

NOT VOTING—27

Ballenger	Gutknecht	Musgrave
Bono	Hayworth	Neal (MA)
Calvert	Jones (OH)	Nunes
Clay	Kline	Radanovich
Davis, Tom	Kucinich	Saxton
Delahunt	Maloney	Souder
Fletcher	Marshall	Sweeney
Fossella	McHugh	Turner (OH)
Gephardt	Mollohan	Turner (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1926

Mr. ABERCROMBIE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill 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.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained and was not here for rollcall 519. The record should reflect that had I been present I would have voted no on rollcall number 519, final passage of the Water Resources Development Act.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1078

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1078.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 14, 2003, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for a further period of debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004.

□ 1928

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 a further period of debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and

the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, with Mr. SHIMKUS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, 4 hours and 24 minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 2 hours and 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 2 hours and 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that an issue as vital to our national security as the war in Iraq gets embedded in Presidential politics.

□ 1930

There is an irony that seeing the bumper stickers which say “United We Stand,” that is more a hope than an expectation. The reason we are at war in Iraq, regardless of all the lint-picking and mistakes and the misjudgments and all the discrepancies, boils down to its simplest terms. The strategic threat from a brutal aggressor that was a challenge to the region as well as to ourselves is a matter of record. And we can debate and argue over this point or that point, but Saddam Hussein was a threat to the region and to the United States, and somebody had to exercise leadership and it devolved upon our President and he has done so. However, I do not propose to talk about that aspect of this many-faceted discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the very difficult question of loan versus grant. I can say to the chairman how much I would like to vote for this to be a loan. It makes sense. It is the most defensible position one can take on this issue. But I have come to the conclusion that that would be a mistake and that we should make this a grant, and I will try to tell you my reasons.

There is a philosopher named Santayana who said something a long time ago, I have never been able to confirm that he said it, but that is the common opinion, those who do not read history are condemned to relive it.

World War I brought on the Treaty of Versailles. It was punitive. The reparations and the punishment that we leveled on Germany, however deserved, ended up in the creation of the Nazi Party.

Mr. Chairman, the punitive Versailles Treaty imposed upon Germany after World War I resulted in a country rife with poverty and the ground was sown for the Nazi Party, and ultimately in 1933 the election of Adolf Hitler and out of that, of course, came World War II.

Now, we learned that lesson because after World War II, instead of imposing

punitive measures on the losers, we came up with the Marshall Plan, which was largely grant and not loans. And the result of the Marshall Plan was Europe was rebuilt, Europe flourished; and instead of being a cradle of dissention and war, it became a source of serenity and peace.

And so it would seem to me if we impose on Iraq, which already has \$200 billion in debt, another how-many-billions more in debt and then demand that we be repaid, we are not purchasing freedom with that. We are purchasing another dissident country with people who have one more reason to hate us because we are imposing a burden on them.

Now, another reason it seems to me is the example we set. We are the leader of the free world whether we like it or not. History has imposed that on us. And if we loan money, other countries are going to loan and add to the debt and add to the misery that Iraq has already undergone. I think if we make a grant, other countries will follow our lead, there is going to be a donors’ conference in Madrid later this month, and I think the example we set will result in other countries making a contribution.

Now, it is important for this reason: one way we can get our money back or at least have our burden lessened is by other countries contributing to the rebuilding of Iraq. They will not do that if we loan the money. They will do that. Other countries will follow our example; and if they do, they can pick up some of the burden that we are at this point perhaps going to have to assume.

Now, Ambassador Bremer has pointed out that creating a sovereign democratic prosperous Iraq is a real blow to the terrorists, and that is our aim. We cannot go to war and then turn on a dime and walk out. We will create a cesspool for terrorists and another problem area, and we are buying difficulty for the future.

Things are better in Iraq. The schools are open. The hospitals are open, a free press, utilities coming back on, infrastructure being repaired, a governing council, writing a constitution. There are some 30 countries standing with us. No, they are not in large numbers, but about 20,000, which is a sizable group, British, Polish, Spanish, Czechs and many others. And so we are in this war. It is a war that deserves our support. And I hope that this House will not burden Iraq which already has tremendous burdens and lots of debt with additional debt, but that we show the way for the rest of the world to make their contributions and truly have a united front.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, it was 1 year ago that Congress voted to authorize the President to use force in Iraq. Many of us supported that resolution; others did not. And I have deep respect for the differences that still divide us.

Those of us who voted "yes" wanted to do this right. We realized that any action in Iraq would require adequate forces, rigorous planning, and a commitment to stay until the whole mission, the war and the peace, was accomplished. A year has gone by, and now we are all in the same boat. We have undertaken a project that if done well can change the face of the Middle East for the better. If done poorly, in my judgment it will pose a grave threat to our national security.

However, the requests made by the President and the Coalition Provisional Authority was shaped in part by a series of miscalculations, miscalculations about how the international community would react to a United States operation to rid Iraq of Saddam Hussein; miscalculations about how our troops and our best intentions would be received by much of the Iraqi public; miscalculations about what would be required to rebuild; miscalculations about how generous other nations would be with donations even as their policy input was rebutted; miscalculations about how long it would take to bring Iraqi oil revenues online; and, finally, miscalculations about how this massive undertaking would affect our Federal budget.

The Committee on Appropriations, led by our able and fair chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), along with myself, reviewed the administration's request seriously and with close attention. Some necessary changes were made. Other adjustments may be made by the full House as they have been made in the Senate, and this is appropriate.

Congress is a co-equal branch of government and we have a responsibility to our constituents, our heroic armed forces, and our democracy to actively participate in this effort, not just rubber stamp the executive branch's request.

