

To begin with, I regret that we have to be voting on this bill now.

I thought the President's decision to begin military action in Iraq was premature. I thought it would have been better to allow more time for other measures, including coercive inspections, to accomplish the goal of disarming Saddam Hussein. However, Congress—by adopting the resolution authorizing the use of force—left it to the President to decide if and when military action would begin.

That is another source of regret. I opposed the resolution precisely because I thought it gave the President too much discretion about the timing of that action. But the resolution was enacted. And, now that military action has begun, it is necessary for Congress to consider the Administration's requests for funds to pay for it and for related purposes.

Our troops are in the field, actively engaged in operations that Congress has authorized. Under those circumstances, I cannot make them the victims of my regrets by failing to support this bill to provide them what they need to carry out those operations.

So much for my regrets. I also have strong concerns about some things that are in this bill and some things that were left out.

The bill does have many good features. For example, I am glad that the Appropriations Committee placed some important limits on the President's request before bringing the bill to the floor.

Among other things, the bill bars the Pentagon from controlling the over \$2.5 billion it provides for humanitarian relief and reconstruction and instead designates the money for the State Department and other non-military agencies. The bill also reduces the President's request for no-strings-attached Pentagon funding from \$63 billion to \$25 billion by putting the rest of the funds into appropriate spending categories. Though the \$25 billion still amounts to a signed check with the payee line left blank, it's an improvement over the request. Regardless of the Administration's preference, it remains the right and duty of Congress—not the White House—to decide how much money is allocated for what purpose.

On the other hand, I am concerned that the bill does not do enough in other areas. In particular, I voted against ordering the previous question on the rule, and against the rule itself, because it did not allow a straightforward vote on the Obey amendment to add more funding for homeland security.

The bill does include \$4.25 billion for this purpose—slightly less than the President's request—but I think that is not nearly enough to meet the country's needs. Although many of our Republican colleagues would have you believe that states and localities are sitting on millions of dollars of unspent funds for first responders, my conversations with Colorado police chiefs, fire departments, and other first responders have convinced me that is not the case. Every time the Department of Homeland Security changes the official color-coded threat level, Colorado and the other States and localities are required to spend more money that they don't have. We are asking them to provide top-dollar security for our nation on a dime's worth of resources.

So, I am very concerned that the Republican leadership has denied us the opportunity to vote to correct the bill's deficiencies. The Obey amendment would have provided \$2.5 billion in additional funds for our local first re-

sponders, for port security grants, for protection for our waterways and nuclear plants, for our National Guard and Reserves to provide assistance with chemical and biological weapons attacks, and for other homeland security needs.

I do not know how many of our colleagues would have joined me in supporting this amendment—and I will never know, because the Republican rule didn't permit a vote—but I know Colorado's first responders would have wanted it to be a majority. That's because homeland security is for Americans—it is not just for Democrats or Republicans. At a time when states and cities are suffering economically and crying out for federal assistance to meet their new and stepped-up homeland security obligations, I believe we must do more than we've done in this bill.

Nonetheless, as I said, I am voting for this bill without hesitation because its prompt passage is needed—not just to support our men and women in uniform as they fight, but also to lay the foundation for the harder mission of winning the peace after they have won the war.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this \$77.9 billion supplemental appropriations bill is the largest ever considered by Congress. Yet, it still fails to address our most critical need of "hometown" security. The lack of adequate funding to protect our hometowns exposes the United States to greater risks than those posed by Saddam Hussein.

This bill provides less than half of an estimated \$9 billion need for the safety of our ports, transportation systems, water supplies, and first responders. It even falls short of what the administration requested for homeland security. Nationwide, cities are spending \$70 million a week to protect and prepare themselves from potential attacks at a time when state and local governments are already crippled by economic conditions.

In the last two weeks since the war in Iraq began, my hometown of Portland, Oregon has spent nearly a million dollars to respond to the heightened security alert. As the State of Oregon struggles to keep schools open and to provide medical care for the neediest people, it is incomprehensible that we are not fulfilling our responsibility at the federal level to help fund critical homeland security needs.

A Democratic amendment that would have added \$5.5 billion for homeland security and \$300 million specifically for metropolitan security needs, would have provided Oregon an additional \$4 million to secure, protect, and prepare our ports, our hospitals, and our first responders against potential terrorist attacks. Appallingly, the Republican leadership blocked this and other Democratic amendments from even being voted on.

There is no reason to rush this resolution through to fund the war on Iraq. It would appear to the casual observer as an attempt to hide the true cost of the war by breaking it up into pieces. There are already discussions that another supplemental will be necessary before the end of the year. The 2004 budget resolution, which was just debated two weeks ago, failed completely to deal with the expended costs of this war.

