses purchase cards and convenience checks shall establish and maintain safeguards and internal controls to ensure the following:

(1) That there is a record in each executive agency of each holder of a purchase card issued by the agency for official use, annotated with the limitations on single transaction and total credit amounts that are applicable to the use of each such card by that purchase cardholder.

(2) That the holder of a purchase card and each official with authority to authorize expenditures charged to the purchase card are responsible for reconciling the charges appearing on each statement of account for that purchase card with receipts and other supporting documentation and forwarding such reconciliation to the designated official who certifies the bill for payment in a timely manner.

(3) That any disputed purchase card charge, and any discrepancy between a receipt and other supporting documentation and the purchase card statement of account, is resolved in the manner prescribed in the applicable Governmentwide purchase card contract entered into by the Administrator of General Services.

(4) That payments on purchase card accounts are made promptly within prescribed deadlines to avoid interest penalties.

(5) That rebates and refunds based on prompt payment on purchase card accounts are monitored for accuracy and properly recorded as a receipt to the agency that pays the monthly bill.

(6) That records of each purchase card transaction (including records on associated contracts, reports, accounts, and invoices) are retained in accordance with standard Government policies on the disposition of records.

(7) That periodic reviews are performed to determine whether each purchase cardholder has a need for the purchase card.

(8) That appropriate training is provided to each purchase cardholder and each official with responsibility for overseeing the use of purchase cards issued by an executive agency.

(9) That each executive agency has specific policies regarding the number of purchase cards issued by various organizations and categories of organizations, the credit limits authorized for various categories of cardholders, and categories of employees eligible to be issued purchase cards, and that those policies are designed to minimize the financial risk to the Federal Government of the issuance of the purchase cards and to ensure the integrity of purchase cardholders.

(10) That the head of each executive agency evaluate the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing the individual a purchase card, and that no individual be issued a purchase card if the individual is found not creditworthy as a result of the evaluation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such evaluation shall include an assessment of an individual's consumer report from a consumer reporting agency as those terms are defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act. The obtaining of a consumer report under this subsection is deemed to be a circumstance or purpose authorized or listed under section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

(11) That each executive agency invalidate the purchase card of each employee who—

(A) ceases to be employed by the agency immediately upon termination of the employment of the employee; or

(B) transfers to another unit of the agency immediately upon the transfer of the employee.

(b) MANAGEMENT OF PURCHASE CARDS.—The head of each executive agency shall prescribe regulations implementing the safeguards and internal controls in subsection (a). Those regulations shall be consistent with regulations that apply Governmentwide regarding the use of purchase cards by Government personnel for official purposes.

(c) PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS.—The regulations prescribed under subsection (a) shall provide for appropriate adverse personnel actions or other punishment to be imposed in cases in which employees of an executive agency violate such regulations or are negligent or engage in misuse, abuse, or fraud with respect to a purchase card, including removal in appropriate cases.

(d) The Inspector General of each executive agency shall—

(1) periodically conduct risk assessments of the agency purchase card program and associated internal controls and analyze identified weaknesses and the frequency of improper activity in order to develop a plan for using such risk assessments to determine the scope, frequency, and number of periodic audits of purchase cardholders;

(2) perform periodic audits of purchase cardholders designed to identify—

(A) potentially fraudulent, improper, and abusive uses of purchase cards;

(B) any patterns of improper cardholder transactions, such as purchases of prohibited items; and

(C) categories of purchases that should be made by means other than purchase cards in order to better aggregate purchases and obtain lower prices;

(3) report to the head of the executive agency concerned on the results of such audits; and

(4) report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General on the implementation of recommendations made to the head of the executive agency to address findings during audits of purchase cardholders.

(e) DEFINITION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—For the purpose of this section the term ''executive agency'' has the meaning provided in section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1)).

(f) RELATIONSHIP TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURCHASE CARD REGULATIONS.—

(1) The requirements under this section shall not apply to the Department of Defense.

(2) Section 2784(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''periodic audits'' and inserting ''risk assessments of the agency purchase card program and associated internal controls and analyze identified weaknesses and the frequency of improper activity in order to develop a plan for using such risk assessments to determine the scope, frequency, and number of periodic audits of purchase cardholders.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(11) That the Secretary of Defense shall evaluate the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing the individual a purchase card, and that no individual be issued a purchase card if the individual is not found creditworthy as a result of the evaluation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such evaluation shall include an assessment of an individual's consumer report from a consumer reporting agency as those terms are defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act. The obtaining of a consumer report under this subsection is deemed to be a circumstance or purpose authorized or listed under section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

''(12) That the Secretary of Defense invalidate the purchase card of each employee who ceases to be employed by the department immediately upon termination of the employment of the employee or transfers to another agency or subunit within the department immediately upon transfer.''.

SEC. 3. MANAGEMENT OF TRAVEL CARDS.

Section 2 of the Travel and Transportation Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–264; 5 U.S.C. 5701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) MANAGEMENT OF TRAVEL CHARGE CARDS.—

''(1) REQUIRED SAFEGUARDS AND INTERNAL CONTROLS.—The head of each executive agency that has employees that use travel charge cards shall establish and maintain safeguards and internal controls over travel charge cards to ensure the following:

''(A) That there is a record in each executive agency of each holder of a travel charge card issued by the agency for official use, annotated with the limitations on amounts that are applicable to the use of each such card by that travel charge cardholder.

''(B) That rebates and refunds based on prompt payment on travel charge card accounts are properly recorded as a receipt of the agency that employs the cardholder.

''(C) That periodic reviews are performed to determine whether each travel charge cardholder has a need for the travel charge card.

''(D) That appropriate training is provided to each travel charge cardholder and each official with responsibility for overseeing the use of travel charge cards issued by an executive agency.

''(E) That each executive agency has specific policies regarding the number of travel charge cards issued by various organizations and categories of organizations, the credit limits authorized for various categories of cardholders, and categories of employees eligible to be issued travel charge cards, and that those policies are designed to minimize the financial risk to the Federal Government of the issuance of the travel charge cards and to ensure the integrity of travel charge cardholders.

''(F) That the head of each executive agency evaluates the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing the individual a travel charge card, and that no individual be issued a travel charge card if the individual is found not creditworthy as a result of the evaluation (except that this paragraph shall not preclude issuance of a restricted use travel charge card when the individual lacks a credit history). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such evaluation shall include an assessment of an individual's consumer report from a consumer reporting agency as those terms are defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act. The obtaining of a consumer report under this subsection is deemed to be a circumstance or purpose authorized or listed under section 604 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

''(G) That each executive agency ensures that the travel charge card of each employee who ceases to be employed by the agency is invalidated immediately upon termination of the employment of the employee.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of General Services shall prescribe regulations governing the implementation of the safeguards and internal controls in paragraph (1) by executive agencies.

''(3) PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (2) shall provide for appropriate adverse personnel actions or other punishment to be imposed in cases in which employees of an executive agency violate such regulations or are negligent or engage in misuse, abuse, or fraud with respect to a travel charge card, including removal in appropriate cases.

''(4) The Inspector General of each executive agency shall—

''(A) periodically conduct risk assessments of the agency travel card program and associated internal controls and analyze identified weaknesses and the frequency of improper activity in order to develop a plan for using such risk assessments to determine the scope, frequency, and number of periodic audits of purchase cardholders;

''(B) perform periodic audits of travel cardholders designed to identify potentially fraudulent, improper, and abusive uses of travel cards;

''(C) report to the head of the executive agency concerned on the results of such audits; and

''(D) report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General on the implementation of recommendations made to the head of the executive agency to address findings during audits of travel cardholders.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) The term 'executive agency' means an agency as that term is defined in section 5701 of title 5, United States Code, except that it is in the executive branch.

''(B) The term 'travel charge card' means the Federal contractor-issued travel charge card that is individually billed to each cardholder.''.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the head of each executive agency shall promulgate regulations to implement the requirements of section 2; and

(2) the Administrator of General Services shall promulgate regulations required pursuant to the amendments made by section 3.

(b) BEST PRACTICES.—Regulations promulgated under this section shall reflect best practices for conducting purchase card and travel card programs.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1745. A bill to designate a Prisoner of War/Missing in Action National Memorial at Riverside National Cemetery in Riverside, California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Prisoner of War/Missing in Action National Memorial Act of 2003. This bill would designate the POW/MIA memorial currently being built at Riverside National Cemetery in California as the National POW/MIA Memorial. This monument would be a memorial to all members of the Armed Forces who have been held as prisoners of war or listed as missing in action.

We should always remember and pay tribute to the men and women who are fighting for our Nation now and have fought for our Nation in the past, including those who have never returned home. Over 89,000 members of the Armed Forces have been listed as missing since the American Revolution.

The families of these missing men and women have had to try to go on with their lives without ever knowing what happened. Many of them have been unable to grieve for their loved ones as they typically would, and many of them have been unable to have a proper burial. The families of our missing in action across the country should know that their nation remembers their loved one, and honors them by dedicating this national memorial in Riverside, CA.

In addition to the missing soldiers, airmen, sailors, and others, there have been over 586,000 members of the Armed Forces who have been taken

prisoner since the American Revolution. In the 20th Century alone, there were over 142,000 Americans taken as prisoners of war.

I would like to thank Congressman KEN CALVERT, who introduced the House version of this bill in May. I commend him for his leadership in honoring Americans missing in action and taken as prisoners of war.

There is no national memorial for both POWs and MIAs; there is not even a statue dedicated to their memory. It is time that the United States recognize the sacrifice that these American POWs and MIAs have made, and designate the memorial at the Riverside National Cemetery as the National POW/MIA Memorial.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DODD):

S. 1747. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of all contact lenses as medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today, with my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, to introduce an important piece of legislation, which will help protect the health of contact lens wearers, by ensuring that all contact lenses satisfy the same regulatory requirements for approval.

Currently, non-corrective contact lenses, such as decorative lenses that change eye color or have some design on them, are regulated under the Food and Drug Administration's cosmetic authority. The problem is this. The FDA does not review cosmetics for safety or effectiveness before they are sold to the public. This means that the FDA cannot require manufacturers to test non-corrective lenses for safety problems, cannot set ''good manufacturing practices,'' and cannot even require that these lenses carry directions for safe use. This lack of FDA review and lack of established safety standards can lead to the marketing of lenses that are neither safe nor suitable for wearing.

An article in the most recent issue of the medical journal Eye & Contact Lens describes the cases of six people injured by the sale of unregulated colored contact lenses. As the article points out, four of the six patients reside in the greater Cleveland area. This obviously concerns me. But what concerns me more is that three of the five female patients were teenagers.

One such case involved a teenage girl from Cleveland who bought colored contact lenses from a video rental store for the purpose of matching her eyes with her dress. The lenses were sold without fitting or instructions. Prior to putting these lenses in her eyes, she had no previous problems with her vision and had never worn contact lenses.

Shortly after wearing the colored contact lenses, she was urgently admitted to a Cleveland hospital where it was determined that the vision in her left eye had become so poor that she could only make out hand motions. She stayed in the ICU for four days because that was the only place where she could receive the treatment necessary for her eye. Worse yet, her doctor feared that she would not only lose her sight, but that she might actually lose her eye.

In an effort to restore vision, her doctor recommended a corneal transplant, which she underwent. Nearly two years after the infection started, her vision has not been fully restored. For the rest of her life, this young girl will be at risk for rejection of the transplant, cataracts and glaucoma.

This type of injury can be prevented. The bill that Senator KENNEDY and I are introducing today would allow non-corrective lenses to be reviewed before they are marketed and before they are accessible to young people. This bill, which has the endorsement of leading organizations in eye care—representing thousands of health care professionals and consumers and the contact lens industry—would clarify that all contact lenses are devices and are to be approved under the FDA's device authority. Applying the medical device requirements across-the-board to all contact lens manufacturers and distributors would help ensure that all companies are held to the same important safety standards.

Our bill would be a positive step forward in helping to prevent unnecessary eye injuries. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1747

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) All contact lenses have significant effects on the eye and pose serious potential health risks if improperly manufactured or used without appropriate involvement of a qualified eye care professional.

(2) Most contact lenses currently marketed in the United States, including certain plano and decorative contact lenses, have been approved as medical devices pursuant to premarket approval applications or cleared pursuant to premarket notifications by the Food and Drug Administration (''FDA'').

(3) FDA has asserted medical device jurisdiction over most corrective and noncorrective contact lenses as medical devices currently marketed in the United States, including certain plano and decorative contact lenses, so as to require approval pursuant to premarket approval applications or clearance pursuant to premarket notifications.

(4) All contact lenses can present risks if used without the supervision of a qualified eye care professional. Eye injuries in children and other consumers have been reported for contact lenses that are regulated by FDA as medical devices primarily when used without professional involvement, and non-corrective contact lenses sold without approval or clearance as medical devices have caused eye injuries in children.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES AS MEDICAL DEVICES.

Section 520 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360j) is amended by adding at the end the following subsection:

''Regulation of Contact Lens as Devices

''(n)(1) All contact lenses shall be deemed to be devices under section 201(h).

''(2) Paragraph 1 shall not be construed as having any legal effect on any article that is not described in that paragraph.''.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 1748. A bill to establish a program to award grants to improve and maintain sites honoring Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today, along with Senator DURBIN and Senator VOINOVICH to introduce the Presidential Sites Improvement Act of 2003. This legislation would honor the great men that have served as our former Chief Executives and have influenced the development of our great Nation. This act would create a new and innovative partnership with public and private entities to preserve and maintain Presidential sites, such as birthplaces, homes, memorials, and tombs. Preserving this heritage is vital to enabling our children and grandchildren to learn about the leadership and infinite wisdom of our past Presidents.

We often forget that the best learning tool is that which a child can touch, see, and relate. When a child boards a bus for a field trip to visit historic sites, that is truly when hands-on learning takes place. Visiting the birthplace or home of the same individuals they heard about or read about in the classroom provides a completely different atmosphere to appreciate history. This learning can continue only through the preservation of the birthplaces, homes, memorials, and tombs of our former Presidents.

Family foundations, colleges and universities, libraries, historical societies, historic preservation organizations, and other non-profit organizations own the majority of these sites. These entities often have little funding and are unable to meet the demands of maintaining such important sites. Operating costs must be met before maintenance needs, and slowly the sites deteriorate.

I have visited many of the Presidential historic sites throughout my home State of Ohio—a state that has been home to eight Presidents. During one such visit at the Ulysses S. Grant house, I found it very disturbing to see the discoloration and falling plaster due to water damage. At the home of President Warren Harding, the famous front porch where then candidate Harding gave his campaign speeches actually began to pull away from the house. Fortunately, we were able to obtain

the funding to prevent these two historic treasures from deteriorating further. However, by providing Federal assistance for maintenance projects today, we can help prevent larger maintenance problems tomorrow.

These Presidential sites are far too important to let them slowly decay. My legislation would authorize grants, administered by the National Park Service, for maintenance and improvement projects on Presidential sites that are not federally owned or managed. A portion of the funds would be set aside for sites that are in need of emergency assistance. To administer this new program, this legislation would establish a five-member committee, including the Director of the National Park Service, a member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and a State historic preservation officer. This committee would make grant recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior. Each grant would require that half of the funds come from non-Federal sources. Up to $5 million would be made available annually.

I encourage my colleagues to join us in support of this legislation, and ask unanimous consent that the text of our bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1748

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Presidential Sites Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) there are many sites honoring Presidents located throughout the United States, including Presidential birthplaces, homes, museums, burial sites, and tombs;

(2) most of the sites are owned, operated, and maintained by non-Federal entities such as State and local agencies, family foundations, colleges and universities, libraries, historical societies, historic preservation organizations, and other nonprofit organizations;

(3) Presidential sites are often expensive to maintain;

(4) many Presidential sites are in need of capital, technological, and interpretive display improvements for which funding is insufficient or unavailable; and

(5) to promote understanding of the history of the United States by recognizing and preserving historic sites linked to Presidents of the United States, the Federal Government should provide grants for the maintenance and improvement of Presidential sites.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) GRANT COMMISSION.—The term ''Grant Commission'' means the Presidential Site Grant Commission established by section 4(d).

(2) PRESIDENTIAL SITE.—The term ''Presidential site'' means a Presidentially-related site of national significance that is—

(A) managed, maintained, and operated for, and is accessible to, the public; and

(B) owned or operated by—

(i) a State; or

(ii) a private institution, organization, or person.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. GRANTS FOR PRESIDENTIAL SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants for major maintenance and improvement projects at Presidential sites to owners or operators of Presidential sites in accordance with this section.

(b) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant awarded under this section may be used for—

(A) repairs or capital improvements at a Presidential site (including new construction for necessary modernization) such as—

(i) installation or repair of heating or air conditioning systems, security systems, or electric service; or

(ii) modifications at a Presidential site to achieve compliance with requirements under titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.); and

(B) interpretive improvements to enhance public understanding and enjoyment of a Presidential site.

(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to award grants under this Act—

(i) 15 percent shall be used for emergency projects, as determined by the Secretary;

(ii) 65 percent shall be used for grants for Presidential sites with—

(I) a 3-year average annual operating budget of less than $700,000 (not including the amount of any grant received under this section); and

(II) an endowment in an amount that is less than 3 times the annual operating budget of the site; and

(iii) 20 percent shall be used for grants for Presidential sites with—

(I) an annual operating budget of $700,000 or more (not including the amount of any grant received under this section); and

(II) an endowment in an amount that is equal to or more than 3 times the annual operating budget of the site.

(B) UNEXPENDED FUNDS.—If any funds allocated for a category of projects described in subparagraph (A) are unexpended, the Secretary may use the funds to award grants for another category of projects described in that subparagraph.

(c) APPLICATION AND AWARD PROCEDURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than a date to be determined by the Secretary, an owner or operator of a Presidential site may submit to the Secretary an application for a grant under this section.

(2) INVOLVEMENT OF GRANT COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall forward each application received under paragraph (1) to the Grant Commission.

(B) CONSIDERATION BY GRANT COMMISSION.—Not later than 60 days after receiving an application from the Secretary under subparagraph (A), the Grant Commission shall return the application to the Secretary with a recommendation of whether the proposed project should be awarded a Presidential site grant.

(C) RECOMMENDATION OF GRANT COMMISSION.—In making a decision to award a Presidential site grant under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration any recommendation of the Grant Commission.

(3) AWARD.—Not later than 180 days after receiving an application for a Presidential site grant under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) award a Presidential site grant to the applicant; or

(B) notify the applicant, in writing, of the decision of the Secretary not to award a Presidential site grant.

(4) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project at a Presidential site for which a grant is awarded under this section shall not exceed 50 percent.

(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project at a Presidential site for which a grant is awarded under this section may be provided in cash or in kind.

(d) PRESIDENTIAL SITE GRANT COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Presidential Site Grant Commission.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Grant Commission shall be composed of—

(A) the Director of the National Park Service; and

(B) 4 members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(i) A State historic preservation officer.

(ii) A representative of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

(iii) A representative of a site described in subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii).

(iv) A representative of a site described in subsection (b)(2)(A)(iii).

(3) TERM.—A member of the Grant Commission shall serve a term of 2 years.

(4) DUTIES.—The Grant Commission shall—

(A) review applications for Presidential site grants received under subsection (c); and

(B) recommend to the Secretary projects for which Presidential site grants should be awarded.

(5) INELIGIBILITY OF SITES DURING TERM OF REPRESENTATIVE.—A site described in clause (iii) or (iv) of paragraph (2)(B) shall be ineligible for a grant under this Act during the 2-year period in which a representative of the site serves on the Grant Commission.

(6) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Grant Commission shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, to remain available until expended.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 1749. A bill to amend various provisions of the Consumer Credit Protection Act to relief for victims of identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we are faced today with one of the fastest growing crimes in America, identity theft. Recent estimates place the number of new identity theft victims at approximately 7 million in a single 12 month period—nearly 800 new victims per hour. Another study found that victims spend an average of 600 hours recovering from identity theft crimes, sometimes spanning several years. Only three years ago, the average time spent addressing identity theft was 175 hours. In addition to the lost time, victims spend an average of $1,400 in their efforts to rectify the damage inflicted by identity thieves. Identity theft is one crime for which the victims are virtually on their own to resolve.

In most States, the burden is on the one harmed—and the only method by which an individual can attempt to repair their good name and credit is by pursuing civil action against creditors and debt collectors. Today, I will introduce PITFALL, the Prevent Identity

Theft From Affecting Lives and Livelihoods Act of 2003. PITFALL addresses identity theft after the fact—to help victims after the harm is inflicted.

The overriding goal of the legislation is to prevent creditors and debt collectors, when existing laws fail to protect identity theft victims, from harassing victims and further sabotaging their financial well-being once a State's highest law enforcement officer has conclusively determined liabilities were fraudulently incurred, with no culpability on the part of the victim.

While there has been much discussion and action aimed at preventing identity theft, it is time to focus on those individuals for which prevention is too late. Please join me in this effort to remove the burden from innocent victims in restoring peace and financial security to their lives.

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1750. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the nutrition and health of children in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill of significant importance to our Nation's health: The Better Eating for Better Living Act of 2003.

Today, heart disease, cancer, stroke, and diabetes are responsible for two-thirds of the deaths in the United States. The major risk factors for these diseases and conditions are established in childhood through unhealthy eating habits, physical inactivity, obesity, and tobacco use. Obesity rates have doubled in children and tripled in adolescents over the last 2 decades. Today 1 in 7 young people are obese and 1 in 3 are overweight. This is not a problem. This is a crisis with potentially dire consequences that demands our immediate attention.

Obese children are twice as likely as non-obese children to become obese adults. Overweightness and obesity can result in physical, psychological, and social consequences, including heart disease, diabetes, cancer, depression, decreased self-esteem, and discrimination. Obesity is a complex multi-factorial disease that is difficult to prevent but even more difficult to treat. Our best bet at improving the lives of children who currently are obese and preventing more from joining the ranks is to encourage environments that foster healthy eating and activity in our communities, in our homes, and in our schools.

It is the need to improve the nutritional environment of our schools that I want to address today. Our school breakfast and lunch programs were originally designed to combat hunger in our nation. They have been and continue to be a vital component of the food security safety net. However, today we have another problem: obesity and overweight, and the child nutrition programs need to be updated to meet the needs of our current health challenges while maintaining their role securing healthy food for all children.

Only 2 percent of children currently consume a diet that meets the five main recommendations for a healthy diet from the USDA Food Guide Pyramid. Three out of four high school students in the U.S. do not eat the recommended 5 or more servings of fruits and vegetables each day and 3 out of 4 children consume more saturated fat than it recommended in the dietary Guidelines for Americans. Although the school lunch and school breakfast programs have made great strides in improving health by meeting these guidelines, our work in creating healthy school environments is not yet done.

Since obesity is a complex issue, stemming the tide will take a myriad of interventions. I commend Senators HARKIN, LEAHY, KOHL, DOLE, and others who have introduced bills that would improve the Child Nutrition programs and the children and schools they serve while preserving its mission to provide nutritionally sound meals to the young people who need them.

Today I am introducing another bill vital to improving our children's health: The Better Eating for Better Living Bill. This bill has four key components.

First, the bill increases the reimbursement rates for school lunch. School food service directors have been expected to improve the quality of their meals without any concurrent funding increase for years, and it's time that changes. An additional 10 cents per meal may not sound like much but it will offer school food service directors significantly greater flexibility in purchasing quality food including leaner meats, fresh vegetables, and fresh fruits.

Second, the bill requires the secretary of agriculture to evaluate the nutrition guidelines for school meals every five years. The science of nutrition is a dynamic and rapidly changing field. Guidelines are appropriately based on the best science of the time but as that science evolves, so should the guidelines regulating school meals. Our children deserve the benefit of the most current science. Thus, updates are to be based on current and sound scientific evidence, current public health concerns, and cultural appropriateness.

Next the bill will liberalize the current milk guidelines so as to only require schools to require low fat or no fat milk as is appropriate for school-age children. Schools would have the option of providing other milk products so long as they are cost and nutritionally equivalent.

Finally, serving healthy food is an important first step, but accompanying that food with adequate nutrition education is vital to growing a generation of healthy eaters and active adults. Thus, the bill provides increased funding for nutrition education. Specifically, it would provide guaranteed funding at the state level for implementation and administration of the Team Nutrition Program. This is a program that has existed in statute for years, but because its administration has rarely been funded, it has not been implemented. It is time we commit to nutrition education as part of making a strong commitment to our children's health and well-being.

Now is the time to take action toward improving the health and well-being of our nations' youth. Let us implement these vital advances in the child nutrition program now while we are reauthorizing the Child Nutrition Act. The cost of improving the health of our children will be far less than the cost of the health consequences to come if we do nothing.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1750

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Better Eating for Better Living Act of 2003''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO RICHARD B. RUSSELL NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT
Sec. 101. Reimbursement for school lunches.
Sec. 102. Nutritional quality of school meals.
TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966
Sec. 201. Funding for nutrition education.
TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATE
Sec. 301. Effective date.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) heart disease, cancer, stroke, and diabetes are responsible for ⅔ of deaths in the United States;

(2) the major risk factors for those diseases and conditions are established in childhood through unhealthy eating habits, physical inactivity, obesity, and tobacco use;

(3) obesity rates have doubled in children and tripled in adolescents over the last 2 decades;

(4) today, 1 in 7 young people are obese, and 1 in 3 are overweight;

(5) obese children are twice as likely as nonobese children to become obese adults;

(6) overweightness and obesity can result in physical, psychological, and social consequences, including heart disease, diabetes, cancer, depression, decreased self-esteem, and discrimination;

(7) only 2 percent of children consume a diet that meets the 5 main recommendations for a healthy diet from the Food Guide Pyramid published by the Secretary of Agriculture;

(8) 3 out of 4 high school students in the United States do not eat the recommended 5 or more servings of fruits and vegetables each day; and

(9) 3 out of 4 children in the United States consume more saturated fat than is recommended in the Dietary Guidelines for

Americans published by the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO RICHARD B. RUSSELL NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

SEC. 101. REIMBURSEMENT FOR SCHOOL LUNCHES.