Despite deep reservations, I have decided to support this supplemental. First and foremost, I believe we have a responsibility to the people of the United States and to the people of Iraq to do our utmost to build a democratic and prosperous Iraq. This remains a fundamental part of our national security strategy. But we cannot do it haphazardly. We must be clear about our priorities and how much money and time it will take to achieve them. We need a plan, a coherent complete strategy that clearly lays out our obligations and shows how we plan to address

them in the most efficient and effective way.

We need priorities. We need to know that our efforts in Iraq will not just be about building roads, bridges, and buildings. They will also be about building democracy.

We need assurances, assurances that United States taxpayer funds are being spent wisely through the use of competitive procurement procedures and strict auditing and oversight of ongoing projects.

We need diplomacy, sincere efforts by the administration to marshal other donor contributions on an ongoing basis and to get the support of the United Nations for the rebuilding effort.

This problem is a marked change from how the United States handled last year's diplomatic effort. I continue to be amazed at our inability to stick to our goal when I read that after a ridiculously brief period of diplomacy at the U.N., the U.S. is said to be "frustrated and ready to give up."

The problem as I see it is that we do not have a plan, priorities, safeguards or sustained diplomatic efforts. We have done what we could with the massive requests of broad parameters of how it would be spent. We asked repeatedly for more detailed information from the CPA and we got some information, removed some of the more problematic provisions, but serious concerns remain. Among them are the impact this borrowed \$87 billion will have on our own budget and the priorities that will not be funded because of our responsibilities in Iraq.

Many of my colleagues have asked how we can fund school construction in Baghdad, but not in Briarcliff or Boston; how we have money for quality housing in Najaf but not in New York City or Newark; and how we can plan for fair elections in Mosul in northern Iraq but not in Miami in southern Florida.

I agree with them. I find it hard to agree that, with this weak economy, the climbing deficit and with the enormous need at home, that we are not engaged in any effort to review our fiscal policies, our tax and spending, as if we still enjoy surpluses as far as the eye can see.

That is why I also support the package drafted by our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The Obey package would provide for all emergency reconstruction needs, important military needs not addressed in the request, and increased donor participation by giving part of the United States funding in cash and part as a loan to the World Bank.

In my judgment this is realistic. If we are only anticipating \$3 billion in direct contributions from allies around the world, we need to find other ways to leverage as much money as we can. And providing \$7 billion to the World Bank would leverage up to \$40 billion in World Bank funds for reconstruction. The Obey package also provides

for detailed reporting and accountability and that is key.

However Members vote on this supplemental, we share the responsibilities for keeping our troops safe and following through on our commitment in Iraq. I believe we must finish the effort we began in Iraq for the people in my district as much as for the citizens in Karbala or Basra. But I also believe that we must be honest about what reconstructing Iraq and Afghanistan costs Americans, especially our military families.

□ 1945

We must be realistic about the tough choices this Nation faces.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that as we move to conference that a sense of responsibility and realism governs our work. The stakes are very high.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Before I yield to my colleague from Michigan, let me just make a couple of comments.

First of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her thoughtful statement. I have had the privilege these last 3 years to work with the gentlewoman from New York as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and she and I have, she would be the first to concede, have not always agreed on every policy issue, but we have approached the legislation, the bill, each time, whether it has been the regular appropriation bill or the supplemental appropriation bill, we have approached it in the spirit of compromise, and we have approached it in the spirit of bipartisanship because we both believe very strongly that when it comes to our foreign policy, partisanship ends at the shores of this country. It has been truly a great joy to work with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and I want to thank her publicly for that.

Mr. Chairman, I will also have more remarks of my own tomorrow when we get to the general debate under the rule for this bill.

Once more before I yield, I would also like to thank, though he is no longer here, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives for his extremely cogent and thoughtful statement. There are few people in this body that have been such leaders for liberty, democracy and freedom around the world, that have been voices for those basic American values as has the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). So when he speaks on an issue such as the funding for Iraq reconstruction and for our military in Iraq, he speaks, I think, with a voice of certainty and a voice of authority that it would do well for all of us to listen to.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this supplemental appropriations bill and urge all my colleagues to support it.

I want to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), obviously, we could go on commending a great number of people, but everybody's contributed to this bill, and I think it shows in that while we ensure the urgent priorities like drinking water, enhanced security and electrical infrastructure, these are all funded, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman, did look over this process, oversights it, and he eliminated projects from the President's request that were simply not necessary in this bill, removing a total of almost \$2 billion. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) does not get credit sometimes for the work he does, but I am very pleased to give him credit here this evening.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, I do want to make my colleagues aware that a portion of this bill falls under my subcommittee's jurisdiction. We have provided about \$400 million to support military construction needs for Iraq and Afghanistan. Let me turn now to the need to support the supplemental as it is written.

A little over 2 years ago, this country was attacked by terrorists whose organizations had received safe harbor from tyrants. In the wake of those attacks, we made it a goal of this country to defeat the terrorists who are actively seeking to kill Americans so that our citizens could be safe and secure at home and abroad.

In Afghanistan, we removed from power a regime that had given safe haven to al Qaeda, and we routed the terrorist organization from its hiding places. The people of Kabul cheered its liberators, and that country is headed in the right direction, though much work still needs to be done.

In Iraq, we removed a danger to an entire region when we defeated the regime of Saddam Hussein, a regime that denied the international community time and time again. We no longer have the prospect of a country being led by an individual who had invaded two neighbors, used chemical and biological weapons on his own people, ran a political prison for children, harbored terrorists, rewarded the families of suicide bombers and pursued weapons of mass destruction when the chance arose. Again, the people cheered its liberators.