I did not support this resolution, because it is not needed at this moment, the process by which it was brought to the floor is unreasonable, and it fails to fund protection for our communities.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, at a time of war Congress has no more important duty than to make sure that our military force have all the resources they need. However, Congress also has a duty to not use the war as cover for unnecessary and unconstitutional spending. This is especially true when war coincides with a period of economic downturn and growing federal deficits. Unfortunately, Congress today is derelict in its duty to the United States taxpayer. Instead of simply ensuring that our military has the necessary resources to accomplish its mission in Iraq, a mission which may very well be over before this money reaches the Pentagon, Congress has loaded this bill up with unconstitutional wasteful foreign aid and corporate welfare spending.

For example, this bill provides a hidden subsidy to vaccine manufacturers by transferring liability for injuries caused by the smallpox vaccine from the companies to the United States Taxpayer. It also provides \$3.2 billion dollars for yet another government bailout of the airline industry, as well as a hidden subsidy to the airlines in the form of \$235 million of taxpayer money to pay for costs associated with enhanced baggage screening. Mr. Speaker, there is no more constitutional reason for the taxpayer to protect what is, after all, the airlines' private property, than there is for the taxpayer to subsidize security costs at shopping malls or factories. Furthermore, the airlines could do a more efficient and effective job at providing security if they were freed from government rules and regulations. I remind my colleagues that it was government bureaucrats who disarmed airline pilots, thus leaving the pilots of the planes used in the September 11 attacks defenseless against the terrorists. I would also remind my colleagues that anti-gun fanatics in the federal bureaucracy continue to prevent pilots from carrying firearms.

Although generous to certain corporate interests, this bill actually contains less money than the administration requested for homeland security. One area of homeland security that Congress did not underfund is its own security; this bill provides the full amount requested to ensure the security of the Congress. Still, one could reasonably conclude from reading this bill that the security of Turkey, Pakistan, and Jordan are more important to Congress than the security of Houston, New York and other major American cities.

On foreign spending, this bill actually provides one billion dollars in foreign aid to Turkey—even though that country refused the U.S. request for cooperation in the war on Iraq. One billion dollars to a country that thumbed its nose at an American request for assistance? How is this possibly an appropriate expenditure of taxpayer money? Additionally, this "war supplemental" has provided cover for more of the same unconstitutional foreign aid spending. It provides 2.5 billion dollar for Iraqi reconstruction when Americans have been told repeatedly that reconstruction costs will be funded out of Iraqi oil revenues. It also ensures that the American taxpayer will subsidize large corporations that wish to do business in Iraq by making transactions with Iraq eligible for support from the Export-Import Bank. It sends grants and loans in excess of 11.5 billion dollars to Jordan, Israel, Egypt, and Afghanistan—above and beyond the money we already send them each year.

Incredibly, this bill sends 175 million dollars in aid to Pakistan even though it was reported

in April that Pakistan purchased ballistic missiles from North Korea! Furthermore, it is difficult to understand how \$100 million to Colombia, \$50 million to the Gaza Strip, and \$200 million for "Muslim outreach" has anything to do with the current war in Iraq. Also, this bill spends \$31 million to get the federal government into the television broadcasting business in the Middle East. With private American news networks like CNN available virtually everywhere on the globe, is there any justification to spend taxpayer money to create and fund competing state-run networks? Aren't state-run news networks one of the features of closed societies we have been most critical of in the past?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1559 endangers America's economy by engaging in pork-barrel spending and corporate welfare unrelated to national security. This bill endangers America's economic health by adding almost \$80 billion to the already bloated federal deficit. Additions to the deficit endanger our financial independence because America will have to increase its reliance on foreign borrowers to finance our debt. H.R. 1559 also shortchanges Americans by giving lower priority to funding homeland security than to funding unreliable allies and projects, like the Middle Eastern TV Network, that will do nothing to enhance America's security. Therefore, I must oppose this bill.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, knowing full well that it will pass today.

Like many of you here in Congress and like millions of Americans across the country, my hopes and prayers go out to our troops. I want to see them safe at home as soon as possible. I deeply admire their courage, mourn their losses, and honor their sacrifice and commitment.

I cannot, however, endorse the decision to send our troops into harm's way by launching a first strike against Iraq. I fear we are witnessing the first chapter of the Doctrine of Preemption. This Doctrine of Preemption is taking us more deeply into uncharted waters. No one knows where this will end.

There is also no end in sight to the costs of war and to the price we will pay here at home in the America we will not be able to build. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. taught us, "In the wasteland of war, the expenditure of resources knows no restraints."

Thus, I cannot support the \$75 billion down payment on this war that makes up the bulk of this supplemental while under-funding homeland security by \$4 billion. With those facts, in mind, I must oppose this appropriations bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that many of my constituents hope that I vote "no" on this supplemental appropriations bill. Many of my constituents are passionate in their opposition to the Iraqi invasion. Last fall, I voted against the resolution that authorized the invasion because I believed the invasion was a mistake for our country. But that fact is this: The resolution passed the Congress. Whether or not one agreed with the actions that led up to today, America's troops are now in the field and the bills need to be paid. Accordingly, I will vote "aye" on this bill.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, two years ago, I don't think there would be any doubt that most Americans would have felt a sense of safety, but in today's world that is not

the case. Indeed, in today's world of opting to spend an estimated \$9 million on security for the Super Bowl, Americans are looking for a greater feeling of safety and security in their daily lives, whether in their homes, on the street, or in their workplace.