Section 4(b)(2) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1753(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''10.5'' and inserting ''20.5''.

SEC. 102. NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF SCHOOL MEALS.

(a) REVISION OF MEAL GUIDELINES.—Section 9(a)(1) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) REVISION OF NUTRITIONAL GUIDELINES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with experts in nutrition, school health, food service, and school administration, shall, not later than July 31, 2004, and every 5 years thereafter—

''(I) review the nutritional guidelines applicable to meals served under the school lunch program under this Act, taking into consideration—

''(aa) advances in the field of nutrition;

''(bb) identified public health risks relating to inadequate nutrition and overconsumption; and

''(cc) the needs of student populations covered by programs under this Act; and

''(II) issue revised nutritional guidelines, as necessary, including guidelines with respect to—

''(aa) the content of meals served of calories, fat (including types of fat), added sugars, fiber, sodium, vitamins, and minerals;

''(bb) the variety of foods offered;

''(cc) the availability of fruits and vegetables; and

''(dd) the cultural appropriateness of foods offered.

''(ii) APPLICABILITY.—Revised nutritional guidelines issued by the Secretary under clause (i) shall apply to meals served under the school lunch program under this Act on and after the date that is 2 years after the date of issuance of the revised nutritional guidelines.''.

(b) FLUID MILK.—Section 9(a)(2) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(a)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B)(i) at a minimum, shall offer students a choice of lowfat or nonfat fluid milk; and

''(ii) in addition to the type of fluid milk offered under clause (i), may offer such other varieties of fluid milk as are—

''(I) consistent with expressed preferences of the student population; and

''(II) reasonably equivalent in calcium, protein, vitamin A, and vitamin K content and cost.''.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

SEC. 201. FUNDING FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION.

Section 19(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1788 (i)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by striking ''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—'' and all that follows through paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(i) FUNDING.—

''(1) PAYMENTS.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this section, to remain available until expended—

''(A) on October 1, 2003, $10,000,000;

''(B) on October 1, 2004, $15,000,000; and

''(C) on October 1, 2005, $20,000,000.

''(2) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section the funds transferred under paragraph (1), without further appropriation.

''(3) GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), grants to each State from the amounts made available under paragraph (1) shall be based on a rate of ½ cent per average daily number of meals served, to be allocated among State, district, and school food service and health education authorities, as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—The minimum amount of a grant provided to a State for a fiscal year under this section shall be $200,000, as adjusted in accordance with section 11(a)(3)(B) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(a)(3)(B)).''.

TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 301. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect on October 1, 2003.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 244—CONGRATULATING SHIRIN EBADI FOR WINNING THE 2003 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE AND COMMENDING HER FOR HER LIFETIME OF WORK TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. BOXER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 244

Whereas Shirin Ebadi is the winner of the 2003 Nobel Peace Prize;

Whereas Shirin Ebadi has fought to support basic human rights in Iran through her work as a lawyer, judge, lecturer, writer, and activist;

Whereas Shirin Ebadi believes that conflict should be resolved peacefully through dialogue and mutual understanding;

Whereas Shirin Ebadi supports democracy and democratic elections and has defended those who have been attacked for exercising their freedom of speech;

Whereas Shirin Ebadi argues for an interpretation of Islamic law that is in harmony with democracy and vital human rights such as equality before the law, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech;

Whereas Shirin Ebadi has been a leader in promoting the human rights of women and girls; and

Whereas Shirin Ebadi has been arrested numerous times for her courageous defense of basic human rights and democratic ideals, sacrificing her own freedom for the freedom of others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Shirin Ebadi for winning the 2003 Nobel Peace Prize; and

(2) commends Shirin Ebadi for her lifetime of work to promote democracy and human rights.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I rise to submit a resolution congratulating Shirin Ebadi, winner of the 2003 Nobel Peace Prize.

Throughout her life, Shirin Ebadi has been the leading advocate for human rights and democratic reform in Iran. As a lawyer, a judge, a writer, and an activist, Ms. Ebadi has spend her career speaking out and defending the rights of women, children, and victims of government repression. Despite repeated threats made to her security, periods of imprisonment, and temporary suspensions from practicing law, Ms. Ebadi has continued to work tirelessly for those needing a voice to speak for them.

In addition to establishing one of the first independent human rights organizations in Iran—the Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Child—Ms. Ebadi also helped create the Center for the Defense of Human Rights, an organization aimed at defending imprisoned journalists and political activists.

Her work is an inspiration to us all. I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution demonstrating our appreciation to such a heroic champion for human rights.

SENATE RESOLUTION 245—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 29, 2003, AS ''NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK''

Mr. DOMENICI submitted the following resolution; which was

Whereas the well-being of the Nation requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry with good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas, although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the Nation;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values which form the foundation of democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of

society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those who have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into their teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of National Character Counts Week, during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations would focus on character education, would be of great benefit to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) proclaims the week beginning October 19, 2003, as ''National Character Counts Week''; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to—

(A) embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 1860. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1861. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1862. Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1863. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1864. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1865. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HOLLINGS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1866. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1867. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. DOLE, and Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1868. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CORZINE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689 , supra.

SA 1869. Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1870. Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1871. Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRAHAM, of South Carolina, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. REID, and Mr. DORGAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1872. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REID, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NELSON, of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GRAHAM, of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1873. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1874. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1875. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1689, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1876. Mr. NICKLES proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1877. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1878. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1879. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1880. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1867 proposed by Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. DOLE, and Mr. EDWARDS) to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1881. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON, of Florida) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

SA 1882. Mr. CORZINE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1860. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, line 15, insert before the period: *: Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $12,520,000 shall be used to facilitate inter-ethnic and inter-religious dialogue, conflict resolution activities, support rule of law programs, and train Iraqi leaders in democratic principles

SA 1861. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 316. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Iraq Survey Group is charged with investigating the weapons of mass destruction programs of Iraq.

(2) The Special Advisor to the Director of Central Intelligence for Strategy and Iraq heads the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON STATUS OF EFFORTS OF IRAQ SURVEY GROUP.—Not later than January 1, 2004, and every three months thereafter through September 30, 2004, the Special Advisor to the Director of Central Intelligence for Strategy and Iraq shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive written report on the status of the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group to account for the programs of Iraq on weapons of mass destruction and related delivery systems.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1862. Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Paragraph (1) of section 1314 of Public Law 108–11 is amended by inserting ''through September 30, 2004,'' after ''available'' the first place it appears.

SA 1863. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 34, line 1, strike everything after ''proviso,'' through ''Iraq''; on line 5, and insert in lieu thereof:

striking the first proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof:

Provided, That subject to the determination and notification requirements of this section, exports are authorized to Iraq of lethal military equipment designated by the Secretary of State for use by a reconstituted (or interim) Iraqi military, private security force, other official Iraqi security forces or police forces, or forces from other countries in Iraq that support United States efforts in Iraq:

SA 1864. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2309 and insert the following:

SEC. 2309. (a) INITIAL REPORT ON RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION.—Not later than 60

days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the United States strategy for activities related to post-conflict security, humanitarian assistance, governance, and reconstruction to be undertaken as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom. The report shall include information on the following:

(1) The distribution of duties and responsibilities regarding such activities among the agencies of the United States Government, including the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense.

(2) A plan describing the roles and responsibilities of foreign governments and international organizations, including the United Nations, in carrying out such activities.

(3) A strategy for coordinating such activities among the United States Government, foreign governments, and international organizations, including the United Nations.

(4) A strategy for distributing the responsibility for paying costs associated with reconstruction activities in Iraq among the United States Government, foreign governments, and international organizations, including the United Nations, and for actions to be taken by the President to secure increased international participation in peacekeeping and security efforts in Iraq.

(5) A comprehensive strategy for completing the reconstruction of Iraq, estimated timelines for the completion of significant reconstruction milestones, and estimates for Iraqi oil production.

(b) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS ON RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION.—(1) Not later than 60 days after the submittal of the report required by subsection (a), and every 60 days thereafter until all funds provided by this title are expended, the President shall submit to Congress a report that includes information as follows:

(A) A list of all activities undertaken related to reconstruction in Iraq, and a corresponding list of the funds obligated in connection with such activities, during the preceding 60 days.

(B) A list of the significant activities related to reconstruction in Iraq that the President anticipates initiating during the ensuing 60-day period, including—

(i) the estimated cost of carrying out the proposed activities; and

(ii) the source of the funds that will be used to pay such costs.

(C) Updated strategies, objectives, and timelines if significant changes are proposed regarding matters included in the report required under subsection (a), or in any previous report under this subsection.

(2) Each report under this subsection shall include information on the following:

(A) The expenditures for, and progress made toward, the restoration of basic services in Iraq such as water, electricity, sewer, oil infrastructure, a national police force, an Iraqi army, and judicial systems.

(B) The significant goals intended to be achieved by such expenditures.

(C) The progress made toward securing increased international participation in peacekeeping efforts and in the economic and political reconstruction of Iraq.

(D) The progress made toward securing Iraqi borders.

(E) The progress made toward securing self-government for the Iraqi people and the establishment of a democratically elected government.

(F) The progress made in securing and eliminating munitions caches, unexploded ordinance, and excess military equipment in Iraq.

(G) The measures taken to protect United States troops serving in Iraq.

SA 1865. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HOLLINGS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

Paragraph (1) of section 1314 of Public Law 108–11 is amended by inserting ''without fiscal year limitation'' after ''available'' the first place it appears.

SA 1866. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 316. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Iraq Survey Group is charged with investigating the weapons of mass destruction programs of Iraq.

(2) The Special Advisor to the Director of Central Intelligence for Strategy and Iraq heads the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON STATUS OF EFFORTS OF IRAQ SURVEY GROUP.—Not later than January 1, 2004, and every three months thereafter through September 30, 2004, the Special Advisor to the Director of Central Intelligence for Strategy and Iraq shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive written report on the status of the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group to account for the programs of Iraq on weapons of mass destruction and related delivery systems.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1867. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. DOLE, and Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 39, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 3002. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of the cost of any disaster relief payment made under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) for damage caused by Hurricane Isabel shall be 90 percent.

SEC. 3003. Of the funds appropriated by this Act, $500,000,000 shall be available for repair or replacement of Department of Defense and National Aeronautics and Space Administration infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel, related flooding, or other related natural forces.

SA 1868. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CORZINE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 2313. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Ethics in Government Contracting Act of 2003''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN ENTITIES.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended for any contract, any financial agreement, or any other arrangement between the United States and any entity that—

(1) at the time of such obligation or expenditure, is obligated under an agreement or otherwise to pay deferred compensation to any individual who holds a position listed in subsection (c); or

(2) has issued to such an individual one or more options for such individual to purchase a total of more than 1,000 shares of stock of such entity.

(c) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—The positions referred to in subsection (b) are—

(1) President;
(2) Vice President;
(3) Secretary of State;
(4) Secretary of the Treasury;
(5) Secretary of Defense;
(6) Attorney General;
(7) Secretary of the Interior;
(8) Secretary of Agriculture;
(9) Secretary of Commerce;
(10) Secretary of Labor;
(11) Secretary of Health and Human Services;
(12) Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;
(13) Secretary of Transportation;
(14) Secretary of Energy;
(15) Secretary of Education;
(16) Secretary of Veterans Affairs;
(17) Secretary of Homeland Security;
(18) Director of the Office of Management and Budget;
(19) United States Trade Representative;
(20) Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;
(21) Director of National Drug Control Policy; and
(22) Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1869. Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2313. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'', or under any other heading, may be obligated or expended for the purpose of arming, training, or employing individuals under the age of 18 years for the Facilities Protection Service, or to carry out any function similar to the functions performed by the Service, or for any other security force.

SA 1870. Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security

and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

SEC. . Section 1605 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding a new subsection (h) as follows:

''(h) Notwithstanding any provision of the Algiers Accords, or any other international agreement, any United States citizen held hostage during the period between 1979 and 1981, and their spouses and children at the time, shall have a claim for money damages against a foreign state for personal injury that was caused by the Foreign State's act of torture or hostage taking. Any provision in an international agreement, including the Algiers Accords that purports to bar such suit is abrogated. This subsection shall apply retroactively to any cause of action cited in 28 U.S.C. 1605(a)(7)(A).

SA 1871. Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. REID, and Mr. DORGAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2313. (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 donors 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.

SA 1872. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REID, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KERRY, MR. WYDEN, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL COUNSEL TO CONDUCT A FAIR, THOROUGH, AND INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION INTO A NATIONAL SECURITY BREACH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the national security of the United States is dependent on our intelligence operatives being able to operate undercover and without fear of having their identities disclosed;

(2) recent reports have indicated that administration or White House officials may have deliberately leaked the identity of a covert CIA agent to the media;

(3) the unauthorized disclosure of a covert intelligence agent's identity is a Federal felony; and

(4) the Attorney General has the power to appoint a special counsel of integrity and stature who may conduct an investigation into the leak without the appearance of any conflict of interest.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Attorney General of the United States should appoint a special counsel of the highest integrity and stature to conduct a fair, independent, and thorough investigation of the leak and ensure that all individuals found to be responsible for this heinous deed are punished to the fullest extent permitted by law.

SA 1873. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) GLOBAL HIV/AIDS FUNDING.—For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading ''Global AIDS Initiative'' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 2004, $879,700,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated by this section shall be made available in accordance with the amount authorized in accordance with sections 202(d)(1) and 202(d)(4) of Public Law 108–25.

(b) OFFSET.—The total amount appropriated under title II under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' (other than the amount appropriated for Iraqi border enforcement and enhanced security communications and the amount appropriated for the establishment of an Iraqi national security force and Iraqi Defense Corps) shall be reduced by $879,700,000.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall consult with, and provide a written report to, the appropriate committees of Congress, concerning the amount by which each sector, program, and activity is reduced pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1874. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

SEC. . SHORT TITLE.

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) That on October 7, 2001, the Armed Forces of the United States and its coalition allies launched military operations in Afghanistan, designated as Operation Enduring Freedom, that quickly caused the collapse of the Taliban regime, the elimination of Afghanistan's terrorist infrastructure and the capture of significant and numerous members of Al Qaeda;

(2) That on March 19, 2003, the Armed Forces of the United States and its coalition allies launched military operations, designated as Operation Iraqi Freedom, that quickly caused the collapse of Saddam Hussein's regime, the elimination of Iraq's terrorist infrastructure, the end of Iraq's illicit and illegal programs to acquire weapons of mass destruction, and the capture of significant international terrorists;

(3) That success in those two campaigns in the Global War on Terrorism would not have been possible without the dedication, courage, and service of the members of the United States Armed Forces and their coalition partners;

(4) That throughout the proud military history of our nation, we have recognized our brave men and women of the Armed Forces by awarding them service medals for personal bravery and other leadership actions and for their service in military operations abroad and for support operations at home and abroad;

(5) That historically the President has relied on senior military officers to recommend the personal and theater campaign

medals and that, in keeping with these longstanding traditions, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combatant commanders, including General Tommy Franks, U.S. Army, former Commander of the United States Central Command, recommended the awards described below in recognition of the worldwide nature of the current conflict;

(6) That following the advice of his senior military and civilian defense leaders, President Bush, by Executive Order 13289 on March 12, 2003, established the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal to be awarded to service members who serve in military operations to combat terrorism on or after September 11, 2001, including, but not limited to actions in Operations Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, in such locations as Afghanistan, Iraq, the Republic of the Philippines, and elsewhere in Southwest Asia, in recognition of the sacrifice and contributions military members make in the global war on terrorism;

(7) That eligibility for the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal is predicated on deployment abroad for 30 days or more in support of Global War on Terrorism operations on or after September 11, 2001;

(8) That by the same Executive Order, the President established the Global War on Terrorism Service Medical recognizing duty in Operation Noble Eagle and the homeland defense mission against further terrorist attacks, and which recognizes duty in support of military operations performed in areas that do not qualify for the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; and

(9) That implementing regulations for eligibility have not been issued by Secretary of Defense.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE AWARD OF CAMPAIGN MEDAL.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should, on an expedited basis, issue the necessary regulations to implement these awards and ensure that any person who renders qualifying service with the Armed Forces in those phases of the Global War on Terrorism including Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom; and Operation Noble Eagle should promptly receive these awards.

SA 1875. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S.1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 2313. Of the amounts appropriated by chapter 2 of this title under the heading ''IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' and available for refugees, human rights, democracy and civil society—

(1) $25,000,000 shall be made available to support the Iraqi Human Rights Ministry, as named in the justification document prepared by the Coalition Provisional Authority, of which—

(A) not less than $5,000,000 shall be available to establish an Iraq Independent Human Rights Commission to—

(i) monitor human rights, including abuses of women's rights such as rape, abduction, and ''honor killings'';

(ii) conduct educational programs on human rights, including with respect to women's rights; and

(iii) promote human rights, including awareness of women's rights and the prevention of violence against women; and

(B) not less than $7,000,000 shall be available for activities in Iraq designed to give women the skills necessary to participate in public life, including—

(i) the conduct of civic education campaigns;

(ii) the construction and operation of women's resource centers and shelters throughout Iraq; and

(iii) the conduct of leadership training and exchange programs;

(2) $10,000,000 shall be made available to support the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission to—

(A) monitor human rights, including abuses of women's rights such as rape, abduction, and ''honor killings'';

(B) conduct educational programs on human rights, including with respect to women's rights; and

(C) promote human rights, including awareness of women's rights and the prevention of violence against women; and

(3) $25,000,000 shall be made available to support the Afghanistan Ministry of Women's Affairs and independent Afghan women's organizations and networks for—

(A) the construction of women's centers and shelters; and

(B) programs to provide legal aid services and computer, English, literacy, and vocational courses for women.

SA 1876. Mr. NICKLES proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) The Senate finds the following:

(1) When Saddam Hussein came to power in the 1970's Iraq was a prosperous county with no foreign debt and significant foreign cash reserves.

(2) Iraq's reserves were exhausted during the Iran-Iraq War in the 1980's and Iraq became a debtor nation.

(3) Today, the debts incurred by Saddam Hussein's regime are estimated to be as much as $150,000,000,000.

(4) A process has been put in place that will establish a new representative Iraqi government based on a democratic political system with a free market economy. The goal is a prosperous Iraq that is not a threat to its neighbors.

(5) For Iraq to be prosperous it must rebuild. In the near term the United States and other donor countries will provide grants to begin the process. In the longer term Iraq must be able to fully participate in the international financial system.

(6) It is impossible for Iraq to borrow funds in international financial markets based on its existing debt. Eliminating that debt will make possible Iraq's continued rebuilding toward a prosperous and stable nation. A prosperous nation is less likely to be a threat to its neighbors and to be a breeding ground for terrorists. A prosperous Iraq is more likely to be a positive force in the region and participant in the world economy.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that all countries that hold debt from loans to the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein should be urged to forgive their debt.

SA 1877. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2313. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A coalition of allied countries led by the United States entered Iraq on March 19, 2003, to liberate the people of Iraq from the tyrannical rule of Saddam Hussein and the Baathist party and to remove a threat to global security and stability.

(2) Achieving stability in Iraq will require substantial monetary investments to develop a secure environment and improve the physical infrastructure.

(3) A stable and prosperous Iraq is important to the peace and economic well-being of the Middle East region and to all nations.

(4) As of October 2003, the United States has provided the majority of the personnel and financial contributions to the effort to rebuild Iraq.

(5) Congress fully supports the commitment required by the United States to establish a stable economic, social, and political environment in Iraq.

(6) The President is currently striving to increase global participation in the effort to stabilize and reconstruct Iraq.

(7) While the United States should aid the people of Iraq during the critical time of transition between tyranny and democracy, the participation of the people of Iraq in the reconstruction effort is essential for the success of such effort.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the President should—

(1) make every effort to increase the level of financial commitment from other nations to improve the physical, political, economic, and social infrastructure of Iraq; and

(2) seek to provide aid from the United States to Iraq in a manner that promotes economic growth in Iraq and limits the long-term cost to taxpayers in the United States.

SA 1878. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) GLOBAL HIV/AIDS FUNDING.—For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading ''Global AIDS Initiative'' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 2004, $879,700,000.

(b) OFFSET.—The total amount appropriated under title II under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' (other than the amount appropriated for Iraqi border enforcement and enhanced security communications and the amount appropriated for the establishment of an Iraqi national security force and Iraqi Defense Corps) shall be reduced by $879,700,000.

SA 1879. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) GLOBAL HIV/AIDS FUNDING.—For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading ''Global AIDS Initiative'' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 2004, $879,700,000.

(b) OFFSET.—The total amount appropriated under title II under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND'' (other than the amount appropriated for Iraqi border enforcement and enhanced security communications and the amount appropriated for the establishment of an Iraqi national security force and Iraqi Defense Corps) shall be reduced by $879,700,000.

SA 1880. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1867 proposed by Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. DOLE, and Mr. EDWARDS) to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of line 8, strike ''.'' and insert the following:

''*: Provided* that the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress): provided further that the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes the designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in House Concurrent Resolution 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.''

SA 1881. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON of Florida) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 316. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate specified in Senate Report 107–151 to accompany S. 2514 (107th Congress) that the Chief of Naval Operations submit to the congressional defense committees a report, not later than June 2, 2003, on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2015.

(2) As of October 16, 2003, the report has not been submitted.

(b) REPORT ON AIRCRAFT CARRIER BASING PLANS THROUGH 2020.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2020.

SA 1882. Mr. CORZINE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new title:

TITLE III—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF INTELLIGENCE RELATED TO IRAQ

SEC. 3001. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established the National Commission on the Development and Use of Intelligence Related to Iraq.

SEC. 3002. FINDINGS.

The Congress underscores its commitment to and support for ongoing congressional reviews regarding the collection and analysis of intelligence related to Iraq.

SEC. 3003. PURPOSES.

The purposes of the Commission are as follows:

(1) To examine and report upon the role of policymakers in the development of intelligence related to Iraq and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(2) To examine and report upon the use of intelligence related to Iraq and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(3) To build upon the reviews of intelligence related to Iraq and Operation Iraqi Freedom, including those being conducted by the Executive Branch, Congress, and other entities.

(4) To investigate and publicly report to the President and Congress on its findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

SEC. 3004. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) MEMBERS.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members, of whom—

(1) 3 members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(2) 3 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) 3 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and

(4) 3 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) CHAIRPERSON; VICE CHAIRPERSON.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by the members.

(2) POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION.—The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall not be from the same political party.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS; INITIAL MEETING.—

(1) QUALIFICATIONS.—It is the sense of Congress that individuals appointed to the Commission should be prominent United States citizens, with national recognition and significant depth of experience in such professions as intelligence, governmental service, the armed services, law enforcement, and foreign affairs.

(2) INITIAL MEETING.—Once 6 or more members of the Commission have been appointed, those members who have been appointed may meet and, if necessary, select a temporary chairperson, who may begin the operations of the Commission, including the hiring of staff.

(d) QUORUM; VACANCIES.—After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 3005. FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

The functions of the Commission are to—

(1) conduct an investigation that—

(A) investigates the development and use of intelligence related to Iraq and Operation Iraqi Freedom; and

(B) shall include an investigation of intelligence related to whether Iraq—

(i) possessed chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, and the locations of those weapons;

(ii) had links to Al Qaeda;

(iii) attempted to acquire uranium in Africa, and if so, when;

(iv) attempted to procure aluminum tubes for the development of nuclear weapons;

(v) possessed mobile laboratories for the production of weapons of mass destruction;

(vi) possessed delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction; and

(vii) any other matters that bear upon the imminence of the threat to the national security of the United States and its allies; and

(2) submit to the President and Congress such report as is required by this title containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations as the Commission shall determine, including proposing organization, coordination, planning, management arrangements, procedures, rules, and regulations.

(A) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report prepared under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 3006. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or, on the authority of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this title—

(A) hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths; and

(B) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, cables, E-mails, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member may determine advisable.

(2) SUBPOENAS.—

(A) ISSUANCE.—Subpoenas issued under paragraph (1)(B) may be issued under the signature of the chairperson of the Commission, the Vice Chairperson of the Commission, the chairperson of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission, and may be served by any person designated by the chairperson, subcommittee chairperson, or member.

(B) ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1)(B), the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found, or where the subpoena is returnable, may issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt of that court.

(ii) ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—In the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section, the Commission may, by majority vote, certify a statement of fact constituting such failure to the appropriate United States attorney, who may bring the matter before the grand jury for its action, under the same statutory authority and procedures as if the United States attorney had received a certification under sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192 through 194).

(b) CLOSED MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Meetings of the Commission may be closed to the public under section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) or other applicable law.

(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—In addition to the authority under paragraph (1), section

10(a)(1) and (3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to any portion of a Commission meeting if the President determines that such portion or portions of that meeting is likely to disclose matters that could endanger national security. If the President makes such determination, the requirements relating to a determination under section 10(d) of that Act shall apply.

(c) CONTRACTING.—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this title.

(d) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this title. Each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairperson, the chairperson of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(e) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis administrative support and other services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(2) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—In addition to the assistance prescribed in paragraph (1), departments and agencies of the United States are authorized to provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as they may determine advisable and as may be authorized by law.

(f) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(g) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 3007. STAFF OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The chairperson and vice chairperson, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The executive director and any personnel of the Commission who are employees shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, and 90 of that title.