These are important steps in the war on terrorism. The United States and the world is safer because of our actions. We have not been left holding the bag, as some have suggested. We are there because as a world's leader, we exercised our leadership and took action against a menace that was Saddam Hussein's regime. We have nothing to apologize for.

Now, we face the harder part, the thankless part. Having made the world

safer, in this moment we must ensure that it is safer in the future. We do not want these two countries to become terrorist havens again. That is why we must go about the task of rebuilding two countries torn down by decades of war and tyranny.

There is no folly in pursuing this course. There is great folly, however, in abandoning it before it is finished. It is not going to be easy, but it is going to get done, and that is why we are here today.

This supplemental is critical to supporting our troops and our mission. We all accept the responsibility to provide our soldiers with the weapons and equipment they need to secure Iraq, but we must also accept the responsibility to aid the new government of Iraq without placing an undue burden on it. Turning reconstruction funds included in this bill into loans does not serve our mission.

I encourage my colleagues to continue to ask those tough questions about the efforts in Iraq. That is our job, but let us stand up for our soldiers and our mission by passing this supplemental today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the leader of our caucus.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us tonight and tomorrow is whether to give the President a blank check of nearly \$87 billion or to fashion a bill that represents and promotes the best interests of our troops and the American people. I, for one, will not write the President a blank check for \$18.6 billion in reconstruction funds of American taxpayers' money based on a reconstruction plan just sent to Congress, which rebuilds Iraq's electricity infrastructure, among other things, when ours is not functioning here at home; which modernizes Iraq's medical facilities and medical equipment, when millions of Americans here at home are living without health care; which pays for that which we did not damage and did not previously exist in Iraq; and which sends \$18.6 billion in grants to a country that has the second largest oil reserve in the world valued at over \$7 trillion.

I do not intend to add another \$18.6 billion to this year's deficit, estimated at over \$480 billion, and that is why we demand an Iraq package that will not bankrupt future generations, that is paid for.

This administration failed to present a financially responsible plan for reconstruction in Iraq. It failed in its responsibilities to our troops in Iraq. Was it responsible to send American troops into Iraq without adequate planning, with tens of thousands of our troops without border armor, without an exit

strategy, without a realistic troop deployment and rotation schedule, without a plan to get them eventually back home? No, and that is why we support our troops and the Democratic proposal to improve the funds in this bill that go to protect them.

Our troops and the American people have paid the brunt of the cost in lives lost and resources spent. In our war on terror and our war in Iraq, they are looking for honest leadership and demand a realistic plan from this President.

So we must give our men and women in uniform the resources they need to do the job they have been given, and we must do all we can to return them to their families quickly and safely. It does not mean cutting and running, but it does mean protecting them while they are there and finding a plan to have them ultimately exit and to bring more people from the international community to bear in Iraq.

However, our troops should not be held hostage to an outright grant for Iraq's reconstruction, and I bristle when I hear already the beginnings of suggestions that question those who have a different view. We demand an opportunity to vote for the money for our troops and at the same time to limit the unbridled grant money to fund reconstruction in Iraq.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this supplemental appropriations legislation as a necessary component in our efforts to liberate the nation of Iraq and continue our successful fight against terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, over the past month, the American people have been bombarded by a very negative portrayal of our efforts in Iraq. However, as we have heard from so many of our colleagues who have recently visited Iraq, these media portrayals are far from the truth.

We are winning the war on terror, and we are setting people free. America is building a free Iraq, and this supplemental funding measure is part of America's exit strategy. A strategy that will see a new Iraq (founded on freedom and democracy) flourish in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, I am a fiscal conservative, and the thought on spending \$87 billion on anything gives me pause. The concept of turning some of this funding into a loan appears to be a sound one, but one we will have time to discuss as this debate continues. However, this spending measure is an investment in the peace and stability of our world. We cannot put a price tag on peace, and we cannot turn our back on freedom.

Our own American history should be the book we study from. When President Harry Truman came to Congress with his Marshall Plan proposal, the price tag, for the times, was staggering indeed.

However, it was not the price tag that Congress finally looked at—it was the mission at hand that drove support for this plan. It was the rebuilding of the post World War II world, in an effort to restore peace to the planet, that drove Congress to support this measure.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has a similar opportunity, to rebuild a nation that will represent freedom and democracy while bringing stability to a very tumultuous and dangerous part of the world.

We have a very unique opportunity in front of us. We have the opportunity to invest in freedom, and to set men free. Most importantly, we can take proactive steps necessary to stabilize a region that presents a great danger to our Nation, and the well-being of our people.

Mr. Chairman, we will be making history with this vote. We will be sending a message to terrorists that America has no intention of allowing the fight against terrorism to be fought on our streets and in our neighborhoods.

We will also be sending a message to the world that we are a nation of peace, and Iraqi liberation in the pursuit of freedom is a component of our democratic principles.

Congress has a responsibility to protect our people, and to promote freedom and democracy worldwide. This supplemental helps move these responsibilities forward, and it is our duty to approve this legislation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the supplemental package and urge its prompt adoption. In fact, the sooner we pass this legislation and provide material support for our troops and begin rebuilding the Iraqi economy savaged by decades of Saddam Hussein's corrupt rule, the sooner our dedicated service personnel will come home with their mission accomplished.

I have just returned from Iraq with a number of my colleagues as part of a fact-finding trip led by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense. We visited with our troops. These brave young men and women are proud of what they are doing and know that it is important to our national security. Of course, we mourn the loss of any American soldiers' lives, and we pray for the early recovery of our wounded. We are forever in their debt and reject the mindless notion of some that their sacrifice has been in vain.