While tensions abroad are troubling, we can't overlook or underfund our own homeland security.

There is a bipartisan consensus that protecting the security of our communities requires that we adequately equip and train our first responders, who form our first line of response to any terrorist attacks. These first responders need additional funding to match mandates and goals, particularly to address the need for new communications equipment. Fire fighters need to be able to communicate with police officers, and police officers need to be able to communicate with emergency medical personnel in order to effectively protect our communities.

Recently, a group of over 80 police, fire and emergency response agencies in Oregon came to me requesting funding for a regional communications system that would allow all the agencies to communicate with one another. This proposal cost \$59 million and would greatly improve the regional response capability of these first responders. Increasing money for first responders may allow them to build their communications system.

We are in the midst of an extraordinary time, when we and our allies are pursuing a war on terrorism that extends across the globe. Our resources, troops, intelligence agents, and surveillance equipment are currently spread across the world, from Yemen to the Philippines, from Afghanistan to Colombia.

In our own backyards, at the borders with Canada and Mexico, in the hundreds of seaports on our coast, indeed even in our own communities, I will fight to ensure that we have the proper resources or organization to prevent terrorist attacks.

In the midst of this lack of resources and organization, we hear constant reports that new attacks on American soil are being planned. Members of President Bush's administration have publicly stated that they believe another attack on American soil is nearly inevitable.

During a time when our nation seems its most vulnerable and under its greatest threat, we have the responsibility to ensure that everyday Americans are safe and secure. We must protect and defend our cities at home during these troubling times by investing in our new Department of Homeland Security, by providing local law enforcement and first responders with adequate resources to prevent or respond to any future attacks.

I am disappointed that this legislation includes less spending on homeland security than was requested by the President, and I am disappointed that the rule was structured in such a way to prevent amendments increasing homeland security spending.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the McGovern Amendment. The war on drugs in Colombia should not receive funding in an emergency supplemental spending bill. Additional funding for Colombia should properly be considered as part of our regular appropriations process for fiscal year 2004. Muddling the important issues at stake in Colombia with an amorphous definition of terrorism and then burying the funding in a bill that is on a fast-track is not the way we should proceed.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The balance of my remarks relate to the underlying issue of war in Iraq and this Supplemental Appropriations bill.

I am one of the 133 Members of this body who cast a "no" vote on the resolution authorizing use of force against Iraq last October. I believed then as I do today that alternative means exist to deal with the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. I believed then as I do today that the world will not be a safer place because of this war. I believed then as I do today that the new Bush doctrine of preemptive military action threatens to further destabilize our world.

For those of us who voted against war in Iraq, this is an incredibly painful and difficult time. Many of our constituents are feeling angry and frustrated, powerless and hurt, worried and disappointed. We've been searching for ways to take meaningful steps toward peace, having failed to convince this President, a majority of this Congress and a majority of the American people that war in Iraq is not the right path. When I refer to the phrase "meaningful steps toward peace," I have three very specific goals in mind. First, I deeply believe that the Bush policy of preemptive war must end, here and now.

Secondly, I believe that we must take immediate responsibility for rebuilding strong trusting relationships with the international community because too many of these relationships have been strained and damaged when this administration turned away from pursuit of a diplomatic resolution to this problem. Lastly, I believe that we must take immediate responsibility for rebuilding Iraq.

Throughout our history, the United States has been viewed by the world as a beacon of freedom and a pillar of democratic principle. While never perfect, we were admired for our openness, our charity and our commitment to liberty. Weary of war, we created, supported and enhanced international institutions and agreements to encourage peaceful solutions to world disagreements and conflicts. The United States was seen as a constructive force in the world. Right now we are seen by many as a destructive force in the world.

I stand here today to urge this President and this Congress to return to our tradition of constructiveness rather than destructiveness. We should be builders rather than destroyers.

A vote against this bill would do nothing to stop this war. If a "no" vote would stop the war, that is how I would vote. Rather, I urge Members and citizens to join me in the effort to become constructive as a nation, once again, to become builders, once again. This measure does contain resources to begin the rebuilding process. In light of these considerations, I expect to cast a vote to pass this bill.

We must rebuild and restore our relationships with our allies and our friends around the world. Our long term security rests in working cooperatively in a world community with international standards and laws, seeking peaceful solutions to the many challenges we face.

We must also rebuild Iraq. We can't back away now. American compassion, generosity and respect in Iraq are the essential first step in restoring trust between the United States and the Islamic world.

I said that we must construct and we must build rather than destroy. But, I make one exception to that statement. We must destroy