(B) MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(b) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(c) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Commission is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3008. COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission may be compensated at not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3009. SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.

The appropriate executive departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Commission in expeditiously providing to the Commission members and staff appropriate security clearances in a manner consistent with existing procedures and requirements, except that no person shall be provided with access to classified information under this section who would not otherwise qualify for such security clearance.

SEC. 3010. REPORT OF THE COMMISSION; TERMINATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(b) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities of this title, shall terminate 60 days after the date on which the report is submitted under subsection (a).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.—The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in paragraph (1) for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its reports and disseminating the second report.

SEC. 3011. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to carry out this title $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 16, 2003, at 9:30 a.m., in closed session, to receive a classified briefing on the intelligence portion of the fiscal year 04 emergency supplemental appropriations request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 16, 2003, at 10:00 a.m., to conduct a hearing on ''proposals for improving the regulation of the housing GSEs.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 16, 2003 at 2:00 p.m., to hold a hearing on Afghanistan: In Pursuit of Security & Democracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 16, 2003 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a Subcommittee hearing on US–EU Cooperation on Regulatory Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on Promoting Access to Postsecondary Education: Issues for the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 16, 2003 at 10:00 a.m. in SD–430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Thursday, October 16, 2003 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on the Missouri River Master manual.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, October 16, 2003, at 10 a.m. in Dirksen Room 226.

I. Nominations

Henry W. Saad to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit; George W. Miller to be Judge for the United States Court of the Federal Claims; Deborah Ann Spagnoli to be United States Parole Commissioner; Dora L. Irizarry to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

II. Bills

S. 1545, Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act of 2003 (the DREAM Act) [Hatch, Durbin, Craig, DeWine, Feingold, Feinstein, Grassley, Kennedy, Leahy, Schumer]

S. 1691, the Wartime Treatment Study Act [Feingold, Grassley, Kennedy]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT AND THE COURTS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Common Sense Consumption: Super-Sizing Versus Personal Responsibility'' on Thursday, October 16, 2003, at 2 p.m. in Room 226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Panel I: Senator Mitch McConnell, Kentucky.

Panel II: Victor Schwartz, Partner, Law Firm of Shook, Hardy, & Bacon, L.L.P., Washington, D.C.; Russell L. Sutter, Principal, Tillinghast-Towers Perrin, St. Louis, MO.

Panel III: Wayne Reaves, President, Manna Enterprises, Inc., Anniston, AL; Dr. Gerard Musante, Founder, Structure House, Durham, NC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Shay Wester, a staff person in my office who does not currently have floor privileges, be admitted to the floor during the time of my brief remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to Michael Gayle during consideration of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 245 which was submitted yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 245) designating the week beginning October 19, 2003, as National Character Counts Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today with my friend Senator DODD to introduce a resolution regarding ''National Character Counts Week.'' Our resolution says the week of October 19 of this year will be known across the country as ''National Character Counts Week.''

Nearly a century ago President Theodore Roosevelt said the following about character:

> Character, in the long run, is the decisive factor in the life of an individual and of nations alike.

I would submit that character truly does transcend time as well as religious, cultural, political, and socioeconomic barriers. I believe our country is having a renewed focus on character and this sends a wonderful message to Americans, and will help those of us involved in character education reinvigorate our efforts to get communities and schools involved.

I say that because a number of years ago we started this approach to character education called ''Character Counts.'' Senators Nunn, DODD, and I first introduced the resolution that has now passed the Senate on innumerable occasions. The resolution simply declares that for all of America, one week during the year will be known as ''National Character Counts Week.''

Frankly, we hear a lot about how we should help our young people growing up in this often difficult society. However, I believe the key is finding those ideas and programs that work. We all understand that there are certain people who have the primary responsibility to care for our children like mothers, fathers, siblings, and grandparents. We are not in any way talking about negating that responsibility of raising a child with good values. However, we have found the teachers in our schools have been yearning for something they could teach our children that for some reason had been eliminated from both the public and private school agenda curriculum. It is sometimes referred to as character education.

I choose to speak about the ''Character Counts'' program that is being used in many public schools in our country, and certainly in my State of New Mexico where teachers embrace six pillars of character. The values comprising the six pillars are everyday concepts that Americans across this land wish their children would have and hope America will keep. They are simply: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. They transcend political and social barriers and are central to the ideals on which this Nation was built.

As a matter of fact, I think they are central and basic to any nation that survives for any long period of history. As Plato once said:

> A country without character is a country that's doomed and the only way a country can have character is if the individual citizens in the country have character.

I could speak for hours about the 200,000 New Mexico schoolchildren in public, private and parochial schools learning about good character. About 90 percent of the grade school children, and a significant portion of the others, are now participating in character education programs that simply and profoundly bring them into contact with each of these pillars one month at a time.

So if you walk the halls of a grade school in Albuquerque, you might see a sign outside that says, ''This Is Responsibility Month.'' And all the young people will be discussing the concept of responsibility in their classrooms, and they will put up posters saying, ''Responsibility Counts.'' At the end of that month they may have an assembly where responsibility will be discussed by all the kids, and awards will be given to those demonstrating the most responsibility. The next month it might be ''respect.'' The month after that it might be ''caring.''

I could go on for quite some time talking about Character Counts in New Mexico. The bottom line is that I believe it is working in New Mexico and other parts of the country. Consequently, I think we need to salute the efforts already underway and encourage even more character education across our country.

So today, Senator DODD and I are here to introduce a resolution to accomplish just that and hopefully our renewed effort will bring together even more communities to ensure that character education is a part of every child's life.

I hope that my colleagues will support this effort.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I join my friend and colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, in introducing a resolution declaring next week ''National Character Counts Week.'' Senator DOMENICI and I have worked together for many years on the issue of character education and hope that by designating a special week to this cause, students and teachers will come together to participate in character building activities in their schools. In 1994, Senator DOMENICI and I established the Partnerships in Character Education Pilot Project and have worked regularly since then to commemorate National Character Counts Week. I am pleased that we are continuing our efforts today to help expand States' and schools' abilities to make character education a central part of every child's education.

Our schools may be built with the bricks of English, math and science, but character education certainly is the mortar. Character education means teaching students about such qualities as caring, citizenship, fairness, respect, responsibility, trustworthiness, and other qualifies that their community values.

Character education provides students a context within which to learn. If we view education simply as the imparting of knowledge to our children, then we will not only miss an opportunity, but will jeopardize our future. Character education isn't a separate subject, but part of a seamless garment

of learning. Taking this to heart, teachers at Duffy Elementary School in West Hartford, Connecticut, have incorporated the fundamentals of character education into their schoolwide curriculum so that every child has the opportunity to focus on one aspect of character education in each garde. In turn, these learning opportunities have translated into action within the community.

Philip R. Smith Elementary School in South Windsor, Connecticut, was recently named a National School of Character by the Character Education Partnership for demonstrating outstanding character education initiatives that yield positive results in student behavior, school climate and academic performance. Their schoolwide approach has also translated into a number of community wide service projects. Annually, students organize and run a blood drive for the community and sponsor a two-month long clothing and can food drive for the homeless. In response to 9/11, students raised close to $1,500 in change for the Red Cross.

Mr. President, character education programs work. Schools across the country that have adopted strong character education programs report better student performance, fewer discipline problems, and increased student involvement within the community. Children want direction—they want to be taught right from wrong. The American public wants character education in our schools, too. Studies show that about 90 percent of Americans support schools teaching character education.

As all education policy should be, character education is bipartisan. This year we have 28 cosponsors to our resolution, cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. Character education is also actively supported by a number of national education and youth organizations including 4–H, Boys and Girls Clubs of America and the Little League. Character education can and is being incorporated into children's lives in and outside of the classroom.

This measure provides a helping hand to our schools and communities to ensure those children's future are bright and filled with opportunities and success. Character education not only cultivates minds, it nurtures hearts. While our children may be one-quarter of our population, they are 100 percent of our future.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 245) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 245), with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 245

Whereas the well-being of the Nation requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry with good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas, although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the Nation;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values which form the foundation of democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those who have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into their teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of National Character Counts Week, during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations would focus on character education, would be of great benefit to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) proclaims the week beginning October 19, 2003, as ''National Character Counts Week''; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to—

(A) embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

WESTERN SHOSHONE CLAIMS DISTRIBUTION ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 285, S.618.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 618) to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326–A–1, 326–A–3, 326–K, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

[Strike the part shown in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.]

S. 618

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

[SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

[This Act may be cited as the ''Western Shoshone Claims Distribution Act''.

[SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

[In this Act:

[(1) COMMITTEE.—The term ''Committee'' means the administrative committee established under section 4(c)(1).

[(2) WESTERN SHOSHONE JOINT JUDGMENT FUNDS.—The term ''Western Shoshone joint judgment funds'' means—

[(A) the funds appropriated in satisfaction of the judgment awards granted to the Western Shoshone Indians in Docket Numbers 326–A–1 and 326–A–3 before the United States Court of Claims; and

[(B) all interest earned on those funds.

[(3) WESTERN SHOSHONE JUDGMENT FUNDS.—The term ''Western Shoshone judgment funds'' means—

[(A) the funds appropriated in satisfaction of the judgment award granted to the Western Shoshone Indians in Docket Number 326–K before the Indian Claims Commission; and

[(B) all interest earned on those funds.

[(4) JUDGMENT ROLL.—The term ''judgment roll'' means the Western Shoshone judgment roll established by the Secretary under section 3(b)(1).

[(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

[(6) TRUST FUND.—The term ''Trust Fund'' means the Western Shoshone Educational Trust Fund established under section 4(b)(1).

[(7) WESTERN SHOSHONE MEMBER.—The term ''Western Shoshone member'' means an individual who—

[(A)(i) appears on the judgment roll; or

[(ii) is the lineal descendant of an individual appearing on the roll; and

[(B)(i) satisfies all eligibility criteria established by the Committee under section 4(c)(4)(D)(iii);

[(ii) meets any application requirements established by the Committee; and

[(iii) agrees to use funds distributed in accordance with section 4(b)(2)(B) for educational purposes approved by the Committee.

[SEC. 3. DISTRIBUTION OF WESTERN SHOSHONE JUDGMENT FUNDS.

[(a) IN GENERAL.—The Western Shoshone judgment funds shall be distributed in accordance with this section.

[(b) JUDGMENT ROLL.—

[(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a Western Shoshone judgment roll consisting of all individuals who—

[(A) have at least ¼ degree of Western Shoshone blood;

[(B) are citizens of the United States; and

[(C) are living on the date of enactment of this Act.

[(2) INELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—Any individual that is certified by the Secretary to be eligible to receive a per capita payment from any other judgment fund awarded by the Indian Claims Commission, the United States Claims Court, or the United States Court of Federal Claims, that was appropriated on or before the date of enactment of this Act, shall not be listed on the judgment roll.

[(3) REGULATIONS REGARDING JUDGMENT ROLL.—The Secretary shall—

[(A) publish in the Federal Register all regulations governing the establishment of the judgment roll; and

[(B) use any documents acceptable to the Secretary in establishing proof of eligibility of an individual to—

[(i) be listed on the judgment roll; and

[(ii) receive a per capita payment under this Act.

[(4) FINALITY OF DETERMINATION.—The determination of the Secretary on an application of an individual to be listed on the judgment roll shall be final.

[(c) DISTRIBUTION.—

[(1) IN GENERAL.—On establishment of the judgment roll, the Secretary shall make a per capita distribution of 100 percent of the Western Shoshone judgment funds, in shares as equal as practicable, to each person listed on the judgment roll.

[(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTION PAYMENTS.—

[(A) LIVING COMPETENT INDIVIDUALS.—The per capita share of a living, competent individual who is 19 years or older on the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1) shall be paid directly to the individual.

[(B) LIVING, LEGALLY INCOMPETENT INDIVIDUALS.—The per capita share of a living, legally incompetent individual shall be administered in accordance with regulations promulgated and procedures established by the Secretary under section 3(b)(3) of the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1403(b)(3)).

[(C) DECEASED INDIVIDUALS.—The per capita share of an individual who is deceased as of the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1) shall be paid to the heirs and legatees of the individual in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

[(D) INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE AGE OF 19.—The per capita share of an individual who is not yet 19 years of age on the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1) shall be—

[(i) held by the Secretary in a supervised individual Indian money account; and

[(ii) distributed to the individual—

[(I) after the individual has reached the age of 18 years; and

[(II) in 4 equal payments (including interest earned on the per capita share), to be made—

[(aa) with respect to the first payment, on the eighteenth birthday of the individual (or, if the individual is already 18 years of age, as soon as practicable after the date of establishment of the Indian money account of the individual); and

[(bb) with respect to the 3 remaining payments, not later than 90 days after each of the 3 subsequent birthdays of the individual.

[(3) APPLICABLE LAW.—Notwithstanding section 7 of the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1407), a per capita share (or the availability of that share) paid under this section shall not—

[(A) be subject to Federal or State income taxation;

[(B) be considered to be income or resources for any purpose; or

[(C) be used as a basis for denying or reducing financial assistance or any other benefit to which a household or Western Shoshone member would otherwise be entitled to receive under—

[(i) the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.); or

[(ii) any other Federal or federally-assisted program.

[(4) UNPAID FUNDS.—The Secretary shall add to the Western Shoshone joint judgment funds held in the Trust Fund under section 4(b)(1)—

[(A) all per capita shares (including interest earned on those shares) of living competent adults listed on the judgment roll that remain unpaid as of the date that is—

[(i) 6 years after the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1); or

[(ii) in the case of an individual described in paragraph (2)(D), 6 years after the date on which the individual reaches 18 years of age; and

[(B) any other residual principal and interest funds remaining after the distribution under paragraph (1) is complete.

[SEC. 4. DISTRIBUTION OF WESTERN SHOSHONE JOINT JUDGMENT FUNDS.

[(a) IN GENERAL.—The Western Shoshone joint judgment funds shall be distributed in accordance with this section.

[(b) WESTERN SHOSHONE EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUND.—

[(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish in the Treasury of the United States, for the benefit of Western Shoshone members, a trust fund to be known as the ''Western Shoshone Educational Trust Fund'', consisting of—

[(A) the Western Shoshone joint judgment funds; and

[(B) the funds added under in section 3(b)(4).

[(2) AMOUNTS IN TRUST FUND.—With respect to amounts in the Trust fund—

[(A) the principal amount—

[(i) shall not be expended or disbursed; and

[(ii) shall be invested in accordance with section 1 of the Act of June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a); and

[(B) all interest income earned on the principal amount after the date of establishment of the Trust fund—

[(i) shall be distributed by the Committee—

[(I) to Western Shoshone members in accordance with this Act, to be used as educational grants or for other forms of educational assistance determined appropriate by the Committee; and

[(II) to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of the Committee (as defined in the written rules and procedures of the Committee); but

[(ii) shall not be distributed under this paragraph on a per capita basis.

[(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE.—

[(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an administrative committee to oversee the distribution of educational grants and assistance under subsection (b)(2).

[(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of 7 members, of which—

[(A) 1 member shall represent the Western Shoshone Te-Moak Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

[(B) 1 member shall represent the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

[(C) 1 member shall represent the Yomba Shoshone Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

[(D) 1 member shall represent the Ely Shoshone Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

[(E) 1 member shall represent the Western Shoshone Committee of the Duck Valley Reservation and be appointed by that Committee;

[(F) 1 member shall represent the Fallon Band of Western Shoshone and be appointed by that Band; and

[(G) 1 member shall represent the general public and be appointed by the Secretary.

[(3) TERM.—

[(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Committee shall serve a term of 4 years.

[(B) VACANCIES.—If a vacancy remains unfilled in the membership of the Committee for a period of more than 60 days—

[(i) the Committee shall appoint a temporary replacement from among qualified members of the organization for which the replacement is being made; and

[(ii) that member shall serve until such time as the organization (or, in the case of a member described in paragraph (2)(G), the Secretary) designates a permanent replacement.

[(4) DUTIES.—The Committee shall—

[(A) distribute interest funds from the Trust Fund under subsection (b)(2)(B)(i);

[(B) for each fiscal year, compile a list of names of all individuals approved to receive those funds;

[(C) ensure that those funds are used in a manner consistent with this Act;

[(D) develop written rules and procedures, subject to the approval of the Secretary, that cover such matters as—

[(i) operating procedures;

[(ii) rules of conduct;

[(iii) eligibility criteria for receipt of funds under subsection (b)(2)(B)(i);

[(iv) application selection procedures;

[(v) procedures for appeals to decisions of the Committee;

[(vi) fund disbursement procedures; and

[(vii) fund recoupment procedures;

[(E) carry out financial management in accordance with paragraph (6); and

[(F) in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii), use a portion of the interest funds from the Trust Fund to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of the Committee (including per diem rates for attendance at meetings that are equal to those paid to Federal employees in the same geographic location), except that not more than $100,000 of those funds may be used to develop written rules and procedures described in subparagraph (D).

[(5) JURISDICTION OF TRIBAL COURTS.—At the discretion of the Committee and with the approval of the appropriate tribal government, a tribal court, or a court of Indian offenses operated under section 11 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), shall have jurisdiction to hear an appeal of a decision of the Committee.

[(6) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.—

[(A) FINANCIAL STATEMENT.—The Committee shall employ an independent certified public accountant to prepare a financial statement for each fiscal year that discloses—

[(i) the operating expenses of the Committee for the fiscal year; and

[(ii) the total amount of funds disbursed under subsection (b)(2)(B)(i) for the fiscal year.

[(B) DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION.—For each fiscal year, the Committee shall provide to the Secretary, to each organization represented on the Committee, and, on the

request of a Western Shoshone member, to the Western Shoshone member, a copy of—

[(i) the financial statement prepared under subparagraph (A); and

[(ii) the list of names compiled under paragraph (4)(B).

[(d) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Committee on the management and investment of the funds distributed under this section.

[SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

[The Secretary may promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act.]

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Western Shoshone Claims Distribution Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMITTEE.—The term ''Committee'' means the administrative committee established under section 4(c)(1).

(2) WESTERN SHOSHONE JOINT JUDGMENT FUNDS.—The term ''Western Shoshone joint judgment funds'' means—

(A) the funds appropriated in satisfaction of the judgment awards granted to the Western Shoshone Indians in Docket Numbers 326–A–1 and 326–A–3 before the United States Court of Claims; and

(B) all interest earned on those funds.

(3) WESTERN SHOSHONE JUDGMENT FUNDS.—The term ''Western Shoshone judgment funds'' means—

(A) the funds appropriated in satisfaction of the judgment award granted to the Western Shoshone Indians in Docket Number 326–K before the Indian Claims Commission; and

(B) all interest earned on those funds.

(4) JUDGMENT ROLL.—The term ''judgment roll'' means the Western Shoshone judgment roll established by the Secretary under section 3(b)(1).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) TRUST FUND.—The term ''Trust Fund'' means the Western Shoshone Educational Trust Fund established under section 4(b)(1).

(7) WESTERN SHOSHONE MEMBER.—The term ''Western Shoshone member'' means an individual who—

(A)(i) appears on the judgment roll; or

(ii) is the lineal descendant of an individual appearing on the roll; and

(B)(i) satisfies all eligibility criteria established by the Committee under section 4(c)(4)(D)(iii);

(ii) meets any application requirements established by the Committee; and

(iii) agrees to use funds distributed in accordance with section 4(b)(2)(B) for educational purposes approved by the Committee.

SEC. 3. DISTRIBUTION OF WESTERN SHOSHONE JUDGMENT FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Western Shoshone judgment funds shall be distributed in accordance with this section.

(b) JUDGMENT ROLL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a Western Shoshone judgment roll consisting of all individuals who—

(A) have at least ¼ degree of Western Shoshone blood;

(B) are citizens of the United States; and

(C) are living on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) INELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—Any individual that is certified by the Secretary to be eligible to receive a per capita payment from any other judgment fund based on an aboriginal land claim awarded by the Indian Claims Commission, the United States Claims Court, or the United States Court of Federal Claims, that was appropriated on or before the date of enactment of this Act, shall not be listed on the judgment roll.

(3) REGULATIONS REGARDING JUDGMENT ROLL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) publish in the Federal Register all regulations governing the establishment of the judgment roll; and

(B) use any documents acceptable to the Secretary in establishing proof of eligibility of an individual to—

(i) be listed on the judgment roll; and

(ii) receive a per capita payment under this Act.

(4) FINALITY OF DETERMINATION.—The determination of the Secretary on an application of an individual to be listed on the judgment roll shall be final.

(c) DISTRIBUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On establishment of the judgment roll, the Secretary shall make a per capita distribution of 100 percent of the Western Shoshone judgment funds, in shares as equal as practicable, to each person listed on the judgment roll.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTION PAYMENTS.—

(A) LIVING COMPETENT INDIVIDUALS.—The per capita share of a living, competent individual who is 19 years or older on the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1) shall be paid directly to the individual.

(B) LIVING, LEGALLY INCOMPETENT INDIVIDUALS.—The per capita share of a living, legally incompetent individual shall be administered in accordance with regulations promulgated and procedures established by the Secretary under section 3(b)(3) of the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1403(b)(3)).

(C) DECEASED INDIVIDUALS.—The per capita share of an individual who is deceased as of the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1) shall be paid to the heirs and legatees of the individual in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

(D) INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE AGE OF 19.—The per capita share of an individual who is not yet 19 years of age on the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1) shall be—

(i) held by the Secretary in a supervised individual Indian money account; and

(ii) distributed to the individual—

(I) after the individual has reached the age of 18 years; and

(II) in 4 equal payments (including interest earned on the per capita share), to be made—

(aa) with respect to the first payment, on the eighteenth birthday of the individual (or, if the individual is already 18 years of age, as soon as practicable after the date of establishment of the Indian money account of the individual); and

(bb) with respect to the 3 remaining payments, not later than 90 days after each of the 3 subsequent birthdays of the individual.

(3) APPLICABLE LAW.—Notwithstanding section 7 of the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1407), a per capita share (or the availability of that share) paid under this section shall not—

(A) be subject to Federal or State income taxation;

(B) be considered to be income or resources for any purpose; or

(C) be used as a basis for denying or reducing financial assistance or any other benefit to which a household or Western Shoshone member would otherwise be entitled to receive under—

(i) the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.); or

(ii) any other Federal or federally-assisted program.

(4) UNPAID FUNDS.—The Secretary shall add to the Western Shoshone joint judgment funds held in the Trust Fund under section 4(b)(1)—

(A) all per capita shares (including interest earned on those shares) of living competent adults listed on the judgment roll that remain unpaid as of the date that is—

(i) 6 years after the date of distribution of the Western Shoshone judgment funds under paragraph (1); or

(ii) in the case of an individual described in paragraph (2)(D), 6 years after the date on which the individual reaches 18 years of age; and

(B) any other residual principal and interest funds remaining after the distribution under paragraph (1) is complete.

SEC. 4. DISTRIBUTION OF WESTERN SHOSHONE JOINT JUDGMENT FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Western Shoshone joint judgment funds shall be distributed in accordance with this section.

(b) WESTERN SHOSHONE EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish in the Treasury of the United States, for the benefit of Western Shoshone members, a trust fund to be known as the ''Western Shoshone Educational Trust Fund'', consisting of—

(A) the Western Shoshone joint judgment funds; and

(B) the funds added under section 3(b)(4).

(2) AMOUNTS IN TRUST FUND.—With respect to amounts in the Trust fund—

(A) the principal amount—

(i) shall not be expended or disbursed; and

(ii) shall be invested in accordance with section 1 of the Act of June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a); and

(B) all interest income earned on the principal amount after the date of establishment of the Trust fund—

(i) shall be distributed by the Committee—

(I) to Western Shoshone members in accordance with this Act, to be used as educational grants or for other forms of educational assistance determined appropriate by the Committee; and

(II) to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of the Committee (as defined in the written rules and procedures of the Committee); but

(ii) shall not be distributed under this paragraph on a per capita basis.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an administrative committee to oversee the distribution of educational grants and assistance under subsection (b)(2).

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of 7 members, of which—

(A) 1 member shall represent the Western Shoshone Te-Moak Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

(B) 1 member shall represent the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

(C) 1 member shall represent the Yomba Shoshone Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

(D) 1 member shall represent the Ely Shoshone Tribe and be appointed by that Tribe;

(E) 1 member shall represent the Western Shoshone Committee of the Duck Valley Reservation and be appointed by that Committee;

(F) 1 member shall represent the Fallon Band of Western Shoshone and be appointed by that Band; and

(G) 1 member shall represent the general public and be appointed by the Secretary.

(3) TERM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Committee shall serve a term of 4 years.

(B) VACANCIES.—If a vacancy remains unfilled in the membership of the Committee for a period of more than 60 days—

(i) the Committee shall appoint a temporary replacement from among qualified members of the organization for which the replacement is being made; and

(ii) that member shall serve until such time as the organization (or, in the case of a member described in paragraph (2)(G), the Secretary) designates a permanent replacement.

(4) DUTIES.—The Committee shall—

(A) distribute interest funds from the Trust Fund under subsection (b)(2)(B)(i);

(B) for each fiscal year, compile a list of names of all individuals approved to receive those funds;

(C) ensure that those funds are used in a manner consistent with this Act;

(D) develop written rules and procedures, subject to the approval of the Secretary, that cover such matters as—

(i) operating procedures;

(ii) rules of conduct;

(iii) eligibility criteria for receipt of funds under subsection (b)(2)(B)(i);

(iv) application selection procedures;

(v) procedures for appeals to decisions of the Committee;

(vi) fund disbursement procedures; and

(vii) fund recoupment procedures;

(E) carry out financial management in accordance with paragraph (6); and

(F) in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii), use a portion of the interest funds from the Trust Fund to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of the Committee (including per diem rates for attendance at meetings that are equal to those paid to Federal employees in the same geographic location), except that not more than $100,000 of those funds may be used to develop written rules and procedures described in subparagraph (D).