Since my return, I have also been struck by the stark contrast between the reality of the success of our military and civilian missions in Iraq and the stubborn perception that we are failing there. It is not true.

I am also one who strongly objects to the notion held by some that our involvement in Iraq does not count for

something. Our involvement does count. The world and our homeland are safer for Saddam's removal. There is a better life for the Iraqi people after 30 years of oppression and torture and killing. Our involvement there and the sacrifices of our soldiers count for something. The reality is encouraging.

Two hundred and forty hospitals are now operating, and 90 percent of the medical clinics are now reopened. A hundred primary schools and 22 universities have been rehabilitated and reopened this month. More than 55,000 Iraqi police officers are better trained and back to work, and they are being trained by the Coalition Provisional Authority in professional policing, including border security and human rights. Over 4,000 Iraqis are working side by side with coalition soldiers as part of the Civil Defense Corps, and the CPA is working to field 27 battalions of a new Iraqi Army.

Among the most hopeful signs, and we saw it firsthand, were the fact that 90 percent of the cities, towns and villages in Iraq are now governed by elected or appointed local councils, representing, indeed, diverse ethnic groups and religious groups from across the country. Clearly, there is hope growing in Iraq.

Thankfully, the Coalition Provisional Authority, working with military and civilian officials of more than 30 nations, have been working hard to improve the quality of life and deliver much-needed assistance, and now we debate the supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan.

As we know, more than 60 percent of these funds will go to support the efforts of our young men and women in uniform, including extra combat pay, stronger physical protection, better-quality housing, and most importantly, enhanced intelligence gathering and the equipment that includes the latest technology to win the war on terrorism.

I am grateful, as all Members are, that we will now be providing, with these new funds, more money for body armor, radio jammers and reinforced Humvees. These are concrete steps to protect the well-being of our soldiers. The remaining funds will go towards creating conditions on the ground in Iraq that will enable our troops to succeed in their mission.

This supplemental is needed.

□ 2000

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. This debate tonight is not about support of our troops. There is not a Member of Congress that does not support our troops. And it is not about national security. It is about one thing. It is about politics. And I say that for three reasons:

First of all, the timing. It was just a year ago that we were rushed to judgment to give the President the authority to unilaterally invade Iraq, at a time when the U.N. inspectors were saying give us more time; we have not found weapons of mass destruction. If they are there, give us more time to look for them, which had the support of the international community. But why was that vote passed a year ago today? Because it was on the eve of the November elections and the President wanted the vote before the November elections so he could use it in the campaigns.

We followed that vote last spring with a \$78 billion supplemental request. That money does not run out until next April. In the defense appropriations bill, we put enough money in for the troops, so why now? Why have this vote now? Could it be the rush to judgment this year is to get it as far away from the next November elections? Because if we went to next spring, there may not be national support for this bill. I think today is a sure rush to judgment, and I do not think we need to do that. We need to prove to the world that we have a workable plan.

The second is capacity. Where is the building of Iraq capacity? Look at the number of idle people in Iraq, unpaid. Yet American contractors are rushing in on American salaries and American consultant fees who require protection of American troops in order to do the American work in Iraq. We ought to be spending that money on building the capacity for the Iraqis to do it, not for American corporations.

And lastly, the contracting. These are emergency appropriations. They are asking that we forego the regular corporate way of giving out contracts. There is no transparency. This is a gift of funds to American companies, not to Iraqi people.

This Emergency Appropriations bill can't be called the "Iraq bailout bill" when the contracts only go to businesses friendly to the partisan interests of the White House.

The money doesn't go to Iraq, it goes to K Street. It goes to American companies that pay U.S. consultant wages, not the wages earned by Iraqis.

Timing is not necessary, its political capacity building for Iraq is not planned. Contracts don't help earn friends but create animosity.

I have and will continue to vote against the wrong approach to winning peace in the Middle East.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this supplemental emergency appropriations bill. I too went to Iraq 3 weeks ago to see for myself, and I think we all need to go and see for ourselves the progress that is being made. I would like to give a few of my observations.

As we flew low over the country in our helicopter, I saw that there is more

water than I would have imagined and more agriculture. The other thing is that the farmers and the children out in the country always waved at the helicopter. That was the military helicopter with a machine gunner on each window. They did not know there were Congressmen in there, but the machine gunner waved back.

As we went through Iraq, the people waved at us. They stood; they smiled. I have a pretty good idea of body language, and 70 percent of the people in that country are delighted we are there.

Mr. Chairman, we found and deposed the greatest weapon of mass destruction that this world has known since Hitler and Stalin. Go to the burying fields at al-Hilla, with the mass graves, where they have buried hundreds of thousands of people who were marched into a pit and mowed down with a machine gun and covered over with a bulldozer, whether they were alive or dead, and you understand what went on in that country.

We talked to the doctors and the hospital administrators and the keepers of the graves and the operators of the power plant. These are people striving to get back on their feet, and they need our help. This will be one of the greatest things that we have done in our term in Congress, not only to support our troops but to support the putting back together of Iraq, putting it back together from the damages inflicted on it by Saddam Hussein, because the damage inflicted by our military on structures is very small.

This money in the supplemental will do more for the safety of our troops and the safety of our citizens than most anything we could do. It is hard to comment on some of the things that have been said tonight; they are so ridiculous. We are on a path with a good plan. It is being carried out by young men and women of intense bravery whom we can be very proud of and we need to support them.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Two-run homer by Boston. They are ahead by three in the ninth.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and leader, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I wish he had not told me that, because now that is all I can think of.

But I am going to begin by quoting the dissenting views of the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), because it states the reason for voting for this supplemental better than anything that I have heard stated before. It says, "The Bush administration is still incapable or unwilling to articulate a coherent and workable underlying strategy to accomplish our mission and bring our

troops home. Since the power of the purse remains the only effective means that we in the Congress have to ensure the American people that such a strategy exists, and that it has a reasonable chance for success, support for these funds prior to evidence of such a strategy would be an abdication of responsibility." And it will be an abdication if this supplemental passes.

We had any number of hearings in the appropriation subcommittees before this bill went to the full committee. Administration witnesses time and again told us they could not comment on a time frame to transition to decision-making with Iraqi leaders, which was the original intent, to establish a democratic government. They had no idea how many troops would be required beyond next September. They could not guess as to what contributions in terms of military assistance or cash would be forthcoming from other nations. They had no idea how much additional Iraqi reconstruction money would be requested. And they had no idea how Iraqi deployment might affect long-term priorities within the defense budget.

Yet we are asked to support an \$87 billion request. This entire venture has been a pattern of deception. We went into this war unilaterally and prematurely based upon that pattern of deception. If anyone should challenge me, I can give three instances. We were told we had to go to war immediately, with or without our allies, because of Saddam's connection to, and I quote our President, "because of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001." President Bush has now admitted we had no evidence, and I am quoting again, "no evidence of such a connection."

Our Vice President said, and I am quoting, "Saddam has reconstituted nuclear weapons." Now Mr. CHENEY admits, "I did misspeak."

Secretary Rumsfeld told us that "we know where the weapons of mass destruction are. They are around Tikrit and Baghdad." They were not there.

I could go on and on, but the fact is that we have no reason to truly trust even that this money is going to be used for the purposes for which it is intended, to support our troops, to do the right thing, and then to get out of Iraq and protect our country from future threats. I ask the American people to look at the dissenting views of the leader of the Democrats on the Committee on Appropriations.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, this supplemental, if it is granted, leaves 80 percent of our troops in Iraq without clean water. We provided over \$60 billion for our troops, yet they could not find a few million dollars to provide all of our troops with Kevlar jackets. 46,000 of them went into battle without body armor. They could not protect the vehicles that they were driving for a few million dollars. They could not give them hand-held devices for remotely controlled explosive devices.

They did not do that because they knew they would use it as leverage to

get this supplemental. Vote down this supplemental. Teach them that that is not the right way to conduct business.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), another member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for this supplemental funding. Like some of the other speakers we have heard tonight, I returned from Iraq just 2 weeks ago. I was part of a congressional delegation, a bipartisan delegation, that came from all sorts of views. Some had strongly supported the resolution, some strongly spoke out against it, others were more cautious, and some questioned why now and how much. But I can say from that bipartisan congressional delegation, we came back and unanimously said, after seeing it, we truly understand, first of all, what is being done there and how well it is being done.

It is startling, startling, Mr. Chairman, the contrast in what we saw and what we hear here; what the American people hear and the people all over the world hear, because it is not at all what we saw.

First of all, it is startling because of Saddam Hussein's presence, his palaces, the gilding, the money that has been socked away, and then of course the mass graves that we have heard about today. The one we went to had 3,000 bodies that were discovered, the remains of men, women, and children as young as 2 years of age, shot in the back of the head and dumped in those mass graves. Some were not shot. Perhaps they ran out of ammunition, perhaps they got tired and they just threw them living into those graves.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we saw the citizens, citizens living in poverty and citizens who had lived in terror for years. And I object to the term rebuilding, because people think, when we say rebuilding, it is what we destroyed. That is not the situation at all. What we are doing is building, because we went to a country that was not without assets. In fact, the oil reserves were second only to Saudi Arabia. But we had a leader who would not put those assets back into his own country. Instead, he stole those assets and used them to buy guns, but he did not keep up the infrastructure of his country.

We visited, for instance, a power plant, unlike any I have ever seen, because it was held together by rope and hope and rust. The engines themselves, the plant itself was so badly in need of not repair, but in need of a new facility.

We went to a hospital, the largest in Baghdad. We went to a maternity ward, and I have never seen equipment like that in my lifetime, perhaps in old movies of World War I or World War II; but I saw terrible conditions, where the roof was leaking so much there was water on the floor. We went to a neonatal unit where a child died that day because we saw such terrible equipment. No backup. They had electricity

that was on 3 hours, off 3 hours. We saw a country where, with all those assets, they should have had a modern hospital; instead they had infant mortality as high as India. So I am absolutely in support of this.

We did have a stunning military victory, but we have not finished the job. We owe it to the men and women in that country, from our country and the Coalition forces that have lost their lives in Iraq, to keep our promise and to say we will let you finish the job.

The most telling comment was that of General Sanchez, when he said, "We will not win this militarily. We will win it by winning the hearts and the minds of the Iraqi people." So we need to keep our promises and let them enjoy and understand some of what we have in this country: the freedom, the opportunity, the ability to pursue the happiness that they have not had. It is that possibility, the possibility of having that in that part of the world which will be a real victory, because they can understand what we enjoy and they can be a part of that.

So this supplemental has my very strong support. I went back to my district and told everyone, this is what you need to know, because it is not what you are hearing anywhere else.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute to the bill that is before us that was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in the Committee on Appropriations. The Obey substitute was rejected then and will likely be ruled out of order tomorrow. That is unfortunate, because the Obey substitute offers a plan for fixing the chaos in post-war Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, the war on Iraq was a war of choice, not of necessity. The administration's two primary reasons for this war, Saddam Hussein's alleged weapons of mass destruction and his alleged links to al Qaeda, were both deliberately exaggerated to build support for that war. No weapons of mass destruction will be found, and the President himself has now downplayed the alleged link between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda.