(5) JURISDICTION OF TRIBAL COURTS.—At the discretion of the Committee and with the approval of the appropriate tribal government, a tribal court, or a court of Indian offenses operated under section 11 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), shall have jurisdiction to hear an appeal of a decision of the Committee.

(6) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.—

(A) FINANCIAL STATEMENT.—The Committee shall employ an independent certified public accountant to prepare a financial statement for each fiscal year that discloses—

(i) the operating expenses of the Committee for the fiscal year; and

(ii) the total amount of funds disbursed under subsection (b)(2)(B)(i) for the fiscal year.

(B) DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION.—For each fiscal year, the Committee shall provide to the Secretary, to each organization represented on the Committee, and, on the request of a Western Shoshone member, to the Western Shoshone member, a copy of—

(i) the financial statement prepared under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) the list of names compiled under paragraph (4)(B).

(d) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Committee on the management and investment of the funds distributed under this section.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary may promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is a bill introduced by Senator REID and Senator ENSIGN. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 618) was read the third time and passed.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1751

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1751 introduced by Senator GRASSLEY yesterday is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1751) to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2003

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9 a.m. October 17. I further ask that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1689, the Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental appropriations bill as provided under the original order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of this Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental appropriations bill. At 9 a.m., the Senate will proceed to a stacked series of votes on the remaining pending amendments. Senators should therefore expect the first vote of Friday's session to begin at 9 a.m., and votes will continue throughout the day. It is still our intention to complete action on this bill on Friday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. STEVENS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:05 a.m., adjourned until Friday, October 17, 2003, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 16, 2003:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TIMOTHY JOHN DUNN, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES.

STUART W. HOLLIDAY, OF TEXAS, TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ZALMAY KHALILZAD, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE TRANSITIONAL ISLAMIC STATE OF AFGHANISTAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ADAM MARC LINDEMANN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY BOARD FOR CUBA BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 27, 2005, VICE CHRISTOPHER D. COURSEN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAMES CURTIS STRUBLE, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PERU.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

To be commander

DELANO G ADAMS, 0000
WILLIAM F ADICKES, 0000
JAY A ALLEN, 0000
ERIK S ANDERSON, 0000
STANLEY E BALINT, 0000
NICHOLAS A BARTOLOTTA, 0000
DENNIS S BAUBY, 0000
JAMES D BAUGH, 0000
GEORGE G BONNER, 0000
DOUGLAS K BRUCE, 0000
ERIC L BRUNER, 0000
MELISSA A BULKLEY, 0000
KEVIN C BURKE, 0000
GREGORY A BUXA, 0000
WENDY M CALDER, 0000
WILLIAM L CHANEY, 0000
JASON K CHURCH, 0000
TONY C CLARK, 0000
WILLIAM J COFFEY, 0000
CRAIG S CROSS, 0000
JOHN M CUSHING, 0000
JOHN J DALY, 0000
RUSSELL A DAVIDSON, 0000
TIMOTHY Y DEAL, 0000
PETER N DECOLA, 0000
CLAYTON L DIAMOND, 0000
SHERYL L DICKINSON, 0000
ROMUALDO DOMINGO, 0000
WILLIAM M DRELLING, 0000
MICHAEL J EAGLE, 0000
BRIAN T ELLIS, 0000
ELMER O EMERIC, 0000
DOUGLAS M FEARS, 0000
DAVID S FIEDLER, 0000
DAVID S FISH, 0000
BRUCE C FISHER, 0000
PATRICK FLYNN, 0000
RICHARD D FONTANA, 0000
JASON A FOSDICK, 0000
CRAIG O FOWLER, 0000
MARK A FRANKFORD, 0000
JEFFREY D GAFKJEN, 0000
ROBERT L GANDOLFO, 0000
MICHAEL P GERMINARIO, 0000
ERIC M GIESE, 0000
MATTHEW J GIMPLE, 0000
PATRICK M GORMAN, 0000
BRIAN K GOVE, 0000
KARL GRAMS, 0000
CHARLES M GREENE, 0000
DIRK A GREENE, 0000
CAROLYN HARRISS, 0000
PETER J HATCH, 0000
DAVID C HAYNES, 0000
LARRY W HEWETT, 0000
RICHARD L HINCHION, 0000
JEFFREY S HUDKINS, 0000
DONALD E JACCARD, 0000
MARK A JACKSON, 0000
KIRK D JOHNSON, 0000
DANIEL P KANE, 0000
RICHARD M KEESLER, 0000
DANIEL E KENNY, 0000
KEVIN C KIEFER, 0000
PETER M KILFOYLE, 0000
ROBERT D KIRK, 0000
ROBIN J KORTUS, 0000
AMY B KRITZ, 0000
ROBERT A LAAHS, 0000
RONALD A LABREC, 0000
JUNG A LAWRENCE, 0000
DANIEL L LEBLANC, 0000
ROBERT D LEFEVERS, 0000
PATRICK J MAGUIRE, 0000
THURMAN T MAINE, 0000
ROBERT B MAKOWSKY, 0000
ANDREA M MARCILLE, 0000
KENNETH D MARIEN, 0000
MICHAEL P MCCRAW, 0000
SCOTT R MCFARLAND, 0000
PATRICIA A MCFETRIDGE, 0000
ROBERT E MCKENNA, 0000
CLAUDIA V MCKNIGHT, 0000
DANIEL J MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
PATRICK M MCMILLIN, 0000
BRENDAN C MCPHERSON, 0000
NEIL E MEISTER, 0000
MARK S MESERVEY, 0000
THOMAS C MILLER, 0000
KATHLEEN MOORE, 0000
RICHARD L MOUREY, 0000
SEAN R MURTAGH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S MYSKOWSKI, 0000
JOHN P NADEAU, 0000
MARC H NGUYEN, 0000
DAVID L NICHOLS, 0000

JAMES B NICHOLSON, 0000
JOSE A NIEVES, 0000
JEFFREY P NOVOTNY, 0000
JOHN C OCONNOR, 0000
JAMES R OLIVE, 0000
ROBERT F OLSON, 0000
GEORGE E PELLISSIER, 0000
LARRY P PESEK, 0000
JEFFERY M PETERS, 0000
ROBERT D PHILLIPS, 0000
HAL R PITTS, 0000
JACK P POLING, 0000
RUSSELL C PROCTOR, 0000
KEVIN E RAIMER, 0000
JEFFREY M RAMOS, 0000
MARK E REYNOLDS, 0000
TY W RINOSKI, 0000
RICARDO R RODRIGUEZ, 0000
SCOTT D ROGERSON, 0000
DAVID J ROKES, 0000
RICHARD F RONCONE, 0000
THOMAS A ROUTHIER, 0000
MARK T RUCKSTUHL, 0000
MARC F SANDERS, 0000
KEVIN R SAREAULT, 0000
MATTHEW W SIBLEY, 0000
MICHAEL H SIM, 0000
ARTHUR J SNYDER, 0000
TIMOTHY G STUEVE, 0000
DOUGLAS L SUBOCZ, 0000
MICHAEL G TANNER, 0000
DANIEL P TAYLOR, 0000
JASON L TENGAN, 0000
BRIAN J TETREAULT, 0000
ROBERT K THOMPSON, 0000
PAUL D THORNE, 0000
ANDREW J TIONGSON, 0000
KATHERINE F TIONGSON, 0000
PAUL A TITCOMBE, 0000
CATHERINE W TOBIAS, 0000
STEPHEN H TORPEY, 0000
WILLIAM J TRAVIS, 0000
TODD A TSCHANNEN, 0000
LEONARD R TUMBARELLO, 0000
JOHN E TYSON, 0000
ERIC J VOGELBACHER, 0000
MICHAEL A WALZ, 0000
MICHAEL F WHITE, 0000
ROBERT L WHITEHOUSE, 0000
ANTHONY WIEST, 0000
MARK J WILBERT, 0000
ROBERT S WILBUR, 0000
BRIAN S WILLIS, 0000
KEITH A WILLIS, 0000
THOMAS P WOJAHN, 0000
JERALD L WOLOSZYNSKI, 0000
WILLIAM J WOLTER, 0000
ROGER N WYKLE, 0000
RUSSELL H ZULLICK, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHEL L. BUNNING, 0000
JAMES J. CARROLL, 0000
WAYNE C. CHEATUM, 0000
MATTHEW R. CHINI, 0000
MICHAEL L. CHYREK, 0000
WILLIAM G. COURTNEY, 0000
FORREST C. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
STEVEN R. DEANDA, 0000
PAUL W. FISHER, 0000
ROGER L. GIBSON, 0000
DANNY J. GLOVER, 0000
CARROLL H. GREENE III, 0000
RANDALL S. HAGAN, 0000
KENNETH E. HALL, 0000
MARK S. HOLDEN, 0000
ARTHUR S. KAMINSKI, 0000
JAMES E. MCCLAIN, 0000
DAVID J. MIETZNER, 0000
CAROLYN L. MILLER, 0000
KEVIN P. MULLIGAN, 0000
DEBRA M. NIEMEYER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JEFFERSON L. SEVERS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LESA M. WAGNER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

FRANCIS D. POMBAR, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ELWOOD M. BARNES, 0000
OLEDIA F. BELL, 0000
JIMMY M. BROWNING, 0000
RONALD M. HARVELL, 0000
RAYMOND L. JOHNSON, 0000
JOHN M. KINNEY, 0000
STEVEN P. MCCAIN, 0000
STEVEN J. NICOLAI, 0000
ROBERT E. ODELL JR., 0000
SCOTT A. OFSDAHL, 0000
PATRICK J. RYAN, 0000
PAUL L. SHEROUSE, 0000
DOUGLAS J. SLATER SR., 0000
WILLIAM T. TOGUCHI, 0000
VICTOR J. TONEY, 0000
TIMOTHY P. WAGONER, 0000
REX A. WILLIAMS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

RAAN R. AALGAARD, 0000
JOSEPH D. ABEL, 0000
JOSEPH A. ABRIGO, 0000
ELIZABETH F. ADAMS, 0000
JAMES S. ADAMSKI, 0000
BRIAN T. ADKINS, 0000
KRISTOPHER J. ALDEN, 0000
MICHAEL D. ALFORD, 0000
CHARLES T. ALLEN, 0000
KEVIN S. ALLEN, 0000
MARK E. ALLEN, 0000
MARK P. ALLEN, 0000
SCOT T. ALLEN, 0000
MICHAEL W. ALLIN, 0000
JAMES W. ALSTON, 0000
DENIO A. ALVARADO, 0000
IGNACIO G. ALVAREZ, 0000
GREGORY C. ANDERS, 0000
DANIEL L. ANDERSON, 0000
JON M. ANDERSON, 0000
MARK RICHARD ANDERSON, 0000
MICHAEL A. ANDERSON, 0000
RICHARD N. ANDERSON, 0000
STEPHEN L. ANDREASEN, 0000
KEITH E. ANDREWS, 0000
BENJAMIN C. ANGUS, 0000
JOHN B. APOSTOLIDES, 0000
ANTHONY R. ARCIERO, 0000
ROBERT G. ARMFIELD, 0000
JOHN E. ARMOUR, 0000
JOHN T. ARNOLD, 0000
DAVID R. ARRIETA, 0000
AMY V. ARWOOD, 0000
MYRON H. ASATO, 0000
TROY A. ASHER, 0000
JAMES M. ASHLEY, 0000
GARY A. ASHWORTH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. ATHEARN, 0000
HANS R. AUGUSTUS, 0000
DAVID A. AUPPERLE, 0000
ERIC AXELBANK, 0000
JOSEPH L. BACA, 0000
JOSEPH V. BADALIS, 0000
BRYAN J. BAGLEY, 0000
FREDERICK L. BAIER, 0000
WILLIAM D. BAILEY, 0000
JEFFREY A. BAIR, 0000
JAMES C. BAIRD, 0000
RONALD B. BALDINGER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER BALLARD, 0000
MERRILL D. BALLENGER, 0000
JOHN M. BALZANO, 0000
SALVADOR E. BARBOSA, 0000
TONY L. BARKER, 0000
PHILLIP B. BARKS, 0000
WARREN P. BARLOW, 0000
KYLER A. BARNES, 0000
BARTON V. BARNHART, 0000
ANTHONY J. BARRELL, 0000
DOUGLAS W. BARRON, 0000
BRADLEY D. BARTELS, 0000
BRYAN C. BARTLETT, 0000
JOHN S. BARTO, 0000
MARCUS P. BASS, 0000
DALE L. BASTIN, 0000
DAVID W. BATH, 0000
KENNETH J. BAUMER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. BAUTZ, 0000
BRENT R. BAXTER, 0000
KEITH L. BEARDEN, 0000
ANDREW C. BEAUDOIN, 0000
VINCENT K. BECKLUND, 0000
SCOTT M. BEDROSIAN, 0000
MICHAEL A. BEHLING, 0000
ROBERT H. BEHRENS, 0000
STEVEN G. BEHRENS, 0000
SCOTT W. BEIDLEMAN, 0000
DOVER M. BELL, 0000
CHRISTIAN P. BENEDICT, 0000
WARREN L. BENJAMIN, 0000
KEVIN S. BENNETT, 0000
MICHAEL P. BENSCHE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. BEODDY, 0000
WILLIAM S. BERGMAN, 0000
KEVIN L. BERKOMPAS, 0000
PETER H. BERNSTEIN, 0000
ALAN R. BERRY, 0000
JAMES A. BESSEL, 0000
ROBERT W. BICKEL, 0000
DARREN L. BISHOP, 0000
STEPHEN H. BISSONNETTE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. BJORKMAN, 0000
MILTON L. BLACKMON JR., 0000
DAVID T. BLACKWELL, 0000
KRISTINE E. BLACKWELL, 0000
RICK A. BLAISDELL, 0000
JEFFREY E. BLALOCK, 0000
RICHARD D. BLOCKER III, 0000
JUSTIN L. BOBB, 0000
MATTHEW J. BOHN, 0000
LISA D. BOMBERG, 0000
GREGORY L. BONAFEDE, 0000
GERALD A. BOONE, 0000
SCOTT C. BORCHERS, 0000
PHILLIP M. BOROFF, 0000
ANDREW J. BOSSARD, 0000
DAROLD S. BOSWELL, 0000
MARY NOEHL BOUCHER, 0000
THOMAS A. BOULEY, 0000
ROBERT D. BOWER, 0000
MICHELLE M. BOWES, 0000
CLIFFORD M. BOWMAN, 0000
GORDON F. BOYD II, 0000
MARCUS A. BOYD, 0000
TUCK E. BOYSON, 0000
HAROLD W. BRACKINS, 0000
JAMIE S. BRADY, 0000
JAMES R. BRAY, 0000
JEFFREY R. BREAM, 0000
DAVID A. BRESCIA, 0000
DAVID P. BRIAR, 0000
ANTHONY S. BRIDGEMAN, 0000
WILLIAM S. BRINLEY, 0000
DAVID G. BROSIUS, 0000
HAROLD D. BROWN JR., 0000
KEVIN D. BROWN, 0000
MANNING C. BROWN, 0000
SCOTT F. BROWN, 0000
LARRY A. BRUCE JR., 0000
RICHARD M. BRULL, 0000
JAMES E. BUCHMAN, 0000
GEORGE B. BUDZ, 0000
ANTHONY W. BUENGER, 0000
MICHAEL P. BUONAUGURIO, 0000
RONALD A. BURGESS, 0000
KEVIN E. BURNS, 0000
SANDRA K. BURR, 0000
PHLECIA R. BURSEY, 0000
JAMES B. BURTON, 0000
MICHAEL D. BUSCH, 0000
DEAN E. BUSHEY, 0000
CARLOS E. * BUSHMAN, 0000
DEE A. BUTLER, 0000
ANTHONY C. BUTTS, 0000
JOHN J. * CABALA, 0000
WILLIAM B. CADE III, 0000
HENRY T. G. CAFFERY, 0000
SHAWN D. CALDWELL, 0000
ELWIN B. CALLAHAN, 0000
ROBERT W. CALLAHAN, 0000
RONALD CALVERT, 0000
MARLON G. CAMACHO, 0000
CAROLYN D. CAMPBELL, 0000
MICHAEL F. CANAVAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER G. CANTU, 0000
ROBERT J. CAPOZZELLA, 0000
DANIEL D. CAPPABIANCA, 0000
ALEXANDER C. CARDENAS, 0000
MARIA L. CARL, 0000
BARAK J. CARLSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. CARPER, 0000
KEVIN P. CARR, 0000
DAVID A. CARROLL, 0000
JAY A. CARROLL, 0000
THOMAS J. CARROLL III, 0000
GARY R. * CARRUTHERS, 0000
LISA C. CARSWELL, 0000
WILLIAM T. CARTER, 0000
STEVEN M. CASE, 0000
JAMES W. CASEY, 0000
LINA M. CASHIN, 0000
MANUEL F. CASIPIT, 0000
HENRI F. CASTELAIN, 0000
ELMA M. CASTOR, 0000
BRUCE C. CESSNA, 0000
JAMES L. CHAMBERLAIN, 0000
CHARLES E. CHAMBERS, 0000
ROBERT D. CHAMPION, 0000
SANDRA M. CHANDLER, 0000
CRAIG C. CHANG, 0000
JOHN W. CHAPMAN, 0000
MARK C. CHARLTON, 0000
XAVIER D. CHAVEZ, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. CHELALES, 0000
SCOTT D. CHOWNING, 0000
ROBYN A. CHUMLEY, 0000
MICHAEL S. CLAFFEY, 0000
KELLY B. CLARK, 0000
MICHELLE M. CLAYS, 0000
PATRICK G. CLEMENTS, 0000
JEFFREY E. CLIFTON, 0000
LUKE E. CLOSSON III, 0000
THOMAS C. CLUTZ, 0000
RICHARD G. COBB, 0000
DWIGHT F. COCKRELL, 0000
RICHARD A. COE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. COFFELT, 0000
JAMES A. COFFEY, 0000
STEVEN D. COLBY, 0000
THOMAS D. COLBY, 0000
JON M. COLEMAN, 0000
DAVID M. COLEY, 0000
STEPHEN J. * COLLINS, 0000
GERALD K. * COLMER JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. COMEAU, 0000
DONALD M. CONLEY, 0000
SHANE M. CONNARY, 0000
JEFFREY J. COOK, 0000
MICHELE M. COOK, 0000
STEPHEN D. COOPER, 0000
BRIAN C. COPELLO, 0000
JAN L. COPHER, 0000