If the aftermath of the war were going well, Americans would probably overlook the deliberately misrepresented intelligence on Iraq's weapons and its ties to al Qaeda. Now, as Americans are killed almost every day, it is clear that winning the peace will be a long, difficult, and expensive process; and people are questioning how we got where we are today.

□ 2015

The American people are learning that the President's insistence on a unilateral war means that we will pay for a unilateral peace. There is popular opposition to the President's request for so much money for Iraq. This year

America will run the largest deficit in our history, over \$475 billion, without even including this \$87 billion request for Iraq. The \$87 billion that we are debating today is money that would have been better used to create jobs and improve health care and education for Americans here at home. The Obey substitute is an excellent proposal that provides the body armor, the equipment and adequate pure drinking water that our troops need to finish their jobs and return home quickly and safely. The Obey substitute makes our troops safer. The Obey substitute insists on accountability and transparency for the expenditure of reconstruction dollars, and it encourages support from other nations, thereby reducing the burden on American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the President's war on Iraq, but I support the Obey substitute because it makes better use of our limited resources.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Green Bay, Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN). Few Members of this body have a greater appreciation or understanding of America's role in the world, for he himself was a former Peace Corps member.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman both for yielding time and for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that this bill that we are debating tonight spends a lot of money. There is no doubt that the costs of war are high. There is no doubt that the costs of reconstruction are high. But I think the point we need to remember is that the costs of inaction, the costs of leaving Iraq behind are far greater and, more importantly, the costs of failing to give our troops what they need as quickly as possible, those costs are absolutely unacceptable.

Some here tonight will try to break the package apart and make a false distinction, a distinction between military assistance and reconstruction assistance. They claim they support one but not the other, and they will try to put strings on one and not the other. Mr. Chairman, that approach is wrong and what is more, it is dangerously wrong. The mission in Iraq from a military perspective will only end when freedom and democracy have begun to take root, when the economy is starting to move, when there is some semblance of hope restored into Iraq. Those goals collectively represent an antidote to terrorism.

The reconstruction dollars that we are talking about tonight, in my view, will help us achieve those goals and achieve them much more quickly. Therefore, the reconstruction dollars will bring about final victory to Iraq more quickly, they will bring our mission to a close and just as importantly, of course, to everyone back home, they will bring our troops back safe and sound. On the other hand, failing to approve reconstruction dollars or

hamstringing our ability to use it will extend the mission. It will delay it. It will lengthen the time line. Worse yet, it will, in my view, weaken the mission. It will foster the fear that America will withdraw or walk away, a fear that is very real to everyday Iraqis, a fear that will only increase despair and steal hope from them at the very time when hope is just beginning to appear. It will make the mission of our troops all that much more dangerous.

Iraq has become, in my view, the central battle in the war against terrorism. We have received many reports of terrorists entering Iraq from countries throughout the region. We must remember that they are entering Iraq not because we are failing, but because we are winning, because we are succeeding. This is the time we must push on, we must build on that mission, we must give our diplomats, we must give our soldiers, we must give the leaders the tools and the resources they need to finish this job. To fail to give this money to our troops, to fail to give money to reconstruction that they are overseeing would strengthen the hands of those who want us to fail.

We must live up to our responsibilities. We must not abandon the Iraqis. We must not abandon our troops. I strongly support this supplemental. It is critically important, and it is important we get it done now.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the distinguished ranking member from Wisconsin for yielding me this time, and I appreciate his leadership in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no doubt that we support the troops and support whatever resources they need. Clearly the Defense Department and the Secretary of Defense have done a terrible job preparing to go into this mission. Just yesterday, I saw on television where the administration says America is not being told the truth. I could not agree more. Just yesterday, I saw where the President now says that he is in charge. That is about the third boss in a week that we have had over this project. He says that debt for Iraq is bad, debt for America is good. The truth is Iraq can afford to pay this debt off more than we can. I can tell you this. The miscalculations, the poor planning, say anything we can dream up to try to make the American people think that this is a good idea, change stories every week and now we are asked to give this same administration that has engaged in this another \$87 billion with no plan, no requirement for us to know how this money is going to be spent, and, clearly, they have not known how to spend it before now.

I can tell you this, Mr. Chairman. In the First Congressional District of Arkansas, if you spend a billion dollars, you do not have to wonder how it got spent. You can drive down the road and

see it. It takes us a long time to make a billion dollars in the First Congressional District of Arkansas. It has been referred to that they have got hospitals in Iraq that have leaky roofs, that they have hospitals in Iraq that do not have backup generators. Come to the First Congressional District of Arkansas, and I can show you the same thing. There is simply no reason to borrow this money from our children and our grandchildren and expect them to repay this debt when we have the ability. If we are going to do this, we should at the very least pay for it ourselves. But I have to tell you, I think the Iraqi people ought to pay for it or at least pay for part of it. I urge the defeat of this bill and the support of the Obey amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from LeMoyne, Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone that I know in this body agonizes over an additional \$87 billion supplemental spending bill. No one is real happy about it. While we may disagree on some of the details, I hope that we can agree on two things. Number one, we are engaged in a conflict that we cannot afford to lose. Whatever it takes to win needs to be done. And, number two, more than ever, we need to display a unity of purpose and a common resolve in this body that we may not have seen since 9/11.

Our opponents believe that persistent acts of terrorism will eventually prevail. They saw internal strife that resulted in failure in Vietnam. They saw us leave Beirut after a truck bomb destroyed a Marine barracks. They saw us relocate troops after the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia. And, unfortunately, they also see partisanship, and they see discord, and they see finger-pointing on the floor of this House at a time when this country cannot afford that. And so they see us as a Nation which can be divided. If we pull out, if we back down, if we give up, if we fail to see this through, every soldier that has died in Iraq will have died in vain, and we will have sent a clear signal to terrorists everywhere that we are an easy target. We will have shown that the U.S. no longer has the national resolve demonstrated at Valley Forge, at Gettysburg, at The Argonne, and on D-Day. When the stakes are high and when the task is daunting, and this is, commitment, perseverance and unity of purpose eventually prevail. I urge approval of the supplemental, and I hope that this can be accomplished with a spirit of bipartisan cooperation that displays a united front to the world.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposal for \$87 billion and in support of the Obey substitute. \$87 billion

translates into 1,720,000 jobs in this country. That is how big \$87 billion is. This administration was unwilling to spend a few billion in our country this year to create jobs in America as unemployment—ticks up. Yet they are willing to spend \$87 billion and add that to our deficit. This year this administration will have the largest deficit in modern history. This proposal is fiscally irresponsible. \$87 billion is as much as we spend on all our foreign aid, plus \$68 billion. It is more than we spend on all the countries of the world rolled together. It is as much as we spend in one year on our entire budget for housing, for veterans, for NASA, for transportation, for environment, all rolled into one. This is a lot of money. In fact, it is as much money as our States were in deficit earlier this year before they had to raise taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes to cut services.

This morning the Detroit News reports, Michigan has to cut \$900 million from its State budget. They do not have the money. My own newspaper this morning, Lucas County, my home county, \$10 million in deficit for this year. They are cutting services for first responders. And where are we from this administration to help us at the local level? And the Cleveland paper over the weekend, what does \$87 billion mean? It means that the Mayor of Cleveland needs over \$2 billion just to take care of the homeless in Cleveland, and she does not have the money to do it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a lot of money, and it averages \$3,000 for each Iraqi citizen. Maybe we would be wiser just to give them the money. Three thousand dollars per citizen. I have in my hand here a picture of our soldiers handing out \$20 bills in Iraq. I have never seen anything like this. Are we creating a modern version of the welfare state over in the Middle East? Pallets of \$100 bills being sent over to Iraq, what is that all about?

Secretary Rumsfeld said, "I don't know that there is much reconstruction to do." Why, then, is this the second time the administration has asked Congress for money to support this war? The administration cannot even agree on who is supposed to take the lead in Iraq. We were told it was Secretary Rumsfeld; then it switched to Mr. Bremer; and then General Abizaid and now Condoleezza Rice. It seems to me they are making it up as it goes along and attacks are increasing every day inside Iraq.

We need global allies to stabilize the situation. The administration continues to go it alone. Relations with our NATO allies have never been worse. The road map for peace in Israel and the Palestinian Authority has utterly broken down and the madrassas in Pakistan continue to churn out hate-filled youth every day.

I intend to vote "no" on this bill. It is not paid for. The administration has to develop a plan that stands a chance of succeeding by engaging both the Arab world and our allies. We need a

plan before us that is fiscally responsible and diplomatically hopeful.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to one thing that was said here.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio made note of the fact that we were actually handing out cash in Iraq and wondering what the heck that was for and how we could account for that. I think it is worth noting that a couple of years ago, when I visited Mozambique after the huge, horrendous floods there, we found that a very creative and innovative way of actually providing for relief from the flood, instead of going around and handing out pots and pans or aluminum or wood for rebuilding their house, to give them actually cash and they made decisions about how they would use it. We gave it to the woman of the household. It turned out to be a very creative and innovative way of handling immediate kinds of relief.

□ 2030

Apparently what was creative and innovative in the previous administration is now a bad thing in this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Watertown, Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, we are hearing two sides of a story here. On one side we are hearing doom and gloom. On the other side from folks like myself who have had a chance to go over to Iraq, we are hearing a story that there is much more progress there than the press is reporting. There are much greater prospects there if we just take the time to finish the job and invest in this country.

And what I would like to do today to try to shed some more light on that is quote from an article that was e-mailed to me by a constituent, a Major Cepelche who is serving in Iraq. I am just going to quote an excerpt from the article, but I will include the whole article in the RECORD.

What it says is: "Over 3 months after a formal declaration of an end to hostilities, the occupation is bogged down. Fanatical elements of the former . . . regime who, in their zeal to liberate their nation from the foreign occupiers . . . continue to commit almost-daily acts of sabotage against an already-ravaged infrastructure, and attack American troops." It also says that many complain of a lack of security, that in the wake of the budding disaster, some have called for more international participation in peacekeeping.

It goes on to say: ". . . It's time to ask whether the people are better off now than they were a few months ago. Yes, a brutal dictator has been deposed, but at least the electricity and water supply were mostly working." It says: "Many have criticized flawed intelligence for our failure," and finally says: "Without this man that they told us was such a great threat to America,

how can they even claim that this war was justified?"

Mr. Chairman, this sounds like a lot of the things that are being said here today by some others talking tonight, but this was really a 1945 article that Reuters wrote about Germany during the time of America's reconstruction of Germany. We all know that Germany was a success. It was a success because America's troops were there to bring stability and security because we invested through the Marshall Plan in reconstructing Germany. If we think about Germany in the 50 years before 1945 that helped contribute to starting two world wars that caused millions of deaths, in the 50 years since then they have been a great friend, a supporter, and have brought prosperity and peace to the region.