GLEN A. CORELL, 0000
KYLE M. CORNELL, 0000
BARRY R. CORNISH, 0000
MICHAEL J. COSTELLO, 0000
JAMES A. COTTURONE JR., 0000
BARRY J. COUSLER, 0000
GERARD G. * COUVILLION, 0000
BRYAN R. COX, 0000
KAREN L. * COX, 0000
GREGORY P. COYKENDALL, 0000
STEPHEN P. CRAIG, 0000
ROBERT A. CREWS, 0000
STEPHEN P. CRITTELL, 0000
MICHAEL B. CROSLEN, 0000
ANDREW R. CROUSE, 0000
JAMES A. CRUTCHFIELD, 0000
CURTIS N. CULVER, 0000
DEAN A. CUSANEK, 0000
JENNIFER A. CUSHION, 0000
DAVID J. CUSTODIO, 0000
GLENN T. CZYZNIK, 0000
KIMBERLY E. DAEGER, 0000
DANIEL D. DAETZ, 0000
JONATHAN S. DAGLE, 0000
SCOTT V. DAHL, 0000
KENT B. DALTON, 0000
STEVEN J. DALTON, 0000
LEONARD J. DAMICO, 0000
ERIC D. DANNA, 0000
DANIEL A. DANT, 0000
LARRY G. DAVENPORT, 0000
PETER F. * DAVEY, 0000
JOHN E. DAVIS, 0000
JAMES C. DAWKINS JR., 0000
ALLAN E. DAY, 0000
MELVIN G. DEAILE, 0000
DWIGHT E. DEAN, 0000
MICHAEL E. DEARBORN, 0000
TIMOTHY B. DECKER, 0000
ALEXANDER I. DEFAZIO, 0000
PHILIP S. DEFENBACH, 0000
JAY B. DELONG JR., 0000
JOSEPH W. DEMARCO, 0000
JOHN T. DEMBOSKI, 0000
GERALD M. DEMPSEY, 0000
DAVID R. DENHARD, 0000
MICHAEL R. DENNIS, 0000
TIMOTHY J. DENNISON, 0000
IAN J. DEPLEDGE, 0000
DAVID G. DERAY, 0000
JOSEPH L. DERDZINSKI, 0000
JAY B. DESJARDINS JR., 0000
STEVEN P. * DESORDI, 0000
FRANCES A. DEUTCH, 0000
STEWART L. DEVILBISS, 0000
MICHAEL L. DILDA, 0000
ELLIS D. DINSMORE, 0000
DOUGLAS S. DIXON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. DOBB, 0000
CARRIE M. V. DODSON, 0000
NEAL E. DOLLAR, 0000
BRIAN P. DONAHOO, 0000
WILLIAM R. DONOVAN II, 0000
STEFAN B. DOSEDEL, 0000
GARTH D. DOTY, 0000
PAUL D. DOTZLER, 0000
STEVEN I. DOUB, 0000
PAUL T. DOUBLE, 0000
RONALD J. DOUGHERTY, 0000
GLEN R. DOWNING, 0000
JOHN J. DOYLE, 0000
TIMOTHY J. DRANTTEL, 0000
ROBERT S. DROZD, 0000
JONATHAN T. DRUMMOND, 0000
JOLISA WEBB DUDLEY, 0000
BRIAN P. DUFFY, 0000
KEITH J. DUFFY, 0000
PATRICK B. DUNNELLS, 0000
KENT A. DUSEK, 0000
BRIAN T. DWYER, 0000
THOMAS A. EADS, 0000
KEVIN L. EDENBOROUGH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. EDLING, 0000
ROBERT H. EDMONDSON, 0000
CHERYL L. EDWARDS, 0000
RICHARD F. EDWARDS, 0000
SCOTT D. EDWARDS, 0000
PATRICIA D. EGLESTON, 0000
RONALD S. EINHORN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. EISENBIES, 0000
THOMAS D. EISENHAUER, 0000
GERARD H. EISERT, 0000
REGAN W. ELDER, 0000
ELAINE S. ELDRIDGE, 0000
WILLIAM G. ELDRIDGE, 0000
GEORGE G. ELEFTERIOU, 0000
RICHARD G. ELKINS, 0000
DOUGLAS K. ENGELKE, 0000
GREGORY S. ENGLE, 0000
ADAM C. ENGLEMAN, 0000
MARK E. ENNIS, 0000
SCOTT B. ENRIGHT, 0000
REY R. ERMITANO, 0000
BRIAN E. ERNISSE, 0000
STEVEN A. ESTOCK, 0000
WILBURN EVANS III, 0000
BRIAN D. EWERT, 0000
ROBERT A. FABIAN, 0000
DAVID T. FAHRENKRUG, 0000
JAMES D. FAIN, 0000
MICHAEL G. FARRELL, 0000
CHERYL R. FARRER, 0000
JAMES L. FEDERWISCH, 0000
DONALD S. FELTON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. FERREZ, 0000
WILLIAM A. FERRO, 0000
KEVIN R. FESLER, 0000
ERIC T. FICK, 0000
MICHAEL S. FIELDS, 0000
WILLIE L. FIELDS III, 0000
SCOTT T. FIKE, 0000
DONALD N. FINLEY, 0000
MICHAEL J. FINNEY, 0000
STEVEN T. FIORINO, 0000
CYNTHIA L. H. FISHER, 0000
JASON FISHER, 0000
JAY R. FISHER, 0000
JEFFREY D. FLEWELLING, 0000
BERNARD FLOWERS, 0000
JETH A. FOGG, 0000
DAVID H. FOGLESONG, 0000
RICHARD P. FOJTIK, 0000
EDWARD L. FORD, 0000
STEPHEN D. FORD, 0000
TEDDY R. FORDYCE II, 0000
GERALD T. FORGETTE, 0000
MARK A. FORINGER, 0000
LANCE N. FORTNEY, 0000
CLAUDIA M. FOSS, 0000
JOHN A. FOURNIER, 0000
STEVEN J. FOURNIER, 0000
MARK E. FRANCK, 0000
STEVEN C. FRANKLIN, 0000
JEFFREY B. FREEMAN, 0000
MICHAEL D. FREESTONE, 0000
ROBERT J. FREY, 0000
KENNETH D. FROLLINI, 0000
JEFFREY L. FRYE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. FURBEE, 0000
WALTER A. GAGAJEWSKI, 0000
CRAIG L. GAGNON, 0000
DAVID A. GAINES, 0000
NATHAN W. GALBREATH, 0000
JAMES C. GALONSKY, 0000
EDWARD W. GANIS JR., 0000
RAUL V. GARCIA, 0000
ROBERT A. GARLAND JR., 0000
JOHN R. GARRETT, 0000
MARK P. GARST, 0000
ERIC S. GARTNER, 0000
ROBERT V. GARZA, 0000
EDWARD R. GEDNEY, 0000
MICHAEL T. GEHRLEIN, 0000
WILLIAM E. GERHARD JR., 0000
JEFFREY J. GERINGER, 0000
COREY L. GERSTEN, 0000
CAROL C. GIACHETTI, 0000
GEOFFREY M. GIBBS, 0000
ROBERT C. GIBSON, 0000
THOMAS C. J. GILKESON, 0000
ANDREW W. GILLESPIE, 0000
FRANK M. GILLESPIE JR., 0000
ERIC J. GILLILAND, 0000
KENNY Y. GILLILAND, 0000
THOMAS C. GILSTER, 0000
STEVEN R. GIOVENELLA, 0000
PETER D. GIUSTI, 0000
ANTHONY L. GIZELBACH, 0000
MICHAEL W. GLACCUM, 0000
KELLY L. GOGGIN, 0000
JOHN D. GOLDEN, 0000
PETER E. GOLDFEIN, 0000
WILLIAM M. GOLLADAY, 0000
KEVIN A. GORDEY, 0000
JANICE Y. GORDON, 0000
CATHERINE M. GORTON, 0000
SCOTT D. GRAHAM, 0000
ERIK L. GRAVES, 0000
DAVID E. GRAY, 0000
GORDON P. GREANEY, 0000
DAVID R. GREEN, 0000
TIMOTHY P. GREEN, 0000
JONATHAN J. GREENE, 0000
CHARLES S. GREENWALD, 0000
MICHAEL R. GREGG, 0000
STANLEY E. GRIFFIS, 0000
LUCIEN A. GRISE, 0000
JOHN F. GROFF, 0000
CHARLES K. GROSSART, 0000
JANET R. GRUNFELDER, 0000
JOHN W. GUETERSLOH, 0000
PAUL R. GUEVIN III, 0000
KEVIN J. GULDEN, 0000
DAVID P. GUNDERSEN, 0000
LARRY E. GUNNIN JR., 0000
STEPHEN E. GURNEY, 0000
MARTIN D. GUSTAFSON, 0000
DAVID M. HAAR, 0000
DAVID A. HAASE, 0000
WILLIAM E. HABEEB, 0000
DOUGLAS I. HAGEN, 0000
JOHN O. HAGEN JR., 0000
STEPHEN A. HAJOSY, 0000
LAWRENCE E. HALBACH, 0000
CALVIN S. HALL II, 0000
MICHAEL J. HALL, 0000
STEPHEN N. HALL, 0000
WESLEY P. HALLMAN, 0000
PAUL S. HAMILTON, 0000
DAVID W. HAMMACK, 0000
DOUGLAS M. HAMMER, 0000
MICHAEL C. HAMMOND JR., 0000
MARK D. HANCOCK, 0000
WILLIAM J. HANIG JR., 0000
FRED HANKERSON III, 0000
ERIK W. HANSEN, 0000
DAVID A. HANSON, 0000
JOEL T. HANSON, 0000
GREGORY E. HARBIN, 0000
SAMUEL M. HARBIN, 0000
JAMES R. HARDEE, 0000
STEVEN B. HARDY, 0000
MICHAEL R. HARMS, 0000
GERALD J. HARPOLE, 0000
MICHAEL HARRINGTON, 0000
PATRICK M. HARRINGTON, 0000
RICKEY O. HARRINGTON, 0000
CHARLES H. HARRIS, 0000
MIKE S. HARRIS, 0000
JOHN M. HARRISON, 0000
RODNEY A. HART, 0000
STEPHEN L. HART, 0000
JERI L. HARVEY, 0000
STEVEN M. HATCHNER, 0000
DAVID A. HAUPT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. HAUTH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. HAWES, 0000
DAVID C. HAYEN, 0000
MARION HEARD, 0000
MARKUS J. HENNEKE, 0000
THEODORE P. HENRICH, 0000
JOSEPH S. HENRIE, 0000
GARY L. HENRY, 0000
MARK L. HEREDIA, 0000
MARTIN R. HERTZ, 0000
JOHN P. HESLIN, 0000
CRAIG J. HESS, 0000
MICHAEL A. HESS, 0000
THOMAS P. HESTERMAN, 0000
DAVID L. HICKEY, 0000
DAVID W. HICKS, 0000
HARLAN K. HIGGINBOTHAM, 0000
THOMAS M. HILDEBRAND, 0000
RANDOLPH C. HILDEBRANDT, 0000
CHARLES W. HILL, 0000
MICHAEL S. HILL, 0000
DAVID W. HILTZ, 0000
CARLETON H. HIRSCHEL, 0000
BRIAN S. HOBBS, 0000
TIMOTHY D. HOGAN, 0000
WAYNE P. HOLDEN, 0000
PAUL E. HOLIFIELD JR., 0000
MICHAEL W. HOLL, 0000
DALE S. HOLLAND, 0000
KENNETH G. HOLLIDAY, 0000
ERIC L. HOLSTROM, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. HOLTON, 0000
JOEL N. HOLTROP, 0000
CRINLEY S. HOOVER, 0000
JAY R. HOPKINS, 0000
RUSSELL H. HOPKINSON, 0000
SHAUN D. HOUSE, 0000
ADRIAN L. HOVIOUS, 0000
RUSSELL D. HOWARD, 0000
TIMOTHY W. HOWARD, 0000
ROBERT R. HOWE, 0000
JAMES L. HUDSON, 0000
DOUGLAS A. HUFFMAN, 0000
MARSHALL A. HUGUES, 0000
DEAN G. HULLINGS, 0000
THAD A. HUNKINS, 0000
CRAIG G. HUNNICUTT, 0000
DAVID R. HUNT JR., 0000
JEFFREY R. HUNT, 0000
JON C. HUNTER, 0000
STEVEN B. HURTEAU, 0000
KEVIN A. HUYCK, 0000
RICHARD A. HYDE II, 0000
DAVID C. IDE, 0000
GRETCHEN LARSEN IDSINGA, 0000
JEFFREY D. IRWIN, 0000
JOHN J. IWANSKI, 0000
KYLE E. JAASMA, 0000
TODD A. JAAX, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. JACKSON, 0000
LINWOOD J. JACKSON JR., 0000
TROY S. JACKSON, 0000
JAMES A. JACOBSON, 0000
IAN CHARLES JANNETTY, 0000
PATRICK M. JEANES, 0000
RHETT W. JEFFERIES, 0000
EVA S. JENKINS, 0000
WILLIAM K. JENKINS, 0000
CARLOS D. JENSEN, 0000
WILLIAM P. JENSEN, 0000
KIRK C. JESTER, 0000
LINDA J. JESTER, 0000
JAMES G. JINNETTE, 0000
CAROL A. JOHNSON, 0000
CLARENCE JOHNSON JR., 0000
JAMES M. JOHNSON, 0000
RICHARD A. JOHNSON, 0000
STEVEN B. JOHNSON, 0000
THOMAS N. JOHNSON, 0000
JOHNNY K. JOHNSTON, 0000
BRIAN S. JONASEN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. JONES, 0000
PHILLIP W. JONES JR., 0000
BRIAN D. JOOS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. JOYCE, 0000
KEITH B. KANE, 0000
STEPHEN J. KARIS, 0000
KIRK S. KARVER, 0000
JANET LYNN KASMER, 0000
JAMES C. KATRENAK, 0000
SCOTT M. KATZ, 0000
SHEILA F. KEANE, 0000
JEFFREY T. KEEF, 0000
JOSEPH C. * KEELON, 0000
ROBERT W. KEIRSTEAD JR., 0000
DAVID E. KELLER, 0000
REBECCA A. KELLER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. KELLY, 0000
MICHAEL J. KELLY, 0000
PATRICK J. KELLY, 0000
ROMAN H. KENT, 0000
DARWIN P. KIBBY, 0000
DOUGLAS W. KIELY, 0000
ERIC D. KILE, 0000
ROBERT KILLEFER III, 0000
KEVIN R. KILLPACK, 0000

KENNETH T. KILMURRAY, 0000
PETER E. KIM, 0000
HANS M. KIMM, 0000
CARL L. KING, 0000
KEVIN B. * KING, 0000
ROSEMARY KING, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E. KINNE, 0000
GUS S. KIRKIKIS, 0000
KELLY A. KIRTS, 0000
JAMES J. KISCH, 0000
DOUGLAS K. KLEIST, 0000
KENNETH J. KNAPP, 0000
JAMES A. KNIGHT, 0000
WILLIAM M. KNIGHT, 0000
TRACY L. KNUEVEN, 0000
DAVID M. KOCH, 0000
SANDRA L. KOERKENMEIER, 0000
JOSEPH KOIZEN, 0000
KATHRYN L. KOLBE, 0000
KURT M. KOLCH, 0000
ANTON G. KOMATZ, 0000
MICHAEL W. KOMETER, 0000
DAVID W. KOONTZ, 0000
JOSEPH H. KOPACZ, 0000
RONALD B. KOPCHIK, 0000
ERIC T. KOUBA, 0000
CHARLES H. KOWITZ, 0000
JAMES N. KRAJEWSKI, 0000
STEVEN KRAVCHIN, 0000
ANTHONY B. KRAWIETZ, 0000
KYLE J. KREMER, 0000
THOMAS R. W. KREUSER, 0000
JEFFREY A. KRUSE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. KUBICK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. KULAS, 0000
GUERMANTES E. LAILARI, 0000
DAVID W. LAIR, 0000
STEPHEN P. LAMBERT, 0000
DOUGLAS K. LAMBERTH, 0000
BRIAN W. LANDRY, 0000
JOSEPH C. LANE, 0000
DAVID M. LANGE, 0000
MARK J. LANGLEY, 0000
DENNIS W. LANGSTON, 0000
JEFFREY W. LANNING, 0000
MICHAEL E. LARAMEE, 0000
MARGARET C. LAREZOS, 0000
ANDRE M. LARKINS, 0000
PHILLIP J. LASALA, 0000
JEFFREY R. LATHROP, 0000
SCOTT C. LATTIMER, 0000
DAVID P. LAVALLEY, 0000
GEORGE B. LAVEZZI JR., 0000
PAUL A. LAVIGNE, 0000
PETER S. LAWHEAD, 0000
TIMOTHY J. LAWRENCE, 0000
EUGENE D. LAYESKI, 0000
ANITA L. LEACH, 0000
JAMES E. LEDBETTER JR., 0000
DAVID J. LEE, 0000
DEAN W. LEE, 0000
JAMES K. LEE, 0000
KEVIN R. LEE, 0000
SANDRA S. LEIKER, 0000
GLENN B. LEMASTERS JR., 0000
LAWRENCE M. LENY, 0000
ROBERT T. LEONARD, 0000
ROBERT M. LEVINSON, 0000
DEBORAH J. LIDDICK, 0000
STEVEN T. LIDDY, 0000
MICHAEL P. LIECHTY, 0000
RONALD K. LIGHT JR., 0000
NATHAN J. LINDSAY JR., 0000
RAY A. LINDSAY, 0000
JOHN T. LINN, 0000
DEWEY G. LITTLE JR., 0000
THOMAS B. LITTLETON, 0000
DAVID L. LOBUE, 0000
VINCENT P. LOGSDON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. LONG, 0000
DAVID S. LONG, 0000
GREGORY P. LONG, 0000
JOSEPH C. LOPERENA, 0000
ADALBERTO LOPEZ JR., 0000
RAYMOND S. LOPEZ, 0000
ROYCE D. LOTT, 0000
ANDREW LOURAKE, 0000
JOSEPH C. LOVATI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. LOWE, 0000
DAVID B. LOWE, 0000
DAVID J. LUCIA, 0000
STEVEN P. LUKE, 0000
JEFFREY S. LUM, 0000
NATHAN G. LYDEN, 0000
THOMAS J. LYGA, 0000
ADAM MACDONALD, 0000
JOHN R. MACDONALD, 0000
STEELE R. MACFARLANE, 0000
RONALD G. MACHOIAN, 0000
KENNETH D. MADURA, 0000
PATRICK J. MAES, 0000
EDWARD A. MAITLAND, 0000
WILLIAM H. MALPASS, 0000
PETER E. MANCE, 0000
WILLIAM J. MANDEVILLE, 0000
MATTHEW A. MANDINA, 0000
GREGORY J. MANG, 0000
MATTHEW E. MANGAN, 0000
JEFFREY J. MANLEY, 0000
JOHN F. MANNEY JR., 0000
SCOTT A. MANNING, 0000
JEFFREY N. MARCOTTE, 0000
JEFFREY L. MARKER, 0000
ROBERT G. MARLAR, 0000
JAMES D. MARRY, 0000
MARK A. MARRY, 0000
LEE H. MARSH JR., 0000
STEVEN C. MARSMAN, 0000
JAVIER MARTI, 0000
HAROLD W. MARTIN III, 0000
PETER J. MARTIN, 0000
ORLANDO M. MARTINEZ, 0000
DAVID B. MARZO, 0000
DAVID M. MASON, 0000
RICHARD L. MASTERS JR., 0000
EDWARD J. MASTERSON, 0000
KEVIN M. MASTERSON, 0000
ROY V. MATHIS, 0000
DANE D. MATTHEW, 0000
PATRICK S. MATTHEWS, 0000
MIKE M. MATTINSON, 0000
DAVID K. MAY, 0000
JONATHAN R. MAY, 0000
AARON D. MAYNARD, 0000
EUGENE J. MAZUR JR., 0000
MAURIZIO MAZZA, 0000
ANDRE MCAFEE, 0000
KEITH D. MCBRIDE, 0000
RACHEL A. MCCAFFREY, 0000
THOMAS D. MCCARTHY, 0000
THOMAS I. * MCCLAIN, 0000
JAMES C. MCCLELLAN, 0000
JAMES M. MCCLESKEY, 0000
KATHY P. MCCONNELL, 0000
JAMES D. MCCREARY, 0000
JOE D. MCDONALD, 0000
JOHN J. MCDONOUGH III, 0000
KRISTINE A. MCGINTY, 0000
CARLTON W. MCGUIRE, 0000
JOSEPH R. * MCKAY, 0000
JOHNNY R. MCKENNEY JR., 0000
MATTHEW A. MCKENZIE, 0000
MARY L. MCKEON, 0000
RICHARD R. MCKINLEY, 0000
CAREY M. MCKINNEY, 0000
LAWRENCE W. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
SCOTT D. MCLEOD, 0000
MICHAEL C. MCMAHON, 0000
GREGORY J. MCNEW, 0000
KURT W. MEIDEL, 0000
BERRAE N. * MEIXSELL JR., 0000
DOUG J. MELANCON, 0000
JAMES C. MERCER, 0000
MARK W. MERCIER, 0000
KENT I. MEREDITH, 0000
KEVIN R. MERTENS, 0000
KAREN R. MERTES, 0000
DEBORAH A. MESERVE, 0000
JEFFERY P. MESERVE, 0000
JEFFREY A. MEYER, 0000
JESSICA MEYERAAN, 0000
MONICA E. MIDGETTE, 0000
JOHN M. MIGYANKO, 0000
QUINTEN L. MIKLOS, 0000
CURTIS S. MILAM, 0000
SHARI T. MILES, 0000
BRYAN E. MILLER, 0000
COLIN R. MILLER, 0000
DANIEL A. MILLER II, 0000
DANIEL J. MILLER JR., 0000
DAVID G. MILLER, 0000
KARLA J. MILLER, 0000
RICHARD C. MILLER, 0000
ROBERT C. MILLER, 0000
CHERYL D. MINTO, 0000
ANDREW MISKOVICH III, 0000
KEVIN J. MISSAR, 0000
JOSEPH C. MITCHELL, 0000
MARK E. MITCHELL, 0000
MAX B. MITCHELL, 0000
MICHAEL E. MITCHELL, 0000
RICHARD L. MITCHELL, 0000
STEPHEN E. MOCZARY, 0000
COLIN R. MOENING, 0000
JOHN J. MOES, 0000
PHILLIP M. MOESSNER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. MOFFETT, 0000
CHARLES M. MONCRIEF, 0000
DENNIS A. MONTERA, 0000
THOMAS P. MONTGOMERY, 0000
AUNDRA L. MOORE, 0000
THOMAS C. MOORE, 0000
TIMOTHY K. MOORE, 0000
RICHARD D. MOOREHEAD, 0000
JOHN W. MOREHEAD, 0000
MICHAEL D. MORELOCK, 0000
DAVE B. MORGAN, 0000
DAVID S. MORK, 0000
RONALD P. MORRELL, 0000
SCOTT A. MORTON, 0000
GREGORY D. MOSS, 0000
JEFFREY A. MOSS, 0000
JOHN C. MOSS, 0000
KARI A. MOSTERT, 0000
KIRK B. MOTT, 0000
TIMOTHY B. MOTT, 0000
PETER G. MOUTSATSON, 0000
TY C. MOYERS, 0000
DAVID G. MUEHLENTHALER, 0000
KAY A. MUNOZ, 0000
DAVID W. MURPHY, 0000
TIMOTHY M. MURTHA, 0000
TONY P. MUSSI, 0000
SERDAR M. MUTLU, 0000
ANTHONY E. MUZEREUS, 0000
KENNETH A. MYERS, 0000
CHARLES D. MYRICK, 0000
DAVID S. NAISBITT, 0000
JOSEPH B. NATTERER, 0000
JOHN R. NEAL, 0000
HOWARD D. NEELEY, 0000
DALE L. NEELY JR., 0000
JAMES R. NEEPER JR., 0000
CLIFTON D. NEES, 0000
JON C. NELSON, 0000
KRISTEN A. NELSON, 0000
SCOTT R. NELSON, 0000
SHAWN D. NELSON, 0000
THOMAS N. NELSON, 0000
STEVEN W. NESSMILLER, 0000
RODNEY S. * NEVILLE, 0000
JOSEPH H. NEWBERRY, 0000
ANDREW T. NIELSEN, 0000
MICHAEL J. NOBLE, 0000
JEFFREY R. NOLAN, 0000
LOUIS J. NOLAN, 0000
RICHARD E. NOLAN, 0000
MICHAEL J. NOLETTE, 0000
CAROL S. NORTHRUP, 0000
JULIE ANN NOTO, 0000
ANTHONY T. NOVELLO, 0000
ADAM E. NYENHUIS, 0000
THOMAS F. * OBOYLE, 0000
JEFFREY G. OLESEN, 0000
ANGEL R. OLIVARES, 0000
JOHN SHERMAN OLIVER, 0000
TODD R. OLIVER, 0000
CHARLES S. OLSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. OMLOR, 0000
DWAYNE J. OPELLA, 0000
HOWARD K. OSBORNE, 0000
EDWIN H. OSHIBA, 0000
RAYMOND B. OTT, 0000
ROGER R. OUELLETTE, 0000
DANIEL J. OURADA, 0000
DAVID M. OUTLAW, 0000
MICHAEL R. OUTLAW, 0000
CHARLES R. OWEN, 0000
ANTHONY M. PACKARD, 0000
BENJAMIN R. PAGANELLI, 0000
CLEVELAND S. PAGE, 0000
JAMES P. PAGE, 0000
RICHARD S. PALMIERI, 0000
LOUIS P. PAOLONE, 0000
AMY A. PAPPAS, 0000
KATHYLEEN M. PARE, 0000
JOHN T. PARK, 0000
VINCENT K. PARK, 0000
BRIAN A. PARKER, 0000
EDWARD L. PARKER JR., 0000
JAMES G. PARKER JR., 0000
TIMOTHY W. PARKER, 0000
KEITH C. PARNELL, 0000
DAVID A. PARR, 0000
LIZA M. PARR, 0000
PATRICIA S. PARRIS, 0000
DALE A. PARSONS, 0000
MARK A. PATTERSON, 0000
SCOTT GEORGE PATTON, 0000
DALE A. PATTYN, 0000
JOHN R. PAYNE, 0000
WILLIAM R. PEARSON, 0000
PAUL J. PEASE, 0000
JAMES D. PECCIA III, 0000
DONALD J. PECK II, 0000
SHAWN D. PEDERSON, 0000
SCOTT D. PEEL, 0000
DONALD R. PENDERGRAFT, 0000
GROVER C. PERDUE, 0000
DOUGLAS W. PERSONS, 0000
MELVIN H. PETERSEN, 0000
RICHARD A. PETERSON JR., 0000
RODNEY J. PETITHOMME, 0000
TODD R. PHINNEY, 0000
TODD L. PHIPPS, 0000
MARC D. PICCOLO, 0000
MICHAEL M. PIERSON, 0000
JO A. PINNEY, 0000
KENNETH PLAKS, 0000
DAVID S. POAGE, 0000
DAVID J. POHLEN, 0000
DAVID E. POLLMILLER, 0000
STEPHEN R. POMEROY, 0000
RICHARD T. POORE JR., 0000
ANTHONY P. POPOVICH, 0000
JOSEPH T. POPOVICH, 0000
ROBERT J. POREMSKI, 0000
WILLIAM S. PORTER JR., 0000
CATHERINE A. POSTON, 0000
MICHAEL W. PRATT, 0000
JOHN E. PRIDEAUX, 0000
GREGORY B. PROTHERO, 0000
ROBERT J. PROVOST, 0000
AARON M. PRUPAS, 0000
JACK D. PULLIS, 0000
WALTER E. PYLES, 0000
TERESA A. QUICK, 0000
RODNEY ALLEN RADCLIFFE, 0000
BRIAN D. RADUENZ, 0000
RICHARD A. RADVANYI, 0000
KURT R. RAFFETTO, 0000
MICHELLE M. RAFFETTO, 0000
ELIOT S. RAMEY, 0000
VICKI J. RAST, 0000
GLENN A. RATCHFORD, 0000
DOUGLAS M. RAUSCH, 0000
RONALD M. RAWLINGS, 0000
DARRELL M. RAYNOR, 0000
CATHERINE A. REARDON, 0000
ALAN F. REBHOLZ, 0000
ROBERT D. REDANZ JR., 0000
MICHAEL E. REDDOCH, 0000
MICHAEL J. REEVES, 0000
THOMAS T. REICHERT, 0000
DAVID E. REIFSCHNEIDER, 0000
KEVIN P. REIGSTAD, 0000
PETER C. RENNER, 0000
DAVID A. REY, 0000
MICHAEL REYNA, 0000
DALE D. REYNOLDS JR., 0000
KEVIN M. RHOADES, 0000

ROBERT S. RICCI, 0000
RANDER RICE, 0000
ETHAN B. RICH, 0000
JOHN C. RICHARD, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C. RICHARDSON, 0000
JAMES D. RICHARDSON, 0000
PAUL RICHARDSON, 0000
RENEE M. RICHARDSON, 0000
LENNY J. RICHOUX, 0000
RUDY L. RIDENBAUGH, 0000
PETER A. RIDILLA, 0000
CURTIS B. RIEDEL, 0000
KEITH B. RIGGLE, 0000
PATRICIA M. RINALDI, 0000
RUBEN RIOS, 0000
RANDOLPH E. RIPLEY, 0000
JAMES E. ROBERTS JR., 0000
MANDIE K. ROBERTS, 0000
NEIL W. ROBINSON JR., 0000
STANLEY K. ROBINSON, 0000
WILLIAM A. ROBINSON JR., 0000
JAMES A. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
RONALD K. ROESEBERG, 0000
ROBERT M. ROGERS, 0000
JOSEPH A. ROH, 0000
LUIS A. ROJAS, 0000
GREGORY E. ROLLINS, 0000
JOSEPH J. ROMERO, 0000
STEPHEN J. ROMOLO, 0000
MICHAEL E. RONZA, 0000
PETER B. ROOHR, 0000
EVA M. ROSADO, 0000
DAVID J. ROSE, 0000
RONALD L. ROSENKRANZ, 0000
GREGORY J. ROSENMERKEL, 0000
SCOTT K. ROSS, 0000
DETLEF H. ROST JR., 0000
DOUGLAS F. ROTH, 0000
RICHARD P. ROTH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E. ROUND, 0000
MICHAEL J. ROWE, 0000
DAVID B. ROWLAND, 0000
THOMAS M. ROY, 0000
KARL M. ROZELSKY, 0000
JAMES M. RUBUSH, 0000
GARY S. RUDMAN, 0000
CHRISTIAN M. RUEFER, 0000
BRIAN C. RUHM, 0000
DANIEL H. RUNKLE, 0000
DANIEL B. RUNYON, 0000
ANDREA K. RUPP, 0000
CHE V. RUSSELL, 0000
ROY C. RUSSELL, 0000
JAMES B. * SACKREITER, 0000
THOMAS G. SADLO, 0000
MARK P. SALANSKY, 0000
JOHN C. SALENTINE, 0000
MATTHEW D. SAMBORA, 0000
MONTAGUE D. SAMUEL, 0000
PABLO A. SANCHEZ, 0000
ELIA P. SANJUME, 0000
THOMAS A. SANTORO JR., 0000
MARK A. SARDELLI, 0000
PETER A. SARTORI, 0000
TIMOTHY D. SARTZ, 0000
TODD M. SASAKI, 0000
JEFFREY A. SATTERFIELD, 0000
JEFFREY A. SAXTON, 0000
DARRYL F. SCARVER, 0000
DOROTHY RUTH SCHANZ, 0000
PAUL E. SCHERER, 0000
JOSEPH H. SCHERRER, 0000
TIMOTHY K. SCHIMMING, 0000
SUSAN B. SCHLACTER, 0000
CONSTANCE E. SCHLAEFER, 0000
MICHAEL J. SCHMIDT, 0000
SUZET SCHREIER, 0000
ROBERT J. SCHUTT, 0000
BERNARD SCHWARTZ, 0000
HEIDI H. T. SCHWENN, 0000
ANNE MARIE SCOTT, 0000
TERRY SCOTT, 0000
DOUGLAS B. SEAGRAVES, 0000
MALINDA K. SEAGRAVES, 0000
JOHN T. SEAMON, 0000
JAMES N. SEAWARD, 0000
ROBERT C. SELEMBO, 0000
MICHAEL A. SEMENOV, 0000
DANIEL M. SEMSEL, 0000
CHAD R. SEVIGNY, 0000
JOSEPH A. SEXTON, 0000
JOHN K. SHAFER, 0000
MILHADO L. SHAFFER III, 0000
RAY A. SHANKLES, 0000
MICHAEL P. SHANNAHAN, 0000
BRETT D. SHARP, 0000
JEFFREY M. SHAW, 0000
JOHN E. SHAW, 0000
WAYNE L. SHAW III, 0000
CHRISTINE J. SHEAROUSE, 0000
PERRY T. SHEAROUSE, 0000
BRYAN H. SHELBURN, 0000
JOHN M. SHEPLEY, 0000
JEFFREY R. SHERK, 0000
GEORGE A. SHERMAN III, 0000
JEREMIAH L. SHETLER, 0000
MICHAEL W. SHIELDS, 0000
FREDERICK R. SHINER, 0000
JAMES R. SHOEMAKER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. SHORT, 0000
JOSEPH F. SIEDLARZ, 0000
LEANNE M. SIEDLARZ, 0000
THOMAS A. SILVIA, 0000
JOSEPH SIMILE JR., 0000
RONALD J. SIMMONS, 0000
WILLIAM T. SINGER, 0000
NAVNIT K. SINGH, 0000
JAMES B. SISLER, 0000
RICHARD A. P. SISON, 0000
JOHN H. SITTON, 0000
MICHAEL L. SLOJKOWSKI, 0000
GREGORY L. SLOVER, 0000
ROBERT L. SLUGA, 0000
THOMAS E. SLUSHER, 0000
KALWANT S. SMAGH, 0000
KENNETH SMALLS, 0000
MARK P. SMEKRUD, 0000
DOUGLAS S. SMELLIE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER AVERY SMITH, 0000
DAVID GILMAN SMITH, 0000
DORRISS E. SMITH, 0000
GEORGE T. SMITH III, 0000
JEFFREY M. SMITH, 0000
KIRK W. SMITH, 0000
RANDELL P. SMITH, 0000
THOMAS J. SMITH, 0000
VERNETT SMITH, 0000
CLARK M. SODERSTEN, 0000
JAMES P. SOLTI, 0000
MAURO D. SONGCUAN JR., 0000
JOHN G. SOPER, 0000
ROBERT L. SOWERS II, 0000
MICHAEL J. SPANGLER, 0000
THOMAS E. SPARACO, 0000
COY R. SPEER, 0000
CALVIN B. SPEIGHT, 0000
RICHARD K. SPILLANE, 0000
ANDREW D. SPIRES, 0000
ERIC K. SPITTLE, 0000
ROBERT A. SPITZNAGEL, 0000
SAMUEL L. SPOONER III, 0000
STEPHEN L. SPURLIN, 0000
RAYMOND W. STAATS, 0000
JEFFREY F. STAHA, 0000
MICHAEL ALLEN * STAHR, 0000
GEORGE L. STAMPER JR., 0000
CARL M. STANDIFER, 0000
ROBERT W. STANLEY II, 0000
MARY A. STARING, 0000
LESLIE SCOTT R. START, 0000
STEVEN H. STATER, 0000
JOHN B. STEELE, 0000
JOHN H. STEELE, 0000
JOHN C. STEINAUER, 0000
CINDY D. STEPHENS, 0000
JAMES R. STEPHENS JR., 0000
JAY C. STEUCK, 0000
ALAN C. STEWART, 0000
DAVID R. STIMAC, 0000
HENRY E. E. STISH, 0000
PATRICK J. STOFFEL, 0000
RODNEY J. STOKES, 0000
JOHN A. STONE, 0000
DOUGLAS C. STORR, 0000
PAUL S. STORY, 0000
ANGELA G. STOUT, 0000
TERI L. STRAIN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. STRATTON, 0000
NELSON R. STURDIVANT, 0000
BRAD M. SULLIVAN, 0000
PATRICK T. SULLIVAN, 0000
WILLIAM C. SUMMERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. SVEHLAK, 0000
PETER F. SVOBODA, 0000
DEVIN P. SWALLOW, 0000
BRUCE A. SWAYNE, 0000
BRYAN E. SWECKER, 0000
JOHN G. SWEENEY, 0000
ROBERT J. SWEET, 0000
VIRGINIA G. SWENTKOFSKE, 0000
JOHN B. SWISHER, 0000
JEFFREY P. SZCZEPANIK, 0000
BRUCE A. TAGG, 0000
MICHAEL F. TARLTON, 0000
KYLE F. TAYLOR, 0000
ROBERT K. TAYLOR, 0000
STEPHEN W. TAYLOR, 0000
TIMOTHY S. TAYLOR, 0000
STEPHANIE M. TEAGUE, 0000
CHESTER M. TEEL, 0000
ALVARO L. TEENEY, 0000
RAYMOND J. TEGTMEYER, 0000
KEITH J. TEISTER, 0000
JOHN M. TENAGLIA, 0000
CURTIS G. TENNEY, 0000
TED M. TENNISON, 0000
MARK D. TERRY, 0000
NEAL A. THAGARD, 0000
DOUGLAS G. THAYER, 0000
ANTHONY J. THOMAS, 0000
WILLIAM C. THOMAS, 0000
RICKY L. THOMPSON, 0000
ROBERT A. THOMPSON, 0000
ANDREW A. THORBURN, 0000
KARI A. THYNE, 0000
DONALD G. * TIMPSON JR., 0000
JEFFREY M. TODD, 0000
NICK TOLIAS, 0000
PATRICK M. TOM, 0000
KEVIN S. TOMB, 0000
KEVIN C. TOMPKINS, 0000
KEITH R. TONNIES, 0000
TIMOTHY K. TOOMEY, 0000
CHARLES F. * TOPLIKAR, 0000
STEPHEN J. TOTH, 0000
ADDISON P. TOWER, 0000
JOEL B. TOWER, 0000
NELSON TOY, 0000
HAI N. TRAN, 0000
GARY S. TRAUTMANN, 0000
SCOTT L. TRAXLER, 0000
MARVIN H. TREU, 0000
MARIO J. TRONCOSO, 0000
HUGH M. TROUT, 0000
THOMAS J. TRUMBULL II, 0000
JOSEPH J. TURK JR., 0000
GREGARY S. TURNER, 0000
LINDA M. TUTKO, 0000
JAMES H. TWEET, 0000
ROBERT K. UEMURA, 0000
KIMBERLY C. ULLMANN, 0000
KEVIN R. UMBAUGH, 0000
MICHAEL R. * UPDIKE, 0000
DANIEL URIBE, 0000
GEORGE A. URIBE, 0000
DAVID J. USELMAN, 0000
PAUL J. VALLEY, 0000
TROY A. VANBEMMELEN, 0000
ROBERT M. VANCE, 0000
RICHARD B. VANHOOK, 0000
MARC C. VANWERT, 0000
JOSEPH L. VARUOLO, 0000
CRISTOS VASILAS, 0000
JOSEPH A. VASILE, 0000
ROBBIN F. VAUGHN, 0000
WADE H. VAUGHT, 0000
LD J. VENDANGE GERA, 0000
DARREN R. VIGEN, 0000
SCOTT D. VILTER, 0000
DEAN C. VITALE, 0000
WILLIAM J. VOGT JR., 0000
KARL W. VONLUHRTE, 0000
JAY C. VOSS, 0000
ROBERT L. WADE JR., 0000
JOHN G. WAGGONER, 0000
GARY F. WAGNER, 0000
JOHN A. WAGNER, 0000
DUNKIN E. WALKER, 0000
RICHARD E. WALLACE, 0000
JASON W. WALLS, 0000
CATHERINE L. WALTER, 0000
KENNETH A. WALTERS, 0000
TODD P. WALTON, 0000
KEVIN D. WARD, 0000
MICHAEL T. WARD, 0000
WALTER H. WARD JR., 0000
GEORGE H. V. WARING, 0000
PETER H. WARNER, 0000
RUSSELL M. WARNER, 0000
TIMOTHY S. WARNER, 0000
CHRISTINA L. WATSON, 0000
DON R. WATSON JR., 0000
JOHN K. WATSON, 0000
RICHARD A. WATSON, 0000
ROBERT O. WATT, 0000
MARK E. WEATHERINGTON, 0000
MICHAEL K. WEBB, 0000
ROBERT E. WEBB, 0000
JERRY A. WEIHE, 0000
JEFFERY D. WEIR, 0000
KATHLEEN A. WELCH, 0000
CAROL P. WELSCH, 0000
NEIL D. WENTZ, 0000
ELIZABETH A. WEST, 0000
OTIS K. WEST, 0000
WILLIAM P. WEST, 0000
BEATRIZ WESTMORELAND, 0000
RALPH D. WESTMORELAND, 0000
JEFFERY C. WHARTON, 0000
JEFFREY M. WHITE, 0000
MICHAEL I. WHITE, 0000
RANDALL L. WHITE, 0000
TIMOTHY M. WHITE, 0000
RONALD J. WHITTLE, 0000
GLEN M. WIGGY, 0000
CRAIG A. WILCOX, 0000
JAMES S. WILDES JR., 0000
JOHN L. WILKERSON, 0000
DAVID R. WILLE, 0000
APRIL Y. WILLIAMS, 0000
CARL J. WILLIAMS, 0000
GREGORY A. WILLIAMS, 0000
GREGORY S. WILLIAMS, 0000
MICHAEL R. WILLIAMS, 0000
NANETTE M. WILLIAMS, 0000
PAUL R. WILLIAMS, 0000
TIMOTHY L. WILLIAMS, 0000
ANTHONY W. WILLIS, 0000
STEWART S. WILLITS, 0000
CRAIG D. WILLS, 0000
CEDRIC N. WILSON, 0000
DARREN E. * WILSON, 0000
GREGORY WILSON, 0000
JOEL L. WILSON, 0000
MARTY E. WILSON, 0000
TIMOTHY D. WILSON, 0000
VAN A. WIMMER JR., 0000
MARTIN G. WINKLER, 0000
DUDLEY C. WIREMAN, 0000
DAVID B. WISE, 0000
DOUGLAS P. WISE, 0000
JAMES H. WISE, 0000
CHARLES F. WISNIEWSKI, 0000
SCOTT J. WITTE, 0000
JULIE A. WITTKOFF, 0000
JOEL L. WITZEL, 0000
TERRANCE J. WOHLFIEL, 0000
JEFFREY S. WOHLFORD, 0000
TERRI S. WOMACK, 0000
DEANNA C. WON, 0000
KEVIN K. Y. WONG, 0000
TIMOTHY S. WOOD, 0000
NEIL E. WOODS, 0000
MICHAEL A. WORMLEY, 0000
NORMAN M. WORTHEN, 0000
DANIEL D. WRIGHT III, 0000
DANIEL M. WUCHENICH, 0000
MARK P. WYROSDICK, 0000
JASON R. XIQUES, 0000
JOSEPH M. YANKOVICH JR., 0000
ANCEL B. YARBROUGH II, 0000

JEFFREY H. L. YEE, 0000
BRIAN B. YOO, 0000
WILLIAM G. YOUNG, 0000
MICHAEL J. YOUNGSON, 0000
LING YUNG, 0000
WILLIAM Z. ZECK, 0000
GREGORY S. ZEHNER, 0000
WILLIAM E. ZERKLE, 0000
MICHAEL P. ZICK, 0000
JAMES D. ZIMMERMAN, 0000
THOMAS ZUPANCICH, 0000
STEVEN R. ZWICKER, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DOUGLAS B ASHBY, 0000
DANNY C BALDWIN, 0000
GORDON JR BENNETT, 0000
DAVID O BROOKS, 0000
JAMES J BROSNAN, 0000
JAMES W III CROCKER, 0000
HAROLD J DABNEY, 0000
STEPHEN J DEMSKI, 0000
IRIS L FOSTERDENIEUWE, 0000
RANDY C FRITZ, 0000
CHARLES R GRIFFIN, 0000
JAMES W GROVE, 0000
CRAIG R HARBOUR, 0000
TIMOTHY C HARMS, 0000
WARD K III JOHNSON, 0000
WILLIAM C LEE, 0000
LONI G LOPUSKI, 0000
JANE A MONVILLEHELTON, 0000
DENNIS R PAYNE, 0000
JAMES J PICANO, 0000
CARL F REBSTOCK, 0000
DANNY K SAKATA, 0000
CHARLES L SCHUMAN, 0000
RANDAL A SCHWALLIE, 0000
GREGORY A SIMPSON, 0000
PAUL R SPARANO, 0000
TIMOTHY H SUGHRUE, 0000
PAUL D TANNER, 0000
TERRY C WASHAM, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CURTIS J ALITZ, 0000
JOHN S ALLERDING, 0000
MICHAEL M BADELLINO, 0000
MICHAEL R BANTON, 0000
JEFFREY M BIKLE, 0000
PEDRO M CARAM, 0000
ANTHONY C CARTER, 0000
SOONJA P CHOI, 0000
DAVID A CIOCHETTY, 0000
IRVING M COHEN, 0000
JOSE C DANCEL, 0000
TERI A DEFFENBAUGH, 0000
JAMES A DIRENNA JR., 0000
GERALD A FEIGIN, 0000
ROBERT C GASTON, 0000
MARTIN S GLORE, 0000
VIRGIL L GRAHAM, 0000
RONALD I GROSS, 0000
HOPE S HACKER, 0000
GULABDAS D HARIYANI, 0000
VIBHA A HONKAN, 0000
JAMES S D HU, 0000
MICHAEL E KELLY, 0000
DANA G KETCHUM, 0000
GEORGINA D KRIZSA, 0000
JOSEPH A LANNI, 0000
BASIL C LEBLANC, 0000
KENNETH D LOCKE, 0000
MIMMS J MABEE, 0000
ANNE T MANCINO, 0000
ALBERT F MAPP, 0000
ROGER G MCINTOSH, 0000
LORENZO D MCKNELLY JR., 0000
RICARDO MERLOS, 0000
IVRI K MESSINGER, 0000
EDWIN A MOORE, 0000
PETER J NAPOLI, 0000
LEANN F NITSCHKE, 0000
JEROME A OLACK, 0000
JOSEPH M PAINTER, 0000
MICHAEL L PEERY, 0000
RONALD J RENUART, 0000
BRUNO E RIOSVELEZ, 0000
SAMUEL M RUBEN, 0000
ALBERT C RUTTINGER, 0000
ALEXANDER A SALILLAS, 0000
FLOYD E SCOTT JR., 0000
DIANE M SIMPSON, 0000
NEIL B SJULSON, 0000
KEVIN A SKINNER, 0000
HAROLD J SLEAVIN, 0000
PATRICK J SULLIVAN, 0000
PAUL W SUTHERLAND JR., 0000
JOHN J SWEENEY III, 0000
PASCAL O UDEKWU, 0000
RAY H VANWYNGARDEN, 0000
FERNANDO L VILLA, 0000
ROCHELLE T WASSERMAN, 0000
MARTIN E WEISSE, 0000
CHARLES E WHALEN, 0000
GARY B WILHELM, 0000
MARSHALL F WILLIS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DEBRA E BURR, 0000
JENNY CABANQUINTANA, 0000
ADELLE A DAIGLEBJERKE, 0000
PAMELA L DALZELL, 0000
LISA M P ECKHOFF, 0000
MAUHEE W EDMONDSON, 0000
JOHANNA L EDWARDS, 0000
DONNA R ELLSWORTH, 0000
KATHY J FABISZEWSKI, 0000
ILEANA FERNANDEZDELGADO, 0000
CATHERINE D GALLAGHER, 0000
PEDRO GARRIDO, 0000
WILLIAM H GAW JR., 0000
LOUISE M GUSZICK, 0000
MARGARET A HAECHERL, 0000
BARBARA HARRIS, 0000
LISA K HERMAN, 0000
RANDY J JENSEN, 0000
ETTA L JOHNSON, 0000
MARY V KAOUGH, 0000
AMELIA E KENNEDY, 0000
WILLIAM P KNIGHT JR., 0000
ALBERT J KROLL, 0000
CHERYL KYLE, 0000
JEANETTE L LONG, 0000
SUSAN P LUZ, 0000
FRED P MILLER, 0000
SUSAN E MILLER, 0000
KARI L NEWMAN, 0000
GEORGIA A ONEAL, 0000
JANIS M RICE, 0000
MAUREEN C ROBLES, 0000
CARMEN S SANTIAGOGUTIERREZ, 0000
DIANNE M SCHMIDTCIMINELLI, 0000
JOHN R SHANNON, 0000
RAYGENIA STEWARTBUDD, 0000
JOHN E SUTTON, 0000
KIMBERLY L SUTTON, 0000
FRANCISCO H TREVINO, 0000
DEBORAH L WATSON, 0000
WILLIAM R WATSON, 0000
JANICE B YOUNG, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LARRY J. DODGEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LIONEL BAKER, 0000
MAUREEN T BALDY, 0000
HOWARD J BARANKER, 0000
KEVIN B CARTER, 0000
ROBERT W CATER, 0000
ROBERT H CINATL, 0000
RALPH P ERGAS, 0000
THOMAS M GILBERT, 0000
ERWIN H GOLDRICH, 0000
TAYLOR H HOOVER, 0000
JOHN P HOWARD, 0000
CRAIG M LINDNER, 0000
DOUGLAS W MCPHERSON, 0000
ROGER K PALMQUIST, 0000
PETER A PATE, 0000
ALVIN W REMBERT, 0000
GEORGE M SOOHOO, 0000
RICHARD T SPURGAS, 0000
JOHN J VONARB, 0000
MARK O WALLER, 0000
PHILLIP G WALTON, 0000
PHILIP C WETTIG, 0000
WARREN S WONG, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5589

To be lieutenant

JOHN A ADCOCK JR., 0000
FREDDIE A AMOS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W ANDERSON, 0000
MICHAEL R ANDERSON, 0000
MICHAEL M ANDREWS, 0000
ROBERT ARIAS, 0000
STEPHEN ASHCROFT, 0000
RONALD M ASTRINO, 0000
AARON S AUSBROOKS, 0000
WILLIAM E BAIN, 0000
WILLIAM W BAKER, 0000
PHILLIP L BALL, 0000
ALLAN B BANKS, 0000
DION M BANKS, 0000
BRIAN M BANOS, 0000
JOHNY R BARNES, 0000
JAMES D BARNETT, 0000
PALMO S BARRERA, 0000
JAMES T BARRETT, 0000
TIMOTHY W BARRY, 0000
JEFFREY S BARTLETT, 0000
KELLY L BAZE, 0000
STEVEN G BEALL, 0000
ALLEN L BEASLEY, 0000
ROBERT E BEATON, 0000
CURTIS R BEERS JR., 0000
ISSAC L BELTON, 0000
CARL H BENTON, 0000
KELLY E BISHOP, 0000
SEAN H BLACK, 0000
RICKY BLAND, 0000
DAVID K BLAUSER, 0000
JOYCE M BOEHLER, 0000
JAMES C BONDS, 0000
NEIL BONNETTE, 0000
KIPP C BOULDIN, 0000
JEFFERY S BOWEN, 0000
JOHN R BOWEN, 0000
JOSEPH T BRADNER III, 0000
JAMES A BREDESEN, 0000
WADE A BREWTON, 0000
JOHN B BRICKNER, 0000
DWIGHT BRISBANE, 0000
SCOTT BROCKMAN, 0000
JEFFREY A BROOKS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E BROUSSARD, 0000
CORNELIUS BROWN, 0000
JAMES E BROWN, 0000
CAROLYN BROWNPATTERSON, 0000
RICKY G BURNETT, 0000
JAMES J BURNETTE, 0000
JAMES A BUTLER, 0000
BRIAN C CANUEL, 0000
ABRAHAM CASTOIRE, 0000
LISA M CAULEY, 0000
REECO D CERESOLA, 0000
NATHANIEL CHANDLER, 0000
ANTHONY J CHILES, 0000
KEVIN D CHISOM, 0000
SHAUN A CHITTICK, 0000
DARRELL L CHRISTENSEN, 0000
MARY L CLARK, 0000
SHAWN L CLARK, 0000
WALTER B CLARK, 0000
DANIEL F CODER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C COFFEY, 0000
LAWRENCE S COLE, 0000
MARK COLVIN, 0000
THOMAS O CONNOLLY, 0000
CLARENCE E COOK, 0000
JAMES C COOK, 0000
EDWIN B COPELAND, 0000
MARK A CORREA, 0000
MANUEL A CORTES, 0000
BRUCE A COUCH, 0000
TODD M COX, 0000
JAMES R CROWE JR., 0000
PAUL A CSAPO, 0000
DAVID J CUMMINGS, 0000
DAVID W CUTHBERT, 0000
ERIC L DAVIDSON, 0000
MICHAEL S DAVIS, 0000
TRAVIS E DAVIS, 0000
STEVEN A DEAN, 0000
SALVATORE M DENTU, 0000
KIRK A DEVEZIN, 0000
ANTHONY DIAZ, 0000
ERICA DOBBS, 0000
REGINALD K DOBBS, 0000
JOSEPH E DOLSAK, 0000
RUBEN H DOMDOM, 0000
RICHARD W DONALDSON, 0000
WILLIAM E DONALS JR., 0000
GARY R DONLEY JR., 0000
PAUL S DORRIS, 0000
ROBERT E DUCOTE, 0000
JEFFERY N DUGARD, 0000
STEVEN J DWYER, 0000
JEFFREY H ECCLESTON, 0000
JONATHAN B EDWARDS, 0000
RICARDO G ENRIQUEZ, 0000
KURT E ERICKSON, 0000
STEPHEN A ERICKSON, 0000
MEL S ESTADILLA, 0000
DAVID F ETHERIDGE, 0000
DEMETRICE ETHERIDGE, 0000
HUGH S EVANS JR., 0000
MICHAEL S EVANS, 0000
THOMAS J EWER, 0000
BRENT A FALLA, 0000
CASSIUS A FARRELL, 0000
VICTOR M FEAL JR., 0000
DOROTHY A FENTON, 0000
NORA A FILOS, 0000
ERIC B FINNEY, 0000
DANIEL K FISHER, 0000
JAMES F FLINT, 0000
STEPHEN A FOLSOM, 0000
NICHOLAS E FORD, 0000
JOHN J FORTINO, 0000
DUANE R FOSTER, 0000
LANCE C FOSTER, 0000
DAVID N FOWLER, 0000
DONALD E FRANDSEN, 0000
TONY FREDRICK, 0000
THOMAS R FRIDLEY JR., 0000
KEVIN L FRIEDLY, 0000
JEFFERY S FULSON, 0000
RICHARD W GAINES, 0000
MICHAEL R GARCIA, 0000
DEAN A GAYLE, 0000
TROY S GIGER, 0000
STEVEN D GILBERT, 0000
STEPHEN E GILL, 0000
BRIAN T GIMBEL, 0000
ROUSSELL A GOBER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J GOELZE, 0000
RONALD C GORBY, 0000
JOHNNY L GRAVES, 0000
JEFFREY E GREEN, 0000
SEAN M GREENAWAY, 0000

DENNIS O GREER, 0000
ALEX W GRIFFEN, 0000
JESUSMARTIN C GUASCH, 0000
KEVIN L HACKETT, 0000
KEITH D HAINES, 0000
ROBERT L HAINLINE JR., 0000
CURTIS W HALL, 0000
SHELDON K HAM, 0000
VINCENT R HAMILTON, 0000
STEPHEN L HANEY, 0000
SCOTT T HANKINSON, 0000
JAMES J HARKIN, 0000
RONNIE C HARPER JR., 0000
ERIC J HARRINGTON, 0000
MARVIN D HARRIS, 0000
TIMOTHY M HARRISON, 0000
PATRICIA A HART, 0000
ROBERT J HAUCK, 0000
DANA L HEIDENESCHER, 0000
JAY A HELVIG, 0000
WILLIAM HENDERSHOT, 0000
GORDON C HENDERSON, 0000
ROY L HENKLE, 0000
SEAN K HENRY, 0000
HOWARD HERRING III, 0000
JOHN D HICKMAN, 0000
JACOB R HILL, 0000
NICHOLAS W HILL, 0000
OSVALDO HINOJOS, 0000
GARY L HOAR, 0000
RAY D HOBBS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER HODGES, 0000
DENNIS L HODGSON, 0000
MICHAEL S HOERR, 0000
WESLEY J HOLLAND, 0000
ERIC T HOLLIS, 0000
KERRI L HOLM, 0000
DAVID J HOOPLE, 0000
JAMES T HOPKINS, 0000
HUBERT D HOSKINS, 0000
GARY W HOUZE, 0000
JESSE HUBBART, 0000
DEREK S HUGGINS, 0000
JAMES A HUNT, 0000
COREY D HURD, 0000
STEVEN R IRVINE, 0000
RAY A JACKSON, 0000
STEVEN B JAMES, 0000
NOMER F JAVIER, 0000
MICHAEL J JENO, 0000
RALPH L JOHNSON, 0000
HAROLD W JONES, 0000
JEFFREY G JORDAN, 0000
THOMAS E JOYNER, 0000
JASON V JULAO, 0000
JAMES D KALISTA, 0000
EMILY E KANE, 0000
MARK J KAUL, 0000
PATRICK M KELLY, 0000
KEVIN J KENNEDY, 0000
CHRIS M KNIGHT, 0000
FRANK KOLB, 0000
GEORGE S KOONS, 0000
ANGELA K KOSKO, 0000
ANTHONY F KOSLOSKI, 0000
MICHAEL J KRZYMINSKI, 0000
VINCENT E KUBICSKO, 0000
JOHN J LALLI, 0000
ROY A LAMONT, 0000
BRION G LANGLEY, 0000
THOMAS E LAVIN, 0000
JOHN R LEAMAN, 0000
STEPHEN S LEGG, 0000
ROBERT L LESHER, 0000
DONNIE W LEWIS, 0000
WILLIAM A LEWIS, 0000
WILLIAM G LEWIS, 0000
BRYAN K LOGAN, 0000
LEONARD J LONG, 0000
CALVIN LOPER, 0000
MITCHELL D LOTT, 0000
RICHARD LOZADANEGRON, 0000
DERBY C LUCKIE, 0000
ROBERT A LUTZ, 0000
JAMES W MACISAAC, 0000
DAVID T MAGEE, 0000
ERROL K MANDRELL, 0000
THOMAS G MAROUSEK, 0000
MICHAEL A MARTIN, 0000
TIMOTHY E MARTIN, 0000
OMAR G MARTINEZ, 0000
AUSTIN B MATTHEWS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S MAYFIELD, 0000
CHRISTOPHER C MCCARTER, 0000
JAMES D MCCARTNEY, 0000
DAVID M MCCARTY, 0000
MICHAEL L MCDONOUGH, 0000
KELVIN B MCGHEE, 0000
MICHAEL S MCGREGOR, 0000
JAMES B MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
ROBERT D MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
LAWRENCE B MCLIN, 0000
SAMUELA L MCMOORE, 0000
VONCILE C MCQUEEN, 0000
TROY A MCQUEENEY, 0000
MICHAEL A MEADS, 0000
KENNETH V MEAGHER, 0000
STEVE R MICHAUD, 0000
JEFFREY D MILLER, 0000
DAVID B MITCHELL, 0000
GEORGE I MOORE, 0000
JOHN D MOORE, 0000
SCOTT A MOORE, 0000
MICHAEL A MORAN, 0000
ROSALIND D MORRISON, 0000
ANDRE D NEAL, 0000
DAVID L NICHOLS, 0000
MICHAEL J NICKELS, 0000
EUGENE E NORVELL, 0000
TODD M OAKES, 0000
THOMAS OBER, 0000
MICHAEL J ODOM, 0000
LESLIE A OHARA, 0000
DAVID OLAH, 0000
STEPHEN J OPALENIK, 0000
JOSEPH A OROSCO, 0000
VINCENT A ORTEGA, 0000
ENRIQUE ORTIGUERRA, 0000
PAUL R OUELLETTE, 0000
JEFFREY T OWENS, 0000
TERESA R OWENS, 0000
MARK A PABON, 0000
ANDREW J PAIGE, 0000
FRANCISCO PANGILINAN, 0000
WILLIAM P PARKS, 0000
JASON B PARMLEY, 0000
TERRANCE J PATTERSON, 0000
BRIAN L PAVONE, 0000
ALBIN T PEARSON, 0000
LAWRENCE J PENN, 0000
TIMOTHY H PHENICIE, 0000
JOHN E PHILLIPS, 0000
ANDREW PICKENS, 0000
PATRICK E PIERSON, 0000
RODOLFO A PINERO, 0000
DARRIN P PITRE, 0000
DARRYL B PITTMAN, 0000
ROBERT D PIZZINI, 0000
RICHARD D POLSTON, 0000
STEPHAN H POMEROY, 0000
DWAYNE J PORTER, 0000
ALBERTO M POSIS, 0000
LAFE A POTTALA, 0000
ANDREW J POTTS, 0000
DAVID J PREUSS, 0000
RONALD L PUGH, 0000
ROCKY B PULLEY, 0000
BRYAN C QUINN, 0000
WILLIAM T RAEBER, 0000
DAVID S RAMIREZ, 0000
ORLANDO RAMOS, 0000
JAMES W RAYCRAFT, 0000
BRIAN C REDNOUR, 0000
LAWRENCE M REPASS, 0000
JAMES R RHODES, 0000
TIMOTHY D RICHARDSON, 0000
TRACY D RIDER, 0000
RHONDA RIGGS, 0000
MARTIN S RILEY, 0000
DAVID R RITTER, 0000
MICHELLE M RIZER, 0000
JAMES W ROBB, 0000
TIMOTHY M ROBINSON, 0000
DAVID H RODRIGUES, 0000
REGINA P ROGERS, 0000
LARRY A ROSENTHAL, 0000
ERIC T RUIZ, 0000
SHAWN T RUMBLEY, 0000
STEPHEN L RUSSO, 0000
WESLEY S SANDERS, 0000
ROBERT A SANTE, 0000
JAMES G SCALZO, 0000
GARY M SCHOENFELD, 0000
CARL F SCHOLLE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER SCHREINER, 0000
STEVEN J SCHULTZ, 0000
BRUCE SCOTT, 0000
DEREK G SCOTT, 0000
LESLIE C SCOTT, 0000
MICHAEL A SCOTT, 0000
SAMUEL F SCRUGGS, 0000
ALBERT SEARS, 0000
HAROLD A SEXTON, 0000
JOSEPH A SHAW, 0000
CRAIG V SHILLINGER, 0000
BRIAN M SILVERSTEIN, 0000
FREDRICK J SIMAYTIS, 0000
JERRY L SIMPSON, 0000
RICHARD A SINGER, 0000
WESLEY V SKIBO, 0000
GARY E SMART, 0000
MARK A SMIGELSKI, 0000
WILLIAM L SMILEY, 0000
ALMOND SMITH III, 0000
CHARLES A SMITH JR., 0000
CRAIG D SMITH, 0000
DAVID C SMITH, 0000
KENNETH R SMITH, 0000
JOHN D SNELGROVE, 0000
MICHAEL G SNYDER, 0000
RICKEY L SOWARDS, 0000
WILLIAM M SPENCE III, 0000
CHARLES C SPERRY, 0000
RICHARD A STANFIELD, 0000
MARK D STANLEY, 0000
NORMAND O STCYR, 0000
THEODORE E STEPHENSON JR., 0000
JOHN S STEVENS, 0000
CHARLES G STORME, 0000
BRIAN C STOUGH, 0000
FOSTER L STRINGER, 0000
MARK E STRONG, 0000
RAYMOND SUDDUTH, 0000
PAUL L SULLIVAN, 0000
PERRY A SUMMERS, 0000
CHARLES M TAYLOR, 0000
DWIGHT A TAYLOR, 0000
DWIGHT D TAYLOR, 0000
RITCHIE L TAYLOR, 0000
ROGER W TAYLOR, 0000
DIANA J TERSAK, 0000
JOHN F TEVIS, 0000
MICHAEL P THERRIEN, 0000
GARY R THIELECKE, 0000
HAROLD G THOMAS, 0000
DUANE V THOMPSON, 0000
KIMBERLY THORNHILL, 0000
RICHARD A THOUSAND, 0000
SCOTT A THRASHER, 0000
KARL W THURLOW, 0000
STEPHEN C TIPTON, 0000
DELBERT D TONEY, 0000
ROBERT M TOTH, 0000
ALFONSO TUNDIDOR JR., 0000
ADRIAN D TURNER, 0000
ANGIE D VANDYKE, 0000
KEVIN M WADE, 0000
CLINT J WAGGONER, 0000
JOHN G WALLACE, 0000
DERRYK E WALTERMAN, 0000
STEPHEN R WANGELIN, 0000
MICHAEL WASHINGTON, 0000
JAMES M WASTART, 0000
WYATT T WATERS, 0000
HOWARD D WATT, 0000
LENWARD D WEAVER, 0000
GARY N WEBB, 0000
MICHAEL A WELZ, 0000
JAMES A WESTERMEYER, 0000
TREVOR B WHALEY, 0000
WILLIAM E WILKEN, 0000
JAMES L WILLETT, 0000
MONTE L WILLEY, 0000
KENNETH J WILLIAMS, 0000
THOMAS M WILLIAMS, 0000
BRIAN O WILSON, 0000
DONALD V WILSON, 0000
WILLIAM R WOODFIN, 0000
BOBBY L WOODS, 0000
DAVID E WRIGHT, 0000
TRAMPAS B WRIGHT, 0000
ALONZO WYNN, 0000
COLIN D XANDER, 0000
JOEL A YATES, 0000
JOSEPH ZULIANI, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL E. SULLIVAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) NANCY E. BROWN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DONALD K. BULLARD, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ALBERT M. CALLAND III, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT T. CONWAY JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN J. DONNELLY, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) BRUCE B. ENGELHARDT, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES S. HAMILTON II, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN C. HARVEY JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) CARLTON B. JEWETT, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD J. MAULDIN, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW G. MOFFIT, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL P. NOWAKOWSKI, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) HAROLD D. STARLING II, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES STAVRIDIS, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL C. TRACY, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN J. WAICKWICZ, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ANTHONY L. WINNS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL C BECKETTE, 0000
DALE D BIGHAM, 0000
EDWARD A BRAY, 0000
MICHAEL J BRONS, 0000
CHARLES K CARL, 0000
GREGORY D CLECKLER, 0000
JOSEPH W COLEMAN, 0000
JOHN L CROGHAN, 0000
WARREN E CUPPS, 0000
DAVID W DRY, 0000
GRANT A DUNN, 0000
SETH A EVANS, 0000
GEORGE A FLOYD, 0000
JOHN P FRIEDMAN, 0000
ROBERT S HALDEMAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER H INSKEEP, 0000
KEVIN D JOHNSON, 0000
JACKIE L KILLMAN, 0000
NEIL A KOPROWSKI, 0000
LEOPOLD D KREISEL, 0000
MICHAEL D LUCKETT, 0000
DEAN S LYONS, 0000
SAMUEL R MOSER, 0000
MICHAEL J PELLERITO, 0000
MATTHEW F PHELPS, 0000
ROBERT D SANDERS, 0000
ROBIN S SMITH, 0000
DONALD I TENNEY, 0000
ROBERT S THOMPSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

To be captain

JAMES C TAYLOR, 0000

To be commander

DAVID G ADAMS, 0000
ARNOLD O BROWN, 0000
JOHN C EDGERLY, 0000
KYLE F KAKER, 0000
STEVEN A KREISER, 0000
JOHN A MAKSYM, 0000
JOHN J MARSHALL, 0000
KEVIN R PETERSON, 0000
SCOTT R REICHARD, 0000
THOMAS P ROSDAHL, 0000

To be lieutenant commander

PAUL T ANTONY, 0000
MARK E BURCHER, 0000
CRAIG S COLEMAN, 0000
DONALD C EBY, 0000
GLENN J ESTRADA, 0000
STEVEN E GABELE, 0000
JACOB C HINZ, 0000
THOMAS A JONES, 0000
ANGELA M KEITH, 0000
GRAINGER LANNEAU, 0000
CHARLES H MAHER, 0000
ELIZABETH A MALEY, 0000
JEFFREY C OHMAN, 0000
DAN K PATTERSON, 0000
SCOTT F ROBERTSON, 0000
MARK W SCHADT, 0000

To be lieutenant

KERRY L ABRAMSON, 0000
STACEY F ACRI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T ALEXANDER, 0000
JAMES ALGER, 0000
JEFFREY P AMES, 0000
MICHAEL J AMIS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D ANDERSON, 0000
ERIC W ANDERSON, 0000
JOSEPH A ANDRADE, 0000
BENJAMIN M ANDREW, 0000
SYLVIA M ANDREWS, 0000
JOHN M ARMSTRONG, 0000
JOHN B ARNAUD, 0000
DANIEL R ARNDT, 0000
EDWARD B ARNOLD, 0000
AARON M AUGER, 0000
SPENCER P AUSTIN, 0000
JULIA G AYRES, 0000
DAVID J BACHAND, 0000
DAVID J BACON, 0000
TAUSEEF A BADAR, 0000
SCOTT P BAILEY, 0000
MARK D BAKER, 0000
WILLIAM A BAKER, 0000
THOMAS C BALL, 0000
NOAH S BELLRINGER, 0000
DAVID A BENHAM, 0000
PAUL R BENISHEK, 0000
ROBERT H BERNARDWORT, 0000
RYAN K BETTON, 0000
MARY L BIEGNER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M BIGGS, 0000
JOHN F BISCHOF, 0000
DERRICK E BLACKSTON, 0000
PATRICK C BLAKE, 0000
JUSTIN J BLIFFEN, 0000
JOHN A BLOCKER, 0000
THOMAS T BODINE, 0000
PETER L BORLAND, 0000
DAVID P BOURQUE, 0000
OSCAR E BOWLIN, 0000
THERESA L BOYER, 0000
BENJAMIN C BRACKETT, 0000
JASON E BRAGG, 0000
LISA A BRAUN, 0000
DAVID B BRENNER, 0000
JOHANNA M BRENNER, 0000
MATTHEW J BRICKEY, 0000
KENDALL G BRIDGEWATER, 0000
RAYMOND M BRISTOL, 0000
CYNTHIA J BRITTINGHAM, 0000
MARK J BROPHY, 0000
HOWARD M BRYANT, 0000
MARK R BRZEZINSKI, 0000
ROBERT L BURGESS, 0000
KENNETH E BUTLER, 0000
LEWIS W CALLAWAY, 0000
MICHAEL S CARL, 0000
TODD D CARROLL, 0000
JAMES K CARVER, 0000
DAVID J CASTEEL, 0000
BRIAN J CEPAITIS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A CESA, 0000
DEWON M CHANEY, 0000
JONATHAN S CHANNELL, 0000
SCOTT M CHIEREPKO, 0000
CONNER W CHILDERS, 0000
PETER C CLEMOW, 0000
KIRK E COCO, 0000
DONOVAN P COFFEY, 0000
BRIAN D CONWAY, 0000
DAVID B COOK, 0000
JIMY R COOK JR., 0000
THOMAS T COOK, 0000
PETER O COPELAND, 0000
ADAN J COVARRUBIAS, 0000
TINA M COX, 0000
THOMAS E CRONLEY, 0000
MATTHEW A CRUMP, 0000
JOSE CRUZ JR., 0000
GWENDELLA C CUNNING, 0000
JOHN D CZOHARA, 0000
DAVID F DAUSEN, 0000
ELISABETH I DAVIS, 0000
JONATHAN A DEINARD, 0000
ADAM C DEJESUS, 0000
ROBERT C DETOLVE, 0000
STEVEN A DILIBERTO, 0000
DARYL M DODD, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J DOMENCIC, 0000
STEVEN L DORMAN, 0000
CHARLES W DUNPHY JR., 0000
STEVEN M DUPONT, 0000
MICHAEL E EATOUGH, 0000
ERICK L EDWARDS, 0000
WALTER B EGGE IV, 0000
JORDAN B EICHELBAUM, 0000
JAMES A ELLIS, 0000
MATTHEW R ELLIS, 0000
SCOTT H ELROD, 0000
TIMOTHY J EMERICK, 0000
BRIAN C EMME, 0000
RICARDO A ESCALANTE, 0000
LAURIN N ESKRIDGE, 0000
JACQUEINE M ETHERIDGE, 0000
ANTHONY FACCHINELLO, 0000
MICHAEL L FARMER, 0000
ANTHONY V FARRUGIA, 0000
JOSEPH V FEMENIA, 0000
PETER R FEY, 0000
PATRICK J FITZPATRICK, 0000
ROBERT R FLUCK, 0000
CRAIG S FRANGENTE, 0000
MARK E FRANZEN, 0000
SABRINA G FREGLY, 0000
FLEMING L FRENCH, 0000
KENNETH J FROBERG, 0000
DAVID D FURRY, 0000
MANUEL E GANUZA, 0000
ANTHONY M GARRETT, 0000
HELY S GONZALEZ, 0000
LA H A GRAHAM, 0000
DAVID C GRATTAN, 0000
BRIAN W GRAVES, 0000
DOUGLAS T GRAY, 0000
RICHARD C GREEN, 0000
SHANE M GROSS, 0000
JASON S GROVER, 0000
BRIAN C GUISE, 0000
JASON S HALL, 0000
KAZUNORI S HASHIGAMI, 0000
THOMAS H HEALY, 0000
MICHAEL P HEFFERNAN, 0000
MICHELE J HENRY, 0000
MANUEL A HERNANDEZ, 0000
DAVID L HICKEY, 0000
RYAN D HILL JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER I HOAG, 0000
KENNETH E HODGES, 0000
ANDREW A HOEKSTRA, 0000
JOSEPH G HOELZ, 0000
RONALD HOJNOWSKI, 0000
KENNETH L HOPKINS, 0000
JAMIE L HORNING, 0000
DANNY H HOUGLAN, 0000
JAMES B HOWELL, 0000
JOHN D HUDSON, 0000
JOHN C HUGHES, 0000
ABIGAIL A HUTCHINS, 0000
KENNETH J IAN, 0000
RICHARD J ISAAK, 0000
HELEN H JACKSON, 0000
JAMES P JEROME, 0000
HARRY JURICIC, 0000
ADAM S KANTOR, 0000
BRIAN A KAROSICH, 0000
BENJAMIN F KAVANAGH, 0000
SEBASTIAN J KIELPINSKI, 0000
JEREMY M KILDAY, 0000
JEFFREY A KJENAAS, 0000
KEVIN KLEIN, 0000
SEAN P KNIGHT, 0000
EMILY J KOCHEANASH, 0000
SVEN KRAUSS, 0000
ERIC C KRUEGER, 0000
WILLIAM F KUEBLER, 0000
THEOPHIL A KUSH, 0000
KATHRYN J LACHER, 0000
ERIC D LACROSS, 0000
RUTH A LANE, 0000
SHANE A LANSFORD, 0000
JEFFERY T LAUBAUGH, 0000
THOMAS F LEARY, 0000
WARREN R LEBEAU, 0000
JAMES A LECOUNTE, 0000
DAVID C LEIKER, 0000
JON S LEISNER, 0000
PHILLIP M LEMONDS, 0000
FREDERICK L LENTZ II, 0000
SHANE M LESTEBERG, 0000
MICHAEL G LEVENDOFSKE, 0000
YANFENG LI, 0000
ERIC D LINDGREN, 0000
DEAN M LINER, 0000
DEWEY A LOPES, 0000
TIMOTHY LOTT, 0000
MICHAEL J LUKEN, 0000
LAURO LUNA, 0000
WILLIAM T LUTGEN JR., 0000
PATRICIA A MARSHALL, 0000
KARI L MARTIN, 0000
WALTER B MASSENBURG JR., 0000
JOSEPH C MCALEXANDER, 0000
KEVIN J MCCRAE, 0000
GRADY S MCDONALD, 0000
SUSAN M MCGARVEY, 0000
ROBERT A MCGILL, 0000
THOMAS S MCGOWAN, 0000
MARK L MCGUCKIN, 0000
DOUGLAS W MCINTOSH, 0000
MICAJAH T MCLENDON III, 0000
JONATHAN M MCLEOD, 0000
RACHELLE MCPHERSON, 0000
HOWARD V MEEHAN, 0000
WILLIAM A MEYERS JR., 0000
KEITH L MICHON, 0000
MARK A MIDDLETON, 0000
MAX F MILLER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J MITCHELL, 0000
DANIEL J MONLUX, 0000
STEPHANY L MOORE, 0000
JAMES B MORFITT, 0000
DANIEL J MOSIYCHUK, 0000
JUAN F MULLEN, 0000
SAMANTHA S MURPHY, 0000
JASON M NAIDYHORSKI, 0000
ERIK R NALEY, 0000
BRADLEY R NALITT, 0000
ERLINA P NAVAL, 0000
MICHAEL J NAVARRE, 0000
VICTOR D OLIVER, 0000
ERIC J OSTERHUES, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J PACENTRILLI, 0000
PETRA PAGAN, 0000
WINSOME F PANTON, 0000
PHILIP L PARMLEY, 0000
JACOB R PARSONS, 0000
JASON A PATACSIL, 0000
WILLIAM G PERDUE, 0000
RAFAEL PEREZ JR., 0000
ALBERT D PERRY, 0000
RON PERRY, 0000
WAYNE J PETE, 0000
JOSHUA H PETERSON, 0000
ANDREA K PICONE, 0000
STEPHEN C PLEW, 0000
MARCUS R POLSON, 0000
DAVID L PORTER, 0000
CASEY J POWERS, 0000
JASON S PREISS, 0000
DANIEL E PRICE JR., 0000
ANTHONY W PRIDEMORE, 0000
KEVIN G QUINN, 0000
DEIDRA M RADEL, 0000
JOSEPH E REAUME, 0000
HEIKE K RENTMEISTERBRYANT, 0000
ROBERT R RICHARDSON, 0000
JUAN C RIVERA, 0000
MICHAEL A ROCHARD, 0000
KURT L ROHLMEIER, 0000
EDWARD B ROHRBACH, 0000
ANDRE N ROWE, 0000
DAVID M ROZZELL, 0000
PAUL S RUBEN, 0000
KENNETH A RUSSELL, 0000
GARY A RYALS, 0000
JOSE A SANCHEZ, 0000
JOSEPH M SANCHEZ, 0000
BRIAN D SANDERSON, 0000
ROLAND T SASAKI, 0000
DANIEL G SCHLAFF, 0000
JACOB D SCHMITTER, 0000
NICHOLAS D SCHNAUFER, 0000
SCOTT C SCHULZ, 0000
STEPHEN P SCHWEDHELM, 0000
DAVID A SCHWIND, 0000
ROSS A SCOTT, 0000
MICHAEL J SCULLY, 0000
SHIHO A SEFTON, 0000
MARK D SENSANO, 0000
GENE G SEVERTSON II, 0000
CHRISTIAN M SEWELL, 0000
KEITH A SHANKS, 0000
AARON F SHOEMAKER, 0000
PETER M SHOEMAKER, 0000
ANDREW J SHULMAN, 0000
AARON B SIKES, 0000
JONATHAN S SIMPSON, 0000
JOSEPH E SISSON, 0000
CHARLES P SMITH, 0000
REBECCA S SNYDER, 0000
JOSEPH B SORRELL, 0000
GLENN A SOUTHERN, 0000
JOSEPH M SRODA, 0000
MARK B STEFANIK, 0000
MATTHEW A STEVENSON, 0000
RYAN M STODDARD, 0000
ADAM H STONE, 0000
JASON STRACQUALURSI, 0000
DOROTHY J TAMEZ, 0000
ELIZABETH M TANNER, 0000
SHANE P TANNER, 0000
MATTHEW L TARDY, 0000
MARK W TERRELL, 0000
TRACEY M TOBIAS, 0000
GLENN R TODD, 0000
THOMAS A TODD, 0000
SCOTT P TOMPKINS, 0000
WILLIAM H TROUTMAN, 0000
BRADLEY D TRUESDELL, 0000
DAVID M TULLY, 0000
BRADY W TURNAGE, 0000
SCOTT A TYSON, 0000
MARLIES C URBAN, 0000
MICHAEL T VALENZUELA, 0000
ANN M VALLANDINGHAM, 0000
JEFFREY J VALLINA, 0000
JUSTIN M VERVILLE, 0000
DEREK A VESTAL, 0000
JONATHAN L VIELEY, 0000
JOHN E VOLK, 0000
DAVID M VONHOENE, 0000
JONATHAN G VOORHEIS, 0000
TIMOTHY A WALLACE, 0000
ANTHONY W WALLEY, 0000

SIMONE R WALSTON, 0000
LINNA R WALZ, 0000
SHERRY W WANGWHITE, 0000
KENNETH P WARD, 0000
MARK A WARD, 0000
HOWARD A WARREN, 0000
ROSS W WEILAND, 0000
IAN S WEXLER, 0000
KEVIN S WHISMAN, 0000
NATHAN D WHITE, 0000
ARCELIA WICKER, 0000
SUSANNE M WIENRICH, 0000
PAUL F WILEY, 0000
ANTHONY S WILLIAMS, 0000
ENNIS E WILLIAMS, 0000
RALPH L WILLOUGHBY JR., 0000
WILLIAM E WINDUS, 0000
ERIC M WITHERELL, 0000
DONNA I YACOVONI, 0000
KEVIN D YUSMAN, 0000

To be lieutenant junior grade

RODNEY O ADAMS, 0000
ADAM L ALBARADO, 0000
GEORGE E ALEXANDER, 0000
THOMAS R ALLEN, 0000
BRYAN P BARRY, 0000
LUIS A BENCOMO, 0000
JOSEPHINE F BERNABE, 0000
DANIEL L BESSMAN, 0000
ROBERT L BETTS, 0000
JASON L BIRCH, 0000
DOUGLAS B BOOHER, 0000
MICHAEL J BREAUX, 0000
DONALD L BRITTON, 0000
COREY R BROGNA, 0000
TERRY L BUCKMAN, 0000
GARY L BUXTON, 0000
DAVID I COLON, 0000
MICHAEL A CORRIGAN, 0000
ERIC S CRAFT, 0000
KIM M DACOSTA, 0000
JAMIE B DAVIDSON, 0000
TISH M DAVIS, 0000
ANDRES DIAZ, 0000
ANDREW J DONADIO, 0000
MICHELLE D DONADIO, 0000
ANTHONY C DUYNSTEE, 0000
TENISHA M FINLEY, 0000
VAN R FITZSIMMONS, 0000
JODIE R FORBES, 0000
ADAM H FOX, 0000
DONALD M FREEMAN, 0000
JOSHUA A FREY, 0000
JEFFREY T FREYE, 0000
BRADFORD R GILROY, 0000
TERRENCE D GLASGOW, 0000
KYLE L GUILFOYLE, 0000
ANDREW B HALL, 0000
TOD A HAZLETT, 0000
JESSICA L HERMAN, 0000
ANDREW J HOFFMAN, 0000
PHILLIP C HOLMGREN, 0000
DELMY M HORMAN, 0000
BRIAN E JONES, 0000
JOHN M JONES JR., 0000
MICHAEL J KAUPPERT, 0000
DOUGLAS W LEAVENGOOD, 0000
RICK W LENTZ, 0000
ANDREW L LITTERAL, 0000
MATTHEW D LOVERINK, 0000
DANIELLE M LUKICH, 0000
JAMES I MAIZE, 0000
DARIN E MARVIN, 0000
SEAN MATHIESON, 0000
ANTONIO MAURO, 0000
JOHN P MCCORMICK, 0000
KARA R MCDIVITT, 0000
MATTHEW M MICHALOWICZ, 0000
AARON J MUELLER, 0000
PATRICK S MYER, 0000
PATRICK S MYRICK, 0000
PATRICK J NEWBROUGH, 0000
CHRISTOPHER ODONNELL, 0000
ROBERT S OLIVER, 0000
HAMPTON W PARRISH, 0000
ROBERT R PATTO JR., 0000
CHARLES W PELL, 0000
MITCHELL R PERRETT, 0000
CATALINA L PHIPPEN, 0000
RUSSELL S PILE, 0000
BRYAN D REX, 0000
SARAH C RHOADS, 0000
JODY L RICH, 0000
TODD C RUSSELL, 0000
TIMOTHY E SAMUELSON, 0000
JONATHAN D SCHROEDER, 0000
JOSEPH D SCOTT, 0000
SARAH A SIEWERT, 0000
CHAD B STEINBRECHER, 0000
MAREK STROSIN, 0000
IRA L SWINNEY JR., 0000
LARRY B TALTON, 0000
PHOEBE U TAMAYO, 0000
GEORGE N TAYLOR, 0000
JONATHAN W THURSTON, 0000
MERRITT E TOLLISON, 0000
MICHAEL J TOLLISON, 0000
MICHAEL E TURNER, 0000
BRADLEY J WALTERMIRE, 0000
RILEY A WEBER, 0000
CARL J WELLS, 0000
MARY G WESTHAFER, 0000
ELIZABETH A WICHT, 0000
ALLEN E WILLEY, 0000
ROBERT R WILLIAMS IV, 0000
MARK H WOODS, 0000
JEFFERY S YOUNG, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JEFFREY D. DICKSON, 0000

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on October 16, 2003, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

THOMAS THOMAS RILEY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 22, 2005, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 27, 2003.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S12671–S12767

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1739–1751, S.J. Res. 19, and S. Res. 244–245. **Page S12737**

Measures Reported:

S. 300, to award a congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation, and to express the sense of Congress that there should be a national day in recognition of Jackie Robinson.

S. 1691, to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II. **Page S12737**

Measures Passed:

National Character Counts Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 245, designating the week beginning October 19, 2003, as ''National Character Counts Week''. **Pages S12755–56**

Western Shoshone Claims Distribution Act: Senate passed S. 618, to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326–A–1, 326–A–3, 326–K, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S12756–59**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, Iraq and Afghanistan: Senate continued consideration of S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S12643–69, S12671–S12725**

Adopted:

Stevens (for Feingold) Amendment No. 1832, to require reports on Iraqi oil production and revenues to be made available to the public in English and in Arabic. **Page S12655**

Stevens (for McCain) Amendment No. 1853, to provide for financial and performance audits of the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund and other assistance to Iraq. **Page S12655**

Stevens (for Hollings) Amendment No. 1865, to clarify the fiscal year limitation in a provision of the Public Law 108–11, Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act. **Page S12655**

Stevens (for Durbin) Amendment No. 1866, to require quarterly reports on the status of the efforts of the Iraq Survey Group to account for the Iraq weapons of mass destruction programs. **Pages S12655–56**

Stevens (for McConnell) Amendment No. 1863, to authorize the export of lethal military equipment to Iraq for use by a reconstituted (or interim) Iraqi military or other security forces, that support U.S. efforts in Iraq. **Page S12660**

Stevens (for Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 1814, to require the Coalition Provisional Authority to provide additional information justifying allocations for capital projects in Iraq. **Page S12660**

Stevens (for Harkin/Clinton) Amendment No. 1855, to provide for a report by the Comptroller General on certain contracts performed in, or relating to, Iraq. **Pages S12660–61**

By 97 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 387), McConnell Amendment No. 1874, to express the Sense of the Senate that the Global War on Terrorism medal should be awarded expeditiously to members of the Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle. **Pages S12673, S12677–82**

Stevens (for Reid/Daschle) Modified Amendment No. 1869, to prohibit the use of funds to arm, train, or employ individuals under the age of 18 years for the Facilities Protection Service. **Page S12682**

Stevens (for Hollings) Amendment No. 1870, to provide that, notwithstanding the Algiers Accords, any United States citizen held hostage between 1979 and 1981, and their spouses and children at the time, shall have a claim for money damages against a foreign state for personal injury that was caused by the Foreign State's act of torture or hostage-taking. **Page S12682**

Stevens (for Cantwell) Modified Amendment No. 1857, to improve the process for timely informing members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, their families, their employers, and Congress

of changes in deployment policies and schedules applicable to mobilize members of the reserve components. **Pages S12682–83**

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 388), Nickles Amendment No. 1876, to express the sense of the Senate that all countries that hold debt from the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein should be urged to forgive their debt.

Pages S12683–88, S12708–09

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 389), Bayh Amendment No. 1871, to require that funds for reconstruction in Iraq be used for certain purposes.

Pages S12688–S12708, S12709–10

Hutchison Modified Amendment No. 1877, to express the sense of Congress on reconstruction efforts in Iraq. **Pages S12710–11**

Nelson (FL) Modified Amendment No. 1858, to set aside certain amounts available national security, $10,000,000 for the Family Readiness Program of the National Guard. **Pages S12711–12**

Stevens (for Warner) Amendment No. 1880 (to Amendment No. 1867), to designate the amount designated for disaster relief provided in connection with Department of Defense infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel as an emergency requirement. **Page S12712**

Warner Amendment No. 1867, to increase the Federal share of the cost of disaster relief provided in connection with Hurricane Isabel; and to provide for repair or replacement of Department of Defense infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel. **Page S12656**

Reid (for Nelson (FL)) Amendment No. 1881, to require a report on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2020. **Page S12716**

Reed/Hagel Amendment No. 1834, to increase the end strength of the Army and to structure the additional forces for constabulary duty. **Page S12721**

Feingold Amendment No. 1852, to enable military family members to take leave to attend to deployment-related business and tasks. **Pages S12721–22**

Rejected:

Byrd Amendment No. 1818, to impose a limitation on the use of sums appropriated for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. (By 57 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 385), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S12668–69

Lautenberg Amendment No. 1868, to prohibit the use of funds for any contract or other financial agreement or arrangement with any entity that pays compensation in the form of deferred salary to certain United States Government officials. (By 65 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 386), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S12657–60, S12671–72**

Withdrawn:

Feinstein Amendment No. 1848, to require reports on the United States strategy for relief and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, and to limit the availability of certain funds for those efforts pending determinations by the President that the objectives and deadlines for those efforts will be substantially achieved. **Page S12721**

Pending:

Byrd/Durbin Amendment No. 1819, to prohibit the use of Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Funds for low priority activities that should not be the responsibility of U.S. taxpayers, and shift $600 million from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund to Defense Operations and Maintenance, Army, for significantly improving efforts to secure and destroy conventional weapons, such as bombs, bomb materials, small arms, rocket propelled grenades, and shoulder-launched missiles, in Iraq. **Page S12643**

Bond/Mikulski Amendment No. 1825, to provide additional VA Medical Care Funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs. **Page S12643**

Durbin Amendment No. 1837, to ensure that a Federal employee who takes leave without pay in order to perform certain service as a member of the uniformed services or member of the National Guard shall continue to receive pay in an amount which, when taken together with the pay and allowances such individual is receiving for such service, will be no less than the basic pay such individual would then be receiving if no interruption in employment had occurred. **Page S12715**

Daschle Amendment No. 1854, to achieve the most effective means of reconstructing Iraq and to reduce the future costs to the American taxpayer of such reconstruction by ensuring broad-based international cooperation for this effort. **Page S12643**

Reid (for Landrieu) Amendment No. 1859, to promote the establishment of an Iraq Reconstruction Finance Authority and the use of Iraqi oil revenues to pay for reconstruction in Iraq. **Pages S12716–18**

Boxer Modified Amendment No. 1843, to make retroactive the relief of hospitalized members of the uniformed services from the obligation to pay for food and subsistence while hospitalized.

Pages S12712–13

Reid (for Chafee/Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 1807, to provide for humanitarian assistance and reconstruction in Liberia. **Pages S12713–15**

Durbin Amendment No. 1879, to provide funds for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS. **Pages S12715–16**

Corzine Amendment No. 1882, to establish a National Commission on the Development and Use of Intelligence Related to Iraq. **Pages S12718–21**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

Chair sustained a point of order against Schumer Amendment No. 1872, to express the sense of Congress concerning the appointment of a special counsel to conduct a fair, thorough, and independent investigation into a national security breach, as being in violation of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate which prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S12661–69

Chair sustained a point of order against Durbin Amendment No. 1873, to provide funds for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, as being in violation of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate which prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S12667–68**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 9 a.m., on Friday, October 17, 2003, Senate will begin a series of votes on certain pending amendments. **Page S12759**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 9 a.m., on Friday, October 17, 2003. **Page S12759**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Timothy John Dunn, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States.

Stuart W. Holliday, of Texas, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Zalmay Khalilzad, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan.

Adam Marc Lindemann, of New York, to be Member of the Advisory Board for Cuba Broadcasting for a term expiring October 27, 2005.

James Curtis Struble, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru.

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Air Force under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

18 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Navy. **Pages S12759–67**

Nominations Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Thomas Thomas Riley, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for the remainder of the term expiring September 22, 2005, which was sent to the Senate on February 27, 2003. **Page S12767**

Messages From the House: **Page S12735**

Measures Referred: **Page S12735**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S12735**

Measures Read First Time: **Page S12735**

Executive Communications: **Pages S12735–37**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S12737**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S12737–39**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S12739–48**

Additional Statements: **Page S12734**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S12749–54**

Authority for Committees to Meet: **Pages S12754–55**

Privilege of the Floor: **Page S12755**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—389) **Pages S12669 S12672 S12682 S12709 S12710**

Adjournment: Senate met at 9:31 a.m., and adjourned at 1:05 a.m., on Friday, October, 17, 2003 and will reconvene at 9 a.m. on the same day. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S12759.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS: INTELLIGENCE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing to discuss the intelligence provisions of S. 1689, making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004 (pending on Senate Calendar) from members of the intelligence community.

HOUSING GSE'S

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee held a hearing to examine proposals for improving the regulation of the Housing government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs), focusing on essential elements and proposals of regulatory reform, resolution of accounting issues, funding of new oversight offices, receiving testimony from John W. Snow, Secretary of the Treasury; Mel Martinez, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Franklin D. Raines, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Fannie Mae; George D. Gould, Presiding Director, Freddie Mac; and Norman B. Rice, President and

Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle.

Hearings continue on Thursday, October 23.

AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing on the pursuit of security and democracy in Afghanistan, focusing on providing adequate resources and support to the Afghan government, and related provisions of S. 1689, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan Security and Reconstruction Act 2004, (pending on Senate Calendar), after receiving testimony from William B. Taylor, Jr., Coordinator for Afghanistan, Department of State; Peter W. Rodman, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, and Brig. General Gary L. North, Deputy J–5 for Political and Military Affairs, The Joint Staff, both of the Department of Defense; Peter Tomsen, McLean, Virginia, former United States Special Envoy and Ambassador on Afghanistan; and William J. Durch, Henry L. Stimson Center, The Future of Peace Operations Project, and Nancy Lindborg, Mercy Corps, both of Washington, D.C.

U.S.-EUROPEAN UNION COOPERATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on European Affairs concluded a hearing to examine United States-European Union Cooperation on regulatory affairs, focusing on non-tariff barriers, the history of transatlantic regulatory cooperation, innovative and informal approaches, and global growth, after receiving testimony from Charles P. Ries, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs; Eric Stewart, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Europe; Gerard Depayre, European Commission to the United States, Stuart E. Eizenstat, European-American Business Council, Gary Litman, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Thomas L. Farmer, American Bankers' Association, all of Washington, D.C.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing on access to postsecondary education in relation to reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on the relationship among quality, efficiency, and access to higher education, after receiving testimony from George W. Waldner, York College of Pennsylvania, York; Jamie P. Merisotis, Institute for Higher Education Policy, Washington, D.C.; Shane Hollett, Ohio College Access Network, Cleveland; and Troy Lambert, University of Maryland, College Park.

INDIAN WATER RIGHTS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' management of the Missouri River, focusing on the effects of the Master Manual (a guide used by the Corps to operate the six dams on the mainstream of the Missouri River) on the effect on federally-reserved Indian water rights, after receiving testimony from Senator Daschle; George S. Dunlop, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Policy and Legislation; Brigadier General William T. Grisoli, Commander and Division Engineer, Northwestern Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; John Yellow Bird Steele, Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, South Dakota; and Michael Claymore, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Fort Yates, North Dakota.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1691, to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II; and

The nominations George W. Miller, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Deborah Ann Spagnoli, of California, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, Department of Justice.

Also committee began markup of S. 1545, to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to permit States to determine State residency for higher education purposes and to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

LITIGATIONS IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts concluded a hearing on S. 1428, to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for damages or injunctive relief for claims of injury resulting from a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition related to weight gain or obesity, after receiving testimony from Senator McConnell; Victor E. Schwartz, Shook, Hardy, and Bacon, LLP, Washington, D.C.; Russel

L. Sutter, Tillinghast-Towers Perrin, St. Louis, Missouri; Wayne Reaves, Manna Enterprises, Inc., Anniston, Alabama, on behalf of the National Restaurant Association; and Gerard J. Musante, Structure House, Residential Weight Loss and Life Style Change Clinic, Durham, North Carolina.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 3305–3329; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 72; H. Con. Res. 303–304, and H. Res. 400, 402, 403, 404, were introduced. **Pages H9613–14**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H9614–15**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows today:

H.R. 3214, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, amended, (H. Rept. 108–321, Pt. 1); and

H. Res. 401, providing for further consideration of 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 (H. Rept. 108–322). **Pages H9612–13**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Thornberry to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H9485**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered today by Rev. Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Congregational Methodist Church in Milner, Georgia. **Page H9485**

International Contributions to the Reconstruction of Iraq: The House agreed to H. Res. 198, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, and Russia can initially best contribute to the reconstruction of Iraq by the forgiveness of outstanding debt between both Iraq and France, Iraq and Germany, and Iraq and Russia, by a yea-and-nay vote of 394 yeas to 31 nays, Roll No. 545. **Pages H9489–91, H9508–09**

Agreed to the amendment in the nature of a substitute by voice vote. **Page H9491**

Agreed to amend the preamble by a voice vote. **Page H9509**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read, ''Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that France, Germany, Russia, and other nations can contribute to Iraq's reconstruction by forgiving debts owed by Iraq to those nations and by making generous pledges for Iraq's reconstruction at the International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq to be held in Madrid.'' **Page H9509**

Privileged Resolution: Representative McDermott offered a privileged resolution to correct the Congressional Record of January 28, 2003. **Page H9509**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations: The House concluded debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004. **Pages H9509–29**

The House then began consideration of 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. Further consideration of the bill will resume on Friday, October 17. **Pages H9530–83, H9585–H9606**

Agreed to:

Young of Florida amendment that exempts servicemembers with combat-related injuries from the requirement of paying for subsistence charges while hospitalized; **Page H9562**

Maloney amendment that requires $20 million of the Economic Support Fund be used for programs for women and girls in Afghanistan; **Pages H9593–94**

Slaughter amendment that requires executive agencies to provide specific information to Congress when an agency awards a ''no-bid'' contract using funds from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund; and **Pages H9594–95**

Kirk amendment that allows non-competitive contracts to be reported to Congress seven days after the contract has been awarded in some circumstances (by a recorded vote of 405 ayes to 20 noes, Roll No. 549). **Pages H9588–89, H9602**

Rejected:

Obey amendment that would have required that funds provided for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund be given as loans (by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 546); **Pages H9575–82**

Obey amendment that would have provided funds for quality of life enhancements for U.S. servicemembers (by a recorded vote of 209 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 547); **Pages H9562–65, H9582–83**

Goode amendment that would have eliminated funding for the U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping operations in Liberia and for international disaster and famine assistance in Liberia and Sudan; **Pages H9590–91**

Blumenauer amendment that would have transferred funds from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund to rebuilding and assistance efforts in Afghanistan; **Pages H9599–H9600**

Waxman amendment that would have reduced funding for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (by a recorded vote of 197 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 548); **Pages H9586–88, H9601–02**

Markey amendment that would have struck certain provisions that would allow the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds (by a recorded vote of 146 ayes to 279 noes, Roll No. 550); **Pages H9591–92, H9602–03**

Holt amendment that would have eliminated funding to import petroleum products into Iraq (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 551); and **Pages H9592–93, H9603–04**

Loretta Sanchez amendment that would have struck the wording ''or the Global War on Terrorism'' from page 23 line 13 of the bill (by a recorded vote of 128 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 552). **Pages H9600–01, H9604**

Withdrawn:

Shadegg amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of October 15) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. **Page H9594**

Point of order sustained against:

Obey amendment in the nature of a substitute; **Pages H9552–62**

Pence amendment (No. 33 printed in the Congressional Record of October 15) that sought to require that 50% of the total funds be made as a grant and 50% be made as a loan after the President informs Congress that a democratically elected government has been established in Iraq; **Pages H9565–75**

Filner amendment that sought to eliminate the disabled veterans tax; and **Pages H9589–90**

Spratt amendment that sought to increase pay and benefits for active and reserve military personnel. **Pages H9595–99**

Agreed by unanimous consent to consider certain amendments before the consideration of other amendments for 10 minutes each, that such amendments shall not be subject to amendment, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or the Committee on the Whole, and may amend a portion of the bill not yet read (except amendments proposing to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill must conform to clause 2(f) of rule 21). **Page H9606**

Agreed by unanimous consent to limit the time allowed for debate on certain amendments. **Page H9606**

Agreed by unanimous consent to consider certain amendments offered on the bill before consideration of other amendments. **Page H9606**

H. Res. 396, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by voice vote, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 202 nays with one voting ''present'', Roll No. 544. **Pages H9491–H9508**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:55 p.m. and reconvened at 1:01 a.m. **Page H9611**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H9485.

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H9615–17.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 1:02 a.m.

Committee Meetings

MAXIMIZE FARM AND RANCH INCOME

Committee on Agriculture: Held a hearing to examine new generation cooperatives and strategies to maximize farm and ranch income. Testimony was heard from Thomas C. Dorr, Under Secretary, Rural Development, USDA; Douglas Flory, member of the Board, Farm Credit Administration; and public witnesses.

DOD LONG-TERM BUDGET ISSUES

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on Department of Defense Long-Term Budget Issues. Testimony was heard from Dov S. Zakheim, Under Secretary (Comptroller) and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Defense; and Douglas J. Holtz-Eakin, Director, CBO.

HEALTHSOUTH FINANCIAL COLLAPSE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''The Financial Collapse of HealthSouth.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of HealthSouth Corporation: Diana Henze, Assistant Controller; and Greg Smith, Chief Auditing Officer; the following former officials of HealthSouth Corporation: Teresa Sanders, Group Vice President and Chief Auditing Officer; Steve Schlatter, Physical Therapist; Michael Vines, Corporate Fixed Assets Department; Kelly Cullison, Vice President of Compliance; William Horton, Executive Vice President and corporate Counsel; Brandon Hale, Executive Vice President of Administration, Corporate Secretary and Compliance Office; James Goodreau, Chief of Security; and Anthony Tanner, Corporate Secretary and Compliance Officer; and Martin Cohen, Senior Managing Director, FTI Consulting.

In refusing to give testimony, the following former officials of HealthSouth Corporation: Richard M. Scrushy, Founder and Former Chairman and CEO; and Susan Jones-Smith, Senior Vice President Finance Reimbursement, invoked Fifth Amendment privileges.

U.S. CAPITAL MARKET STRUCTURE REVIEW

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Reviewing U.S. Capital Market Structure: The New York Stock Exchange and Related Issues.'' Testimony was heard from John Reed, Interim Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, New York Stock Exchange, Inc.; and public witnesses.

INTERNET VULNERABILITIES AFFECTING BUSINESSES, GOVERNMENTS AND HOMES

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing on ''You've Got Mail—But is it Secure? An Examination of Internet Vulnerabilities Affecting Businesses, Governments and Homes.'' Testimony was heard from Karen Evans, Administrator, Office of Electronic Government, OMB; and public witnesses.

CASTRO'S CUBA—ONGOING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Human Rights and Wellness held a hearing entitled ''Castro's Cuba: What is the Proper United States Response to Ongoing Human Rights Violations in Our Hemisphere?'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Roger Noriega, Assistant Secretary, Western Hemisphere; and Adolpho Franco, Assistant Administrator, Latin America and the Carribean, AID; R. Richard Newcomb, Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

FEC—ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Committee on House Administration: Held a hearing on the Federal Election Commission Enforcement Procedures. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the FEC: Ellen L. Weintraub, Chairman; and Bradley A. Smith, Vice Chairman; Karl Sandstrom, former Commissioner, FEC; and public witnesses.

U.S. POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN—CURRENT RECONSTRUCTION ISSUES

Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on United States Policy in Afghanistan: Current Issues in Reconstruction—Part II. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: William B. Taylor, Jr., Afghanistan Coordinator; and James Kunder, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia and the Near East, AID; Peter Rodman, Assistant Secretary, International Security Affairs, Department of Defense.

RESOLUTION OF THE ETHIOPIA-ERITREA BORDER DISPUTE ACT

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 2760, Resolution of the Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Dispute Act of 2003.

STATE FEDERAL AGENCY PROTECTIONS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on ''The GAO's Recent Report on the Implementation of Executive Order 12630 and the State of Federal Agency Protections of Private Property Rights.'' Testimony was heard from Anu Mittal, Director, Natural Resources and Environment Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

DATABASE AND COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION MISAPPROPRIATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 3261, Database and Collections of Information Misappropriation Act.

OVERSIGHT—VISA OVERSTAYS A GROWING PROBLEM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims held an oversight hearing on ''Visa Overstays: A Growing Problem for Law Enforcement.'' Testimony was heard from Kevin Tanner, Director, Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force, FBI, Department of Justice; Nancy Kingsbury, Managing Director, Applied Research and Methods, GAO; Theresa Papademetriou, Senior Legal Specialist, Library of Congress; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 280, National Aviation Heritage Area Act; H.R. 704, Rim of the Valley Corridor Study Act; H.R. 1399, Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Boundary Revision Act of 2003; H.R. 1594, St. Croix National Heritage Area Study Act; H.R. 1618, Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area Act; H.R. 1862, Oil Region National Heritage Area Act; H.R. 1798, Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Act; and H.R. 2909, Utah Test and Training Range Protection Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Schiff and McInnis; Gerald F. Pease, Jr., Associate Director, Ranges and Airspace, U.S. Air Force, Department of Defense; the following officials of the Department of the Interior: deTeel Patterson Tiller, Acting Associate Director, Cultural Resources, National Park Service; Jeffrey Loman, Acting Director, Trust Services, Bureau of Indian Affairs; and Jim Hughes, Deputy Director, Land Management, Bureau of Land Management; Randy Johnson, Deputy Director, Planning for Public Lands, State of Utah; and public witnesses.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule on 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, providing that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule provides that no further motion or amendment shall be in order.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; FUTURE OF HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

Committee on Science: Ordered reported the following measures: H. Con. Res. 279, recognizing the significance of the anniversary of the American Association for the Advancement of Science Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Program, and reaffirming the commitment to support the use of science in governmental decisionmaking through such Program; and H. Res. 395, recognizing the importance of chemistry to our everyday lives and supporting the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

The Committee also held a hearing on The Future of Human Space Flight. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IS AMERICA LOSING ITS LEAD IN HIGH-TECH?

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled ''Is America losing its lead in high-tech: implications for the U.S. defense industrial base?'' Testimony was heard from Ronald Sega, Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.

AVIATION SECURITY—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held an oversight hearing on the Transportation Security Administration's Perspective on Aviation Security. Testimony was heard from James M. Loy, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.

VETERAN'S HEALTH CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Held a hearing entitled ''Handoff or Fumble: Do VA and DOD Provide Seamless Health Care Coverage to Transitioning Veterans?'' Testimony was heard from Neal P. Curtin, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, GAO; the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: Harold Kudler, M.D., Co-Chairman, Under Secretary for Health's Special Committee on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder; Robert H. Roswell, M.D., Under Secretary, Health; and Robert

J. Epley, Associate Deputy Under Secretary, Policy and Programs, Veterans Benefits Administration; and Edward P. Wyatt, Jr., Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs, Department of Defense.

BRIEFING—SENSITIVE COUNTERTERRORISM ISSUES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a briefing on Sensitive Counterterrorism Issues. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

BRIEFING—GLOBAL INTELLIGENCE UPDATE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security, executive, briefing on Global Intelligence Update. The Subcommittee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

FASTER AND SMARTER FUNDING FOR FIRST RESPONDERS ACT

Select Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness and Response held a hearing on H.R. 3266, Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act of 2003. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PLUGGING THE GAPS IN BORDER SECURITY

Select Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Infrastructure and Border Security held a hearing entitled ''Plugging the Gaps in Border Security: the One Face at the Border Initiative.'' Testimony was heard from Robert Bonner, Commissioner, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2003

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Government Reform, hearing entitled ''Implementing the SAFETY Act: Advancing New Technologies for Homeland Security,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m., Friday, October 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1689, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, with a series of votes to occur on certain amendments.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, October 17

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Further consideration of H.R. 3289, Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2004.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $217.00 for six months, $434.00 per year, or purchased for $6.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (866) 512–1800 (toll free), (202) 512–1800 (D.C. Area), or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Record, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.