We are well ahead of Germany in our reconstruction of Iraq in so many important variables such as naming a cabinet, such as reforming the currency and so many other things. Reforming Iraq, having a democratic government there and an open economy can transform that region; and that will not only be a great benefit to that region but a great benefit to our security here at home. Let us continue America's proud tradition of reforming as we did in Germany and Japan and continue on in Iraq; and I am confident that when we look back in a decade or two from now, we will be proud of the work that we are authorizing here today. I encourage support of the amendment.

[From Reuters, Aug. 12, 1945]

ADMINISTRATION IN CRISIS OVER BURGEONING QUAGMIRE

WASHINGTON.—President Truman, just a few months into his young presidency, is coming under increasing fire from some Congressional Republicans for what appears to be a deteriorating security situation in occupied Germany, with some calling for his removal from office.

Over three months after a formal declaration of an end to hostilities, the occupation is bogged down. Fanatical elements of the former Nazi regime who, in their zeal to liberate their nation from the foreign occupiers, call themselves members of the Werwolf (werewolves) continue to commit almost-daily acts of sabotage against Germany's already-ravaged infrastructure, and attack American troops. They have been laying road mines, poisoning food and water supplies, and setting various traps, often lethal, for the occupying forces.

It's not difficult to find antagonism and anti-Americanism among the population—many complain of the deprivation and lack of security. There are thousands of homeless refugees, and humanitarian efforts seem confused and inadequate.

In the wake of the budding disaster, some have called for more international participation in peacekeeping.

A Red Cross official said that, "... the German people will be more comfortable if their conquerors weren't now their overlords. It makes it difficult to argue that this wasn't an imperialistic war when the occupying troops in the western sector are exclusively American, British and French."

The administration, of course, claims that, given the chaos of the recent war, such a situation is to be expected, and that things will

improve with time. As to the suggestion to internationalize the occupying forces, the administration had no official comment, but an unofficial one was a repetition of the quote from General McAuliffe, when asked to surrender in last winter's Battle of the Bulge—"Nuts."

In an attempt to minimize the situation, a White House spokesman pointed out that the casualties were extremely light, and militarily inconsequential, particularly when compared to the loss rates prior to VE Day. Also, the attacks seem to be dying down with each passing month. But this statement was leaped upon by some as heartless, trivializing the deaths and injuries of young American men.

Many critics back in Washington seem now to be prescient with their previous warnings of just such an outcome a little over a year ago.

One congressman said that "... It's time to ask whether the German people are better off now than they were a few months ago. Yes, a brutal dictator has been deposed, but at least the electricity and water supply were mostly working, and the trains running on time. After years of killing them and destroying their infrastructure with American bombs, it seems to me that the German people have suffered enough without the chaos that our occupation with its inadequate policing, is bringing."

It's not clear how much support the Werwolf has among the populace, who may be afraid to speak their true minds, given the fearfully overwhelming "Allied" presence in the country. But it is possible that, like the guerrilla forces themselves, the people have been inspired by Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels' pre-victory broadcasts, and those of Radio Werwolf.

"God has given up the protection of the people ... Satan has taken command." Goebbels broadcast last spring. "We Werwolves consider it our supreme duty to kill, to kill and to kill, employing every cunning and wile in the darkness of the night, crawling, groping through towns and villages, like wolves, noiselessly, mysteriously..."

While no new broadcasts of Goebbels' voice have been heard since early May, no one can be certain as to whether he is alive or dead, and continuing to help orchestrate the attacks and boost morale among the forces for German liberation. As long as his fate, and more importantly, that of the former leader Adolf Hitler himself, remains unresolved, the prospects for pacifying the brutally conquered country may be dim.

Although Grand-Admiral Donitz made a radio announcement of Hitler's brave death in battle to the beleaguered German people on the evening of May 1, some doubt the veracity of that statement, and there has been no evidence to support it, or any body identified as the former Fuehrer's. Rumors of his whereabouts continue to abound, including reported sightings as far away as South America, and many still believe that he is hiding with the "Edelweiss" organization, with thousands of Wehrmacht troops, in a mountain stronghold near the Swiss border.

Many have criticized flawed intelligence for our failure to find him, causing some, in the runup to next year's congressional elections, to call for an investigation.

A staffer of one prominent Senator said, "For months, starting last fall, we were told by this administration that Hitler would make a last stand in a 'National Redoubt' in Bavaria. General Bradley diverted troops to the south and let the Russians take Berlin on the basis of this knowledge. But now we find out that there was no such place, and that Hitler was in Berlin all along. And now we're told that we can't even be sure of where he is, or whether he's alive or dead."

For many, marching in the streets with signs of "No Blood For Soviet Socialism," and "It's All About The Coal," this merely confirmed that the administration had other agendas than its stated one, and that the war was unjustified and unjustifiable.

General Bradley's staff has protested that this is an unfair criticism—that the strategic decision made by General Eisenhower was driven by many factors, of which Hitler's whereabouts was a minor one, but this hasn't silenced the critics, some of whom have bravely called for President Truman's impeachment, despite the fact that most of these decisions were made even before he became president in April.

But some have taken the criticism further, and say that failure to get Hitler means a failed war itself.

"Sure, it's nice to have released all those people from the concentration camps, but we were told we were going to war against Hitler, even though he'd done nothing to us," argued one concerned anti-war Senator. "Now they say that we have 'Victory in Europe,' but it seems to me that if they can't produce the man we supposedly went to war against, it's a pretty hollow victory. Without this man that they told us was such a great threat to America, how can even they claim that this war was justified?"

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under further debate the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR 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. 108-320) on the resolution (H. Res. 396) providing for 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.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 14, 2003, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan