

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan, Tsunami Relief, and Other Activities

Updated April 19, 2005

Amy Belasco
Specialist in National Defense
Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division

Larry Nowels
Specialist in Foreign Affairs
Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division

FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan, Tsunami Relief, and Other Activities

Summary

On February 14, 2005, President Bush submitted an \$81.9 billion supplemental appropriation request for FY2005 (subsequently amended to total \$82.04 billion) to provide funds for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the “global war on terror,” reconstruction in Afghanistan, Tsunami relief and rehabilitation, and other activities. As the fifth supplemental of the Bush Administration to focus on the “global war on terrorism” and homeland security, these supplemental funds for FY2005 would be in addition to the \$25.7 billion received in August 2004 as part of the FY2005 DOD Appropriations Act to cover war-related costs for the initial months of the fiscal year (P.L. 108-287).

The Administration’s request includes \$74.96 billion for the Department of Defense, \$5.6 billion for reconstruction and other foreign aid, \$950 million for Tsunami relief, and \$770 million for other activities. If enacted as an emergency appropriation, as requested, the funds would not be subject to limits in annual budget resolutions but would add to the size of the U.S. budget deficit. Taking into account the funds already provided, DOD’s request would bring its FY2005 total appropriation to about \$100 billion, which is over 45% higher than the amount provided in the FY2004 supplemental (P.L. 108-106).

While OMB Director Joshua Bolten argues that the request is an emergency supplemental for “known and urgent requirements,” that cannot be met with existing funds, some Members have questioned whether this characterization fits some elements in the request. Some have questioned whether the \$5 billion requested in the supplemental by the Defense Department for the Army’s initiative to re-organize Army units is an unanticipated emergency request since it was announced in the fall of 2003; others argue that the initiative is a war-related expense because it is expected to relieve war-induced stress on Army forces. For foreign aid and Iraq diplomatic facilities, the issue is whether the requests represent true emergencies or could wait for later consideration. If not dealt with in the FY2005 supplemental under an “emergency” designation, however, these foreign policy items could be added to the pending FY2006 international affairs appropriation bills and would place additional pressure on the Administration to defend an already sizable foreign policy increase proposed for next year.

Another controversial issue is the Administration’s proposal to place policy authority and control of funding with the Defense Department rather than the State Department to train and equip Afghan and Iraqi security forces. The Administration is also requesting \$400 million for contingency funds related to the war on terror and \$200 million in aid to the Palestinian Authority, both of which have raised concerns.

The House passed H.R. 1268 on March 16, approving \$81.4 billion in supplemental funding. The Senate bill, reported on April 6, provides \$80.6 billion.

This report will be updated to reflect legislative action.

Contents

Most Recent Developments	1
Overview and Context of the FY2005 Supplemental	2
Previous Funding for the “Global War on Terror”	2
Main Elements in the FY2005 Request	5
Defense Request	5
Foreign Policy Request	5
Other Supplemental Requests	6
Immigration Provisions	7
Craig Amendment, AgJOBS bill	7
Chambliss Amendment	7
Mikulski Amendment	8
Congressional Action	8
Cross-Cutting Issues in the FY2005 Supplemental	8
Iraq and Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	8
Congressional Action	10
Supplemental Requests that May Fail to Meet the “Emergency” Test	11
Congressional Action	12
Defense Department Request and Congressional Review	13
Senate Floor Debate on Defense Request	14
Expanding Military Benefits	14
Other Actions	14
Pending Amendments	15
House and Senate Action on Defense Request	16
Shifts in Funding for Various Defense Accounts	16
Enhancing Death Benefits	16
House Floor Debate on the Defense Request	17
Future Cost and Accountability Issues	18
Congressional Action	19
Size and Composition of DOD Request	21
Congressional Action — House and Senate Fund Personnel and Operations	24
Higher Survivor Benefits	24
Congressional Action — House and Senate Expand Eligibility	25
Recapitalization, Modularity and Construction Costs Grow	28
Procurement and Modularity Requests	28
Military Construction Request	29
Congressional Action — Approach to Procurement Differs	29
Congressional Action — Military Construction Concerns	30
New Flexible Accounts to Train and Equip Afghan and Iraqi Security Forces	31
Congressional Action — House and Senate Bills Add Oversight Mechanisms	33
Flexible Funds to Provide Support to Allies	33
Congressional Action — House Cuts and Senate Supports Request ..	34

DOD Request for FY2005 by Appropriation Account	34
Foreign Policy Supplemental Request and Congressional Review	40
House and Senate Action — Summary	40
U.S. Diplomatic and USAID Operations in Iraq	43
Congressional Action	44
Afghanistan Reconstruction, Counternarcotics, Police Training, and Other Activities	44
Congressional Action	46
Sudan North-South Peace Support	46
Congressional Action	47
Darfur Region and Eastern Chad	47
Congressional Action	47
Global War on Terrorism-Related Programs	48
Congressional Action	50
U.N. Peacekeeping Operations	50
Congressional Action	50
Palestinian Aid	51
Congressional Action	51
Ukraine Aid	52
Congressional Action	52
Broadcasting to Arab and Muslim Audiences	52
Congressional Action	52
Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization	53
Congressional Action	53
Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction	53
Congressional Action	53

List of Tables

Table 1. Main Elements in FY2005 Emergency Supplemental	4
Table 2. Defense-Related Amendments: Senate Floor	15
Table 3. Defense-Related Amendments: House Floor	18
Table 4. DOD Funding: FY2004 Enacted and FY2005 Request	23
Table 5. Proposed Changes in Death Benefits for Active-Duty Servicemembers	27
Table 6. Defense Department FY2005 Supplemental Request and Prior Funding	36
Table 7. Foreign Policy Budget, FY2001-FY2006	40
Table 8. Foreign Policy Amendments: House Floor	41
Table 9. Foreign Policy Funds in FY2005 Supplemental	55

FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan, Tsunami Relief, and Other Activities

Most Recent Developments

On April 11, 2005, the Senate began debate on H.R. 1268, which provides \$80.6 billion, about \$1.46 billion less than the President's \$82 billion request and \$785 million below the House-passed level. After several days of debate, the Senate has added amendments to broaden eligibility for benefits for survivors of active-duty members who die and adopted various other amendments. In the past few days, debate has centered on immigration measures, primarily proposals to change programs for foreign temporary workers.¹ On April 19, the Senate failed to invoke cloture and limit debate on the Craig and Chambliss amendments, alternative proposals to allow more immigrants to work legally in U.S. agriculture. A cloture vote on the Mikulski amendment that would increase the number of visas for seasonal workers is expected later today, as is a cloture vote on the bill itself. Numerous other amendments have been filed, and debate is expected to continue until the end of the week.

The House approved its bill on March 16. The Senate measure reduces the requested defense-related portion of H.R. 1268 slightly (\$392 million) to \$74.56 billion, while the House adds \$1.86 billion to the defense spending request. The Senate Committee bill falls about \$315 million below the President's \$6.3 billion foreign aid and State Department proposals, while the House measure cuts these programs by nearly \$1.4 billion. A key difference between the House and Senate bills is the Senate support for most of the funds sought for a new U.S. embassy in Iraq. The House measure includes a provision banning use of funds for embassy construction. Both bills offset some costs by rescinding \$1 billion in previously appropriated economic aid for Turkey.

H.R. 1268, as passed by the House, also includes the text of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act of 2005, regarding immigration and identification-document security issues as approved by the House in February. H.R. 418 includes several provisions that may complicate final passage of the supplemental. These provisions include 1) setting minimum standards for state-issued drivers licenses that can be accepted for federal purposes (e.g. to board aircraft); 2) expanding the scope of terror-related activity that makes an alien inadmissible or deportable; and 3) allowing the Secretary

¹ CRS Report RL32044, *Immigration: Policy Considerations Related to Guest Worker Programs*, by Andorra Bruno.

of the Department of Homeland Security to waive all laws in order to construct barriers at U.S. borders.² Thus far, the Senate bill does not address this issue.

Overview and Context of the FY2005 Supplemental

The FY2005 supplemental is the fifth of the Bush administration to focus on the global war on terrorism and homeland security. As emergency funding, these requests have not been subject to limits on spending in annual budget resolutions. In the case of both foreign assistance and Defense Department appropriations, some funding to combat terrorism has been included in regular as well as previous supplemental appropriations acts.

Previous Funding for the “Global War on Terror”

Thus far, in response to Administration requests, Congress has provided \$268.7 billion in emergency supplemental funding for the “global war on terror,” including military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, enhanced security for defense installations, and foreign aid spending for reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan and related activities.³ If enacted, this request would bring the total amount of war-related funding in this administration to \$350.6 billion. The bulk of these funds have been and continue to be for military operations as the United States enters its fourth year of operations in Afghanistan and its third year of operations in Iraq.⁴

In addition to the FY2005 supplemental request, funds for the Department of Defense (DOD) have been provided for Iraq and Afghanistan and the “global war on terror” in four previous supplementals as well as regular appropriations acts.⁵ For DOD, funds provided by Congress for the period FY2001 thru FY2004 totaled \$176.2 billion. Congress also appropriated \$25 billion to cover war costs in the initial months of FY2005 as well as any shortfalls in FY2004. DOD obligated \$2 billion of those funds in FY2004. Thus, the total cost projected by DOD for FY2005 is \$98 billion — \$23 billion already provided and \$74.9 billion requested. That total is over 45% higher than the \$64.9 billion provided to DOD in the FY2004 Supplemental. If Congress provides the monies requested, DOD would have

² See CRS Report RL32754, *Analysis of Provisions in H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act of FY2005*, by Michael John Garcia, Mikyung Lee, Todd Tatelman, and Larry M. Eig.

³ This includes \$40 billion in P.L. 107-38 and P.L. 107-117, \$23.9 billion in P.L. 107-206, \$78.5 billion in P.L. 108-11, \$7.1 billion in P.L. 107-248, \$10 billion in P.L. 108-7, \$86.8 billion in P.L. 108-106, \$25.7 billion in P.L. 108-287, less rescission of \$3.5 billion in P.L. 108-87.

⁴ DOD’s war-related funding totals \$201.2 billion; see CRS Report RS21644, *The Cost of Operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Enhanced Security*, by Amy Belasco.

⁵ DOD received \$7.1 billion in the FY2003 DOD Appropriations Act, P.L. 107-248, \$10 billion in FY2003 Consolidated Appropriations Act, and \$25 billion in P.L. 108-287, the FY2005 DOD Appropriations.

received between FY2001 through FY2005, a total of \$276 billion for these missions.⁶

⁶ For more information on war costs, see CRS Report RS21644, *The Cost of Operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Enhanced Security*, by Amy Belasco.

Table 1. Main Elements in FY2005 Emergency Supplemental
(billions of dollars)

Department/Category	FY2005 Supplemental Request	House Passed	Senate Rept.
Supplemental TOTAL	82.04	81.37	80.58
Defense Total	74.96	76.82	74.56
Military personnel	16.87	17.07	17.53
Operation and Maintenance/other	32.88	32.47	32.25
Tsunami relief	0.23	0.23	0.23
Train and Equip Afghan Security Forces	1.29	1.29	1.29
Train and Equip Iraqi Security Forces	5.70	5.70	5.70
[Support for Allies] ^a	[2.00]	[1.50]	[1.97]
[Army and Marine Corps Restructuring] ^b	[5.30]	[5.30]	[5.30]
Procurement	16.14	18.23	15.87
Research, Dev., Test & Evaluation	0.46	0.51	0.55
Military Construction overseas	1.06	0.99	0.81
Military Construction in the United States ^c	0.34	0.34	0.34
Foreign Policy Total	6.29	3.92	4.98
Iraqi Embassy: mission ops & construction ^d	1.37	1.31	1.31
Afghan reconstruction, counternarcotics	2.05	1.41	2.05
Sudan/Darfur	0.34	0.38	0.34
Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction ^e	0.70	0.66	0.66
Aid to partners in global war on terrorism	0.75	0.35	0.59
Palestinian aid ^f	0.20	0.20	0.20
Other peacekeeping and foreign aid	0.88	0.62	0.84
Rescission prior foreign aid appropriations	-.	-1.00	-1.00
Other	0.79	0.63	1.05
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	0.11	0.11	0.11
Immigration and Customs	-.	-.	.28
Coast Guard	0.16	0.16	0.16
Dept of Justice: FBI, BATF, IG, US Marshals	0.08	0.08	0.08
DEA — Afghanistan	0.01	0.01	0.01
Tsunami warning system	0.02	0.02	0.03
Director of National Intelligence (DNI)	0.25	0.25	0.09
Capitol Police	0.06	-.	0.05
Natural disaster aid for Hawaii & elsewhere	-.	-.	0.18
HHS — vaccine production	-.	-.	0.01
Judiciary — additional case workload	0.10	-.	0.06
Rescissions	-.	-.	-0.01

Sources: OMB, Request for FY2005 Supplemental, February 14, 2005. [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/amendments/supplemental_2_14_05.pdf]; Department of Defense, FY2005 Supplemental request for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), and Operation Unified Assistance, February 2005 (hereinafter, DOD, FY2005 Justification). [http://www.dod.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2006/fy2005_supp.pdf]; OMB Request for FY2005 Supplemental for Legislative and Judicial Branches, March 2, 2005.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Figures in “[]” are subsets of other totals.

- a. Includes funds for coalition support for Jordan, Pakistan, and other countries aiding in the global war on terror, plus “lift and sustain” funds for unspecified allies.
- b. Total cost of Army modularity and Marine Corps restructuring, primarily procurement of equipment for new units; costs are included in the relevant appropriation title.
- c. Funding for military construction to support Army and Marine Corps restructuring.
- d. H.R. 1268, as passed by the House, includes \$592 million for a new U.S. embassy in Baghdad. However, an amendment adopted during floor debate prohibits the use of any funds in the bill for embassy security, construction, and maintenance.
- e. Excludes \$250 million in non-foreign policy funds.
- f. The Senate-reported bill includes \$150 million for the Palestinians and \$50 million for Israel.

On the foreign policy side, if enacted as proposed, the supplemental would increase the U.S. foreign policy budget from \$29.7 billion enacted in FY2005 to \$36 billion, an increase of 21%. It would also push the FY2005 amount above the \$33.6 billion international affairs budget request for FY2006. Except for FY2004, which included the \$18.5 billion Iraq reconstruction aid package, the FY2005 total — both enacted and the supplemental request — would represent the largest foreign policy budget, in real terms, since fiscal 1985, and be roughly 50% higher than the international affairs budget (nominal) immediately prior to the 9/11 attacks.

Main Elements in the FY2005 Request

Table 1 provides an overview of the request. This table does not include the funding already received by DOD for war-related costs for FY2005, which is shown in later tables.

Defense Request. The DOD request includes \$16.9 billion for military personnel and \$32.5 billion for operations and maintenance that together total \$44.9 billion. Of that total, about \$35.5 billion is directly associated with operations in Iraq and \$9.4 billion with Afghanistan according to the Defense Department justification material. In addition, the request includes \$5.7 billion to train and equip Iraq’s security forces and \$1.3 billion for Afghanistan’s security forces. Including those funds, the total for Iraq would be \$41.2 billion and for Afghanistan, \$10.7 billion.

DOD does not allocate the remaining funds by mission — e.g. for depot maintenance or recruiting and retention — nor does DOD allocate its procurement or Research, Development, Test & Evaluation request. About \$5 billion of DOD’s procurement request is for the Army’s modularity initiative, and the Marine Corps restructuring, which are both designed to create additional units, which can be more easily deployed independently. The remainder of DOD’s procurement is for a variety of items to upgrade primarily Army units, as well as \$2.7 billion for force protection items; the request also includes \$5.0 billion for classified programs (see **Table 1**).

Foreign Policy Request. The President’s request for \$6.3 billion in FY2005 supplemental funding would support a broad range of foreign policy activities:

- U.S. diplomatic costs in Iraq
- Afghanistan reconstruction and counternarcotics programs
- Darfur humanitarian relief and peace implementation aid for Sudan

- War on Terrorism assistance, including funds for Jordan and Pakistan
- Palestinian aid
- Ukraine assistance
- U.N. peacekeeping contributions
- Broadcasting programs in the Middle East
- Tsunami recovery and reconstruction

Other Supplemental Requests. The Administration's supplemental request also includes several additional items addressing homeland security and global war on terrorism matters:

- Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation — \$110 million for the deployment of radiation detection equipment and the training of law enforcement personnel at four overseas posts designed to provide officials with the means to detect, deter, and interdict illicit trafficking in nuclear and other radioactive materials.
- Coast Guard operating expenses — \$112 million to finance Coast Guard port security and law enforcement capabilities in the Persian Gulf, and \$49 million for acquisition, construction, and improvements for a major refit, renovation, and subsystem replacement of the Coast Guard's 110-foot Patrol Boats.
- FBI — \$80 million to expand the Terrorist Screening Center and to cover costs of FBI personnel stationed in Iraq.
- Drug Enforcement Administration — \$8 million to support DEA's participation in the Counternarcotics Implementation Plan for Afghanistan; and
- Director of National Intelligence (DNI) — \$250 million for additional personnel and a new building for the new DNI who is to oversee the intelligence budget.
- Capitol Police — \$60 million, as requested by the Legislative Branch.⁷
- The Judiciary — \$100 million, as requested by the Judiciary Branch, for costs associated with additional case workload.⁷

⁷ These requests were submitted on March 2, separate from the balance of the supplemental proposal.

Immigration Provisions⁸

The Administration did not include any immigration provisions in its requests, but in floor debate, the Senate is considering a variety of amendments with debate focusing on the following three proposals.

Craig Amendment, AgJOBS bill. Senator Larry Craig has offered an amendment to H.R. 1268 based upon S. 359, the “Agricultural Job Opportunities, Benefits, and Security Act of 2005” (AgJOBS bill). The Craig Amendment would streamline the process of bringing in foreign workers under the H-2A temporary agricultural worker program. The prospective employer would submit an application to the Department of Labor (DOL) containing required assurances (regarding the temporary or seasonal nature of the job, job offers to U.S. workers, etc.), with jobs covered by collective bargaining agreements being subject to fewer assurances.

As is currently the case under the H-2A program, employers would have to pay workers the higher of the applicable minimum wage, the prevailing wage rate, or a wage rate known as the adverse effect wage rate (AEWR). Under AgJOBS, however, the AEWR would remain at the January 2003 level for three years. In addition to these H-2A provisions, AgJOBS would establish a two-stage legalization program for agricultural workers. To obtain temporary resident status, the alien worker would have to establish that he or she performed at least 575 hours, or 100 work days, of agricultural employment in the United States during 12 consecutive months in the 18-month period ending on December 31, 2004, and meet other requirements. To be eligible to adjust to legal permanent resident status, the alien would have to perform at least 2,060 hours, or 360 work days, of agricultural work in the United States during the six years following the date of enactment, and meet other requirements.⁹

Chambliss Amendment. Senator Saxby Chambliss offered an amendment to H.R. 1268 entitled the “Temporary Agricultural Work Reform Act of 2005.” This measure has not been separately introduced in the Senate as a stand-alone bill. Like the Craig amendment, the Chambliss amendment would streamline procedures for bringing in H-2A workers. Under the Chambliss amendment, prospective employers would file petitions containing required assurances with Department of Homeland Security (DHS) but would not submit applications to the Department of Labor. With respect to wages, employers would have to pay workers the higher of the applicable minimum wage or the prevailing wage rate. They would not be subject to the adverse effect wage rate.

In addition, the Chambliss amendment would create a new temporary worker program, called the “blue card program.” This program would be open to current unauthorized agricultural workers who have been in the United States since April 1, 2005, and meet other requirements. To be eligible for the blue card program, the

⁸ This section was written by CRS analysts, Andorra Bruno and Ruth Wasem.

⁹ For an analysis of guest worker issues, see CRS Report RL32044, *Immigration: Policy Considerations Related to Guest Worker Programs*.

worker would have to be sponsored by an employer. An alien with blue card status could work in the United States for a maximum total period of nine years, including extensions. While the Chambliss amendment would grant blue card workers legal temporary status, it would not offer these guest workers a direct path to permanent residency.

Mikulski Amendment. Senator Barbara Mikulski has offered an amendment based on the “Save Our Small and Seasonal Businesses Act” (S. 352). The Mikulski amendment would increase the availability of visas for foreign temporary nonagricultural workers, known as H-2B workers, by exempting returning H-2B workers from the statutory cap of 66,000 annually, if the workers have already been approved and successfully held the H-2B visa in the past three years. This provision would expire at the end of FY2006.

The Mikulski amendment would cap at 33,000 the number of H-2B slots that would be available during the first six months of a fiscal year. It also would require DHS to submit specified information to Congress on the H-2B program on a regular basis. In addition, the Mikulski amendment would impose a new fraud-prevention and detection fee on H-2B employers, and would authorize DHS to impose additional penalties on H-2B employers in certain circumstances.¹⁰

Congressional Action. On April 19, the Senate failed to invoke cloture and limit debate, an action requiring 60 votes, on both the Chambliss and the Craig amendments; the votes were 21 to 77 and 53 to 45 respectively. A vote to invoke cloture on the Mikulski amendment is also expected today.

Cross-Cutting Issues in the FY2005 Supplemental

While Members have raised concerns regarding individual elements of the supplemental request, two matters cut across both the defense and foreign policy portions of the proposal: 1) funds for Iraq and Afghanistan security forces; and 2) “emergency” designation of selected requests.

Iraq and Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

Within the Defense Department portion of the supplemental, the Administration requests \$1.3 billion for Afghan security force assistance and \$5.7 billion for Iraq security forces. These funds would support training, equipping, and deploying of military, protective services, and border personnel, and in the case of Iraq, police training. The resources would be provided to and solely under the authority of the Secretary of Defense to transfer to the Combined Forces Command — Afghanistan and to the Multi-National Security Transition Command — Iraq. Although the Defense request includes some general allocations of where funds would be spent, it does not include any details about plans for the number or type of forces, or the

¹⁰ For more information, see CRS Report RL32044, *Immigration: Policy Considerations Related to Guest Worker Programs* by Andorra Bruno; [<http://www.congress.gov/erp/rl/pdf/RL32044.pdf>].

schedule anticipated for training Iraqi or Afghan forces and in the request, all the funds would be available for any expense related to training and equipping of those forces until funds are expended. This request is similar to other recent DOD requests for flexibility to use funds for a general purpose, such as support of allies in or around Iraq and Afghanistan.

Although most of the past Iraq security forces assistance has been managed on the ground by the Defense Department, the authority and control of funds remained initially with the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA), whose head reported to the Secretary of Defense, and since June 28, 2004, with the State Department. The supplemental proposal would shift this authority from the Department of State to DOD, and move funds from the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittees to the Defense Subcommittees.

In approving \$18.4 billion for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (IRRF) in P.L. 108-106, the FY2004 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation, Congress earmarked \$3.2 billion for security and law enforcement activities. As security challenges increased through the first half of 2004 and the January 2005 Iraq elections approached, the Administration, in September 2004, sought to re-prioritize IRRF spending allocations to shift funds from lower priority activities to more urgent, immediate needs. The White House proposed an increase for security and law enforcement programs to \$5.05 billion. Because the proposed transfers exceeded authorities provided in P.L. 108-106, the Administration needed congressional approval. Congress granted these transfers in P.L. 108-309, the first Continuing Appropriations for FY2005.

Since late 2004, the Administration has programmed the Iraq security and law enforcement funds to address a number of key activities, primarily managed by the Defense Department, but with some responsibility granted to the Departments of State and Justice and USAID:

- Police training and technical assistance — \$1.8 billion (Departments of State, Defense, and Justice).
- Border enforcement — \$ 441 million (DOD).
- Facilities Protection Service — \$53 million (DOD).
- Iraqi Armed Forces (IAF) facilities — \$691 million (DOD).
- IAF equipment — \$641 million (DOD).
- IAF training and operations — \$433 million (DOD).
- Iraqi National Guard operations and personnel — \$232 million (DOD).
- Iraqi National Guard equipment — \$92 million (DOD).
- Iraqi National Guard facilities — \$359 million (DOD).
- Iraqi Security Forces Quick Response program — \$120 million (DOD).
- Commander's Humanitarian Relief and Reconstruction — \$86 million (DOD, Multinational Force-Iraq, and USAID).

For Afghanistan, security assistance funding since early 2002 has been provided exclusively through the Foreign Operations Subcommittee regular Foreign Military Financing (FMF) and Peacekeeping (PKO) accounts. FMF aid finances the

acquisition of military articles, services, and training, supports U.S. regional stability goals, and enables friends and allies to improve their defense capabilities. Policy direction and funding allocations fall under the responsibility of the State Department, while DOD executes the program on the ground. Broadly, PKO activities support non-U.N. voluntary operations, but in the case of Afghanistan, Peacekeeping appropriations have been used to pay Afghan National Army (ANA) salaries. Thus far, Congress has appropriated over \$1.1 billion in FMF and PKO support for Afghanistan, FY2002-2005. Similar to Iraq security assistance, FMF funds have focused on ANA training and equipping. Unlike the Iraqi program, Afghan police training and support has been funded separately out of the State Department's International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) account, and would remain under the State Department's jurisdiction under the supplemental proposal. The supplemental, however, seeks to shift the source of ANA training and equipping from FMF/PKO accounts to DOD resources, and to place authority of the program under the Secretary of Defense rather than the Secretary of State.

During early review of the supplemental proposal, a number of concerns were raised about this shift from the State Department to DOD for funding and management of Iraqi and Afghanistan security forces assistance. Some noted that this diverges from long-standing, historical practice of State Department and country ambassador control of a key foreign policy tool in U.S. relations with allies and other partner nations. While defense personnel may implement the programs, some argued that it was important to maintain civilian authority over the program, especially over foreign police assistance.

In response to these concerns, Secretary of State Rice defended the proposal by noting that Iraq, in particular, is a unique, war zone situation where the United States needs to maintain a coherent strategy for training and equipping Iraqi security, police, and border forces. She said that often these personnel operate along side American military forces and that it made sense to have the Defense Department in charge of training. She also remarked that the situation in Afghanistan was different, and that police training would remain under the jurisdiction of the State Department. But, she added, Afghanistan also remains a war zone and it is important for Afghan security forces to be fully integrated in their operational efforts. Secretary Rice further pledged that the Administration had established the "tightest" possible coordination mechanisms, placing the chief of mission in charge of ensuring close collaboration between the agencies.¹¹

Congressional Action. The House-passed and Senate-reported measures approve the Iraq and Afghanistan security forces funds at the requested levels, but with additional congressional oversight and involvement of the Secretary of State. The bills require that the Secretary of Defense notify congressional defense committees at least five days in advance of any transfers made from this appropriation and report to the same committees on a quarterly basis regarding the

¹¹ See exchange between Representative Kolbe and Secretary Rice during the February 16, 2005, hearing of the House Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee.

details of all transfers. The bills further require that these funds are available “with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.”

Supplemental Requests that May Fail to Meet the “Emergency” Test

Appropriations that are designated as “emergency” requirements do not count against congressionally-set discretionary budget ceilings, formally or informally, but add to costs incurred by the government and cause the current budget deficit to grow. Several Members of Congress, including key appropriation committee leaders, put the Administration on notice that they will look closely at the supplemental proposal, especially for items that do not represent true “emergencies;” that is requirements that did not exist or were unforeseen during consideration of the regular FY2005 appropriations or that could wait and be debated during FY2006 appropriation deliberations.

The FY2006 Administration request includes proposals to tighten the definition of emergency requirements that exempt items from enforcement mechanisms in the Budget Enforcement Act. The Administration is proposing that emergency requirements be defined as “a necessary expenditure that is sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and not permanent.”¹² The Administration also proposes that this definition “encompass contingency operations that are national security related,” and specifically says that “Military operations and foreign aid with costs that are incurred regularly should be a part of base funding and, as such, are not covered under this [emergency] definition.”¹³

This issue came up in recent hearings held by the Senate Budget Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committees. In the Senate Budget Committee hearing of March 1, 2005, some members questioned Administration witnesses about whether all elements in the FY2005 supplemental were appropriately classified as emergency spending — such as \$5 billion for Army modularity and \$300 million for recruiting and retention — and other members argued that the definition of emergency spending should be one-time expenditures.¹⁴

Within the foreign policy portion of the request, Members have questioned the “emergency” nature of several proposals. For some time, the State Department recognized the need for construction of a new embassy in Baghdad but did not propose funds in the regular FY2005 budget. Instead, the Department seeks \$658 million in the supplemental. Likewise, it was widely recognized in 2004 that insufficient peacekeeping funds had been requested in the regular appropriation

¹² Office of Management and Budget, *Fiscal Year 2006 Analytical Perspectives*, February 2005, p. 239; [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2006/pdf/spec.pdf>].

¹³ Office of Management and Budget, *Fiscal Year 2006 Analytical Perspectives*, February 2005, p. 239; [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2006/pdf/spec.pdf>].

¹⁴ Senate Budget Committee, transcript, *Hearing on the Fiscal year 2006 Defense Budget Request*, March 1; see comments by Senator Conrad on p. 3 and Senator Allard on p. 28.

proposal, yet the Administration did not amend its pending request to cover what it now calls a \$780 million gap in peacekeeping requirements.

Additional assistance for Jordan, Pakistan, and Ukraine is also being questioned by some as to whether the needs represent a true emergency or could be addressed during consideration of FY2006 funds. Portions of the Afghan reconstruction supplemental request have also been scrutinized, especially since the \$2 billion proposal follows about a \$1 billion appropriation for FY2005 and a similar request for FY2006. Further, the \$400 million providing support for coalition members with troops deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan and for other “partner” countries in the war on terrorism has also been challenged as new initiatives that would be more appropriately considered as part of the regular FY2006 appropriation process. Some have argued that longer-term tsunami related reconstruction assistance should be debated later in the regular FY2006 Foreign Operations bill.

If not dealt with in the FY2005 supplemental under an “emergency” designation, however, these foreign policy items could be added to pending FY2006 international affairs appropriation requests that seek 13% higher spending compared with enacted levels for FY2005. This would place additional pressure on the Administration to defend an already sizable foreign policy increase that some believe will be closely scrutinized by Congress.

Within the Defense request, some members have questioned whether funds for the Army’s modularity initiative launched in the fall of 2003 to create 10 additional brigades that would be more deployable individually fits the emergency criteria. Others have questioned whether the funds for 30,000 additional Army personnel is appropriately considered a temporary, emergency request rather than a longer-term need. Funding for modularity and additional military personnel was approved by both the House and the Senate appropriators. Other members have questioned whether the cost of DOD’s military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan are, in fact, unanticipated or unpredictable since those operations are entering their third and fourth year respectively, and monthly operational costs have averaged about \$5 billion for some time, and should, therefore, be included in the Administration’s regular request for defense. Questions have also been raised about whether military construction requests — which typically take some time to build — fit the emergency category.

Congressional Action. The House Appropriations Committee, in reporting H.R. 1268, re-designated \$995 million of foreign aid funding as non-emergency requirements and rescinded \$1 billion of previously appropriated economic aid for Turkey as an off-set to the non-emergency items. The House panel determined that assistance for Jordan, Pakistan, Ukraine, the Palestinians, portions of Afghanistan reconstruction, and USAID operating expenses in Iraq do not fit the criteria for an emergency designation, but nevertheless warrant support. The Committee’s report noted that emergency assignments are limited to funds responding “to a situation which poses direct threat to life and property, is sudden, is an urgent and compelling need, is unpredictable, and is not permanent in nature.”

The House-reported measure also denied funding for several foreign policy activities that the Committee felt would be more appropriately addressed during the

regular FY2006 appropriations review. Most notably, the legislation excludes \$570 million in reconstruction support and \$66 million in counter-narcotics programs for Afghanistan that the Committee will take up during debate on the FY2006 Foreign Operations measure. As mentioned above, however, folding these items into consideration of the regular FY2006 spending bill is likely to intensify the challenges of meeting the President's \$22.8 billion Foreign Operations appropriations request.

During House floor debate on March 16, lawmakers adopted an amendment by Representative Upton prohibiting the use of funds in the bill for embassy security, construction, and maintenance. Supporters argued, that among other things, the Baghdad embassy request should have been proposed as part of regular FY2005 and FY2006 appropriation bills and should not be assigned the emergency designation.

Although several members questioned whether the Army's modularity initiative was a legitimate emergency expense, the House appropriators stated in their report that they felt "compelled to fully fund the Army's request," in order to help the Army face "significant challenges," and "mitigate the stress on the current active-duty combat forces."¹⁵

Senate appropriators also questioned whether all proposed military construction projects — which often take some time to build — are appropriately emergency requests, and cut several overseas projects for Bagram Airbase in Afghanistan which they suggested should be considered during the regular defense authorization and appropriations process when the issue of establishing a long-term U.S. presence could be debated. During Senate floor debate, Senator Byrd also questioned whether building a new prison facility in Guantanamo for detainees qualified as an unanticipated emergency. An amendment to cut funding for Guantanamo was defeated by a vote of 27 to 71.¹⁶

Unlike the House measure, H.R. 1268, as reported in the Senate, designates all amounts as an emergency.

Defense Department Request and Congressional Review

In the FY2005 Supplemental presently under consideration by Congress, the Administration requests a total of \$74.96 billion. The Defense Department request is in addition to the \$25 billion already provided in the FY2005 DOD appropriations act (P.L. 108-287) for war-related costs in the initial months of the fiscal year. Of that \$25 billion, \$2 billion was obligated for FY2004 expenses, leaving \$23 billion available for FY2005. That brings the total amount anticipated by DOD for Iraq and Afghanistan and other expenses in FY2005 to \$98.0 billion or 45% higher than the amount appropriated in FY2004.

¹⁵ See *H. Rept.* 109-16, p. 6.

¹⁶ See *S.Rept.* 109-52, p.31ff for military construction cuts. For Byrd amendment, see *Congressional Record*, p. S3515ff, vote on S3523, and section on Senate floor action below.

Potential major defense issues in the FY2005 supplemental include:

- the *long-range cost and accountability for costs* in the global war on terror;
- the *composition and size* of the Defense request;
- *enhanced death benefits* for service members;
- *investment funding* for restructuring;
- *oversight of flexible funds* to support allies;
- *implications of military construction* funding.

Senate Floor Debate on Defense Request

Since debate started on the supplemental on April 11, 2005, the Senate considered a number of amendments to the defense portion of the bill (see **Table 2** below).

Expanding Military Benefits. In amendments passed by voice vote, the Senate expanded benefits for survivors of those active-duty service members who die by:

- providing basic housing allowance for dependents for a year rather than six months;
- increasing the death gratuity from \$12,400 to \$100,000 for *all* active duty service members after October 1, 2001, expanding eligibility in the Senate-reported version;
- provides Federal employees who are activated reservists with additional pay to make up the difference between their military and civilian salaries; and
- provides meal and telephone services for soldiers recuperating from Afghan or Iraq-incurred injuries (see **Table 2** below).

Other Actions. In floor action, the Senate also restored funding for a new building for the Director of National Intelligence that was cut during markup. The Senate rejected an amendment to cut \$36 million in military construction funds for a new prison facility in Guantanamo Bay. On April 12, 2005, a Senate amendment that would provide \$1.98 billion for medical care for veterans was ruled out of order.¹⁷

The Senate also indicated its concerns about accountability by passing the Byrd amendment which states a sense of the Senate that military costs be included in the Defense Department's regular appropriations act, a provision included in the FY2004 Supplemental as well as reiterating a requirement that DOD report its costs for Iraq and Afghanistan, semi-annually as required in the FY2004 supplemental and the FY2005 DOD Appropriations Act.¹⁸

¹⁷ *Congressional Record*, April 13, 2005.

¹⁸ *Congressional Record*, p. S3786ff.

Pending Amendments. Debate is expected to continue throughout the week. At least a dozen defense-related amendments are pending on the floor and a number of others have been submitted. Of these amendments, at least two are likely to be controversial — an amendment to prevent DOD from terminating the C-130J program, an aircraft used for intra-theater lift and other missions and a proposal to require the Navy to keep 12 carriers rather than retire one as planned (see Senate amendments 418 and 499). The Defense Department considers 11 carriers to be sufficient because ships are being deployed for longer periods, and plans to terminate the C-130J program because of cost increases and problems in meeting requirements. The Air Force is also considering restructuring the C-130J program because termination costs have been reported to be as high as \$2 billion.¹⁹

Table 2. Defense-Related Amendments: Senate Floor

Sponsor	Purpose/Congressional Record page reference	Status
Kerry (SA333)	Extends payment of basic housing allowance for dependents of active-duty service members who die on active duty. (p. S3513, 3521)	Approved (voice)
Kerry (SA334)	Provides \$100,000 death gratuity to survivors of all active-duty service members who die. (p. S3513, 3521)	Approved (voice)
Durbin	Makes up the difference in civilian and military pay for federal employees who are activated for reserve duty. (p. S3518ff)	Approved (voice)
Reid	Sense of the Senate that veterans rated as unemployable be considered eligible for concurrent receipt of VA benefits and military retirement. (p. S3620)	Adopted (voice)
Obama	Provides meal and telephone service benefits for active-duty service members recuperating from Iraq or Afghan-incurred injuries. (p. S3641)	Adopted (voice)
Stevens	Provides amount requested for new building and additional employees for new Director of National Intelligence (p. 3532)	Approved (UC)
Warner	Requires report by 7/15/05 on property disposal process applying during current base closure round. (p. S3644)	Approved (voice)
Salazar	Renames “death gratuity” the “Fallen Hero compensation” in permanent statute. (p.S3643)	Adopted (voice)
Coryn-Feinstein	Sense of the Senate that Congress should not delay enactment of appropriations to support armed forces in Iraq and elsewhere by debating immigration reform. (p.S3523-32)	Adopted (61-38)
Byrd	Sense of the Senate that war costs should be included in regular DOD appropriations. (p. S3786ff)	Adopted (61-31)
Byrd	Cuts \$36 million in military construction funds for detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (p. S3513ff)	Rejected (27-71)

¹⁹ *Inside the Air Force*, “Senior USAF officer C-130J termination costs could exceed \$2 billion,” March 4, 2005 and *Washington Post*, “Air Force to Require Lockheed Cost Details,” April 14, 2005.

Sponsor	Purpose/Congressional Record page reference	Status
Murray	Provides \$1.98 billion for medical care for veterans (p. S3451ff)	Ruled out of order

House and Senate Action on Defense Request

As marked up by the Senate Appropriations Committee (SAC) on April 6, 2005, the total for the Defense Department would be \$74.65 billion or \$554 million less than the Administration's request and \$1.86 billion less than the House version. The Senate appropriators generally provided funds close to the amounts requested for each service by DOD but distributed the funds somewhat differently among accounts. Like the House, the SAC provides the full \$7.0 billion requested to train Afghan and Iraqi security forces but added several oversight mechanisms. For both special accounts, the House and the SAC would require:

- the concurrence of the Secretary of State;
- five-day advance notification to the defense committees of fund transfers;
- quarterly reports to the defense committees;
- availability of funds limited to the end of FY2006.

Shifts in Funding for Various Defense Accounts. The Senate appropriators made several major adjustments to DOD's requests specifically directing more funds to military personnel accounts to pay for enhanced death benefits for survivors of service members as well as adding funds to RDT&E accounts. To offset these increases, the Senate panel cut \$500 million in operations and maintenance monies that was designated to train and equip foreign sources, with those costs to be funded instead in the special Iraq Security Forces Fund described above. The House added funds to procurement accounts.

The SAC also cut \$253 million in military construction funds because they were not convinced that the projects met an emergency criteria and because of concerns about the implications that the projects may prematurely signify an "enduring presence" of the United States in the region.²⁰ The Senate panel also cut \$265 million in procurement, mainly from classified programs. Unlike the House, the Senate appropriators did not add funds for additional Army and Marine Corps equipment such as trucks and other vehicles.

In markup, the Senate Appropriations Committee added several provisions including a section that would prohibit DOD from spending funds for a winner-take-all competition for the DD(X) destroyer as is being considered by DOD. For additional details about the Senate-reported bill, see individual sections below.

Enhancing Death Benefits. The Senate appropriators, like the House, endorsed the Administration's proposal to raise the limit on life insurance that

²⁰ For a discussion of these construction issues, see CRS Memo, "Military Construction in Support of Afghanistan and Iraq," by Amy Belasco, April 11, 2005, available from author.

members can purchase from \$250,000 to \$400,000 and to increase the death gratuity from \$12,400 to \$100,000 in certain circumstances. DOD proposed that the Secretary of Defense be given discretion to determine who would be eligible for the higher benefits retroactively and in the future. The House and the Senate bills propose different changes in the eligibility standards for survivors to receive these enhanced death benefits with the House changing the eligibility for life insurance and the Senate changing eligibility for the death gratuity (see section below entitled “Higher Survivor Benefits” for a full discussion).

House Floor Debate on the Defense Request

As passed by the House on March 16, 2005, H.R. 1268 provides DOD with a total of \$76.8 billion, \$1.8 billion above the request. The House added funds for trucks, tracked vehicles, and other equipment for the Army and Marine Corps much of which would otherwise be funded in the regular FY2006 DOD appropriations. In addition to supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan for the rest of the fiscal year, the bill provides a total of \$18 billion for procurement of equipment for returning and deploying units, for new Army and Marine Corps units, and to replace equipment losses. Despite some concerns about whether the emergency classification was appropriate, the House fully-funded the Army and Marine Corps request for \$5.3 billion to restructure units to be more deployable.

The bill also fully funds the DOD request for \$7.0 billion to train and equip Afghan and Iraqi security forces though it requires concurrence of the Secretary of State in use of the funds and includes additional reporting requirements. The bill provides \$480 million less than the \$2.9 billion requested for coalition and other support for allies working with U.S. military forces. H.R. 1268 also includes enhanced death benefits for service members. During the two days of floor debate on H.R. 1268 on March 15th and March 16th, 2005, the House considered 11 defense-related amendments (see **Table 3**). The House adopted an amendment that modified eligibility for enhanced death benefits for service members that was included in the bill. The House rejected attempts by some members to add amendments to set up a commission modeled on World War II’s Truman Commission to investigate contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan in response to recent concerns about accounting for war costs. For more details, see discussion of individual issues below.

Table 3. Defense-Related Amendments: House Floor

Sponsor	Purpose/Congressional Record page reference	Status
Moran	Reduces and then increases Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide by \$1 million; with the intent to require the Defense Department to provide Congress with standards for success in Iraq. (p. H1458)	Approved (voice)
Markey	Prohibits the use of funds in the bill for purposes that would violate the United Nations Convention Against Torture. (p. H1496)	Approved (420-2)
Velazquez	Prohibits the use of funds in the bill for contracts that contravene small business participation goals in Sec. 15 (g)(2) of the Small Business Act.	Approved (voice)
Tierney	Adds \$5 million to Operation and Maintenance defense-wide to be used to create a commission to investigate contracting in Iraq. (p. H1455; H1486)	Rejected (191-236)
Hooley	Motion to recommit bill with instructions to increase funds for O&M by \$40 million and funding for Defense Health by \$100 million.	Rejected (200-229)
Woolsey	Transfers \$186 million from regular defense appropriations bills to National Guard and Reserve personnel. (p. H1457)	Withdrawn
Lantos	Adds title, Hope at Home Act, providing that activated reservists with federal jobs would receive the difference between their military and civilian salaries, and provides tax credits to private businesses which make up the difference in income. (p. H1490).	Withdrawn
Markey	Requires that military personnel who are evacuated due to injuries continue to receive hazardous duty pay until they are re-assigned. (p. H1495)	Withdrawn
Obey	Prohibits obligating funds in the bill for national intelligence activities in countries sponsoring terrorism until President informs congressional intelligence and defense communities of all clandestine military activities where U.S. government involvement will be hidden.	Withdrawn
Tierney	Establishes a select committee of the House to investigate awarding and implementation of contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq. (p. H1452)	Point of Order
Filner	Prohibits use of funds in the bill for reconstruction contracts in Iraq unless employers agree to give preference to veterans.	Point of Order

Sources: *Congressional Record*, March 15, p.H.1427-H.1500 and March 16, 2005, p. H1545-26.

Future Cost and Accountability Issues

As part of the current debate about U.S. involvement in Iraq, the long-range cost of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and accounting for those costs continue to be significant issues. The Administration has not provided a projection of DOD costs for FY2006-FY2011 that was required by January 1, 2005 in the FY2005 DOD

Appropriations Act.²¹ The Congressional Budget Office recently published an illustrative long-term cost estimate that assumes that military personnel deployed or supporting operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and enhanced security for defense installations remain at today's level of about 300,000 through FY2006, then decline gradually to 74,000 by FY2010, and remain at that level through FY2015.²² Based on those assumptions, CBO estimated that the cost for DOD from FY2006-FY2010 would be \$260 billion and the ten-year cost through FY2015 would be \$393 billion.²³ Typically, CBO's estimates are lower than DOD requests.²⁴

CRS has estimated that DOD has already received \$201.2 billion for Iraq, Afghanistan, and enhanced security through previous enacted appropriations. If Congress provides the \$75 billion requested for the remainder of FY2005, and if CBO's estimate of \$260 billion were to be accurate, DOD's costs could total \$536 billion by FY2010.

The Democratic staff of the House Budget Committee (HBC) also recently issued a report specifically projecting the future costs of the Iraq war (i.e. excluding Afghanistan and enhanced security) under two scenarios. One scenario envisions that the United States withdraws all forces from Iraq within four years or by 2009, a scenario which Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld told reporters that he expected to be the case.²⁵ Based on that scenario, the study estimates Iraq costs could total \$461 billion including \$287 billion in DOD costs and \$175 billion in interest costs of the Federal government because of the additional borrowing necessary to pay for the war. Assuming a more gradual withdrawal of forces for Iraq as assumed by CBO, this analysis estimates costs through FY2015 would total \$646 billion, including \$430 billion in DOD costs and \$217 billion in additional interest costs.²⁶

Congressional Action. Although the Administration did not include any funds for war-related expenses in FY2006, both the House and Senate budget committees are expected to include a reserve fund of about \$50 billion for FY2006 but no war-related funding for later years. The House is currently marking up its resolution. In a recent estimate, CBO reported that the deficit in FY2005 — including an estimate of war-related spending — would total \$394 billion in FY2005

²¹ See Section 9012 of P.L. 108-287; the President may waive the requirement if he certifies that the cost may not be provided for "purposes of national security."

²² CBO, Estimate of War Spending, FY2005-FY2015, February 1, 2005. [<http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/60xx/doc6067/02-01-WarSpending.pdf>]

²³ CBO, Estimate of War Spending, FY2005-FY2015, February 1, 2005. [<http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/60xx/doc6067/02-01-WarSpending.pdf>]

²⁴ CBO, Letter to Senator Kent Conrad, "Estimated Costs of Continuing Operations in Iraq and Other Operations of the Global War on Terrorism," June 25, 2004, p. 1.

²⁵ *New York Times*, "Rumsfeld Sees an Iraq Pullout in Four Years," December 7, 2004.

²⁶ House Budget Committee, Democratic Caucus, "Iraq War Cost Estimate" Costs to Date and Costs to Go," February 15, 2005. [http://www.house.gov/budget_democrats/analyses/06iraq_war_cost_update.pdf].

and \$370 billion to \$375 billion in FY2006.²⁷ Although several members expressed concerns about the lack of information about future costs of the war and occupations, H.R.1268 does not address this issue.

Accountability Concerns. Attempts on the House side to add amendments during markup and floor debate to set up investigating committees or a special commission modeled on the World War II Truman Commission that would investigate war-time contracting failed to be added to H.R. 1268. During floor debate, members raised concerns about where and how the Department of Defense has spent the \$200 billion already appropriated for the “global war on terror” in light of recent reports by auditors about misuse of funds and DOD’s lateness in submitting reports on war costs. DOD has not yet sent Congress two reports on war costs and other matters that were required by statute and due on April 1 and October 31, 2004; nor has DOD delivered an estimate of costs for FY2006-FY2011 that was due January 1, 2005.²⁸ An amendment offered by Congressman Tierney to set up a select committee of the House made up of 15 members to investigate the awarding and implementation of contracts was ruled out of order and a follow-up amendment to provide \$5 million to be used for such a commission was rejected by a vote of 236 to 191 (see **Table 3** above).

The House later adopted by voice vote the Moran amendment which reduced and then added \$1 million to funding for Operation and Maintenance Defensewide with the intent — as voiced on the floor — that these funds would be used by the Defense Department to provide Congress with information about its standards for success in Iraq. The House also adopted the Velazquez amendment that would require that contractors receiving funds in the act comply with small business participation goals. In floor debate, Senator Byrd’s sense of the Senate amendment to include war and occupation costs in DOD’s regular appropriations, following various precedents, and to require DOD to submit reports on costs that are overdue passed by a vote of 61 to 31.²⁹

Torture and Intelligence Amendments. During floor debate on March 16, 2005, the House adopted an amendment offered by Representative Markey that would prohibit the use of funds for any act in violation of the U.N. Convention against torture that the United States signed. Congressman Obey also withdrew an amendment offered earlier that would have prohibited the obligation of funds in the act for intelligence activities until the Administration submitted to the intelligence and defense communities on the Hill a procedure for advance reporting on clandestine activities, stating that the White House had agreed to work out a reporting process.³⁰

²⁷ CBO, Letter to Senator Thad Cochran, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, March 4, 2005, p. 1.

²⁸ See P.L.108-106, Sec. 1120, P.L.108-287, Section 9010, and Sec. 9012; for debate, *Congressional Record*, March 15, 2005, p.H1444, H1449, H1453-H1459.

²⁹ *Congressional Record*, April 18, 2005, p. S3786ff.

³⁰ See *Congressional Record*, March 16, 2005, p. H.1515. For further information about (continued...)

Size and Composition of DOD Request

The Defense Department request for FY2005 — including the \$25 billion in funds previously provided in the FY2005 regular DOD Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-287) — totals \$98.0 billion or over 45% more than the \$65.1 billion provided in the FY2004 Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 108-106). The total request includes several major types of expenses as shown in **Table 4**:

- **Recurring costs for military operations**, which increase by 17% from \$60.2 billion in FY2004 to \$70.5 billion in FY2005;
- **Investment costs**, which grow six-fold from \$3 billion in FY2004 to almost \$18 billion in FY2005 to replace equipment damaged or lost in battles, recapitalize equipment for units returning to the United States who leave their equipment behind, and buy additional equipment for units to improve capability or add force protection;
- **Support for other nations**, which increase five-fold from \$2 billion to \$11.5 billion including funds to train and equip Afghan and Iraqi security forces, funds to pay for cooperative operations in the war on terrorism by Jordan and Pakistan (coalition support), DOD counterdrug programs in Afghanistan, administrative costs in Iraq, and the Commanders Emergency Response Fund (CERP), a program providing funds directly to unit commanders to distribute for local needs.

Much of the year's operating costs have already been provided in the \$25 billion included in Title IX of the FY2005 DOD Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-287). Combined with peacetime appropriations for FY2005, those funds may allow DOD to finance or cash flow war-related expenses through May 2005.³¹ Of the total request, about 70% is for operational costs — higher pay for active-duty forces who are deployed, the cost of activating reservists, higher operating tempo costs, higher depot maintenance costs to repair equipment reflecting wear and tear on equipment, and classified programs. In the FY2005 supplemental request, recurring costs for military operations increase by \$10 billion or 17%. About \$3.5 billion is for higher than anticipated fuel costs, and another \$3.5 billion is for higher operating tempo.

Military personnel costs are comparable to FY2004 reflecting force levels in FY2005 similar to those the previous year. The Defense Department anticipates that forces in Iraq will decline from a highpoint of about 160,000 before the Iraqi

³⁰ (...continued)

issues relating to clandestine activities, see CRS Report RL32601, *Comparison of 9/11 Commission Recommended Intelligence Reforms, S. 2845, S. 2774, H.R. 5024, Administration Proposal, H.R. 10, Current Law*, by Alfred Cumming.

³¹ CRS calculation taking into account average peacetime and war-related obligation rates, assumes DOD would use all 4th quarter peacetime Army O&M and military personnel funds as well as remaining transfer authority (where DOD moves funds between appropriation accounts with Congressional approval).

elections to 138,000 or about 20 brigades. Force levels in Afghanistan are expected to remain at about 18,000 or three brigades.³² DOD continues to provide little information about the roughly 300,000 military personnel either deployed or supporting Iraq and Afghan operations, as well as enhanced security for defense installations. The justification does not say how many reserve personnel are expected to be activated, on average, for FY2005, or the number of personnel likely to be deployed more than once in three years for active-duty forces or more than once in five years for reserves, the policy standard set by DOD. As of the end of FY2004, one-third of all those deployed had served two or more deployments suggesting that these DOD policies are currently not being met.³³

³² DOD, *FY2005 Justification*, p. 15.

³³ Data from the Defense Manpower Data Center.

Table 4. DOD Funding: FY2004 Enacted and FY2005 Request
(in billions of dollars)

Type of Cost [Brackets = entry not included in totals]	FY2004 Enacted Supp.	P.L. 108- 287 Title IX	FY2005 Total (Title IX + Request)	FY2005 Request (net of Title IX)
Military Operations Costs	60.2	21.4	70.5	49.1
Operating Tempo	31.8	15.8	35.6	19.8
Military Personnel	18.6	1.1	17.6	16.5
Depot Maintenance	2.8	0.4	3.6	3.2
Healthcare Support	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.2
Fuel price increase	0.0	1.0	3.5	2.5
Working Capital Funds ^a	0.0	0.5	0.9	0.4
Morale/ Welfare/ Recreation	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.3
Classified/Other Global War on Terrorism ^b	6.3	1.8	8.0	6.2
Investment Costs	3.0	2.6	17.8	15.2
Military Construction ^c	0.5	0.0	1.1	1.1
Replacing battle losses	0	0.0	1.8	1.8
Recapitalization and Procurement	2.2	2.6	9.5	6.6
Army Modularity ^d	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Marine Corps Force Structure Review Grp	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
Storm Damage Repair	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Support to Other Nations	2.0	1.1	11.5	10.4
Iraq				
[Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, security costs funded in foreign operations]	[5.0]	0.0	0.0	0.0
Iraq Security Fund	0.0	0.0	5.7	5.7
Commanders Emergency Response Fund [legislative cap]	[.]	0.4	0.7	0.3
Train and Equip: Backfill	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0
CPA Operating Costs/Iraq Project and Contracting Office	NA	0.0	0.3	0.3
Afghanistan				
[Military Aid training of security forces funded in foreign ops]	[.7]	0.0	0.0	0.0
Afghan Security Fund	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3
Commanders Emerg. Response Program		0.1	0.1	0.0
Train and Equip: Backfill		0.3	0.3	0.0
Afghan Freedom Spt. Act & Counterdrug	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.5
Coalition Support (Includes Lift & Sustain)	1.9	0.0	2.0	2.0
Special Operations Forces Ctr in Jordan	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Tsunami Relief	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
TOTAL SUPP'L	65.2	24.9	99.8	74.9
FY2005 Already Enacted in Title IX	NA	24.9	-24.9	NA
FY2005 New Request	NA	NA	74.9	74.9

Notes and Sources: See [http://www.dod.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2006/fy2005_supp.pdf]

a. Excludes fuel price increase.

b. Includes both procurement and O&M funds.

c. Excludes military construction for modularity.

d. Includes military construction associated with modularity.

The FY2005 Supplemental request includes about \$1.7 billion for the cost of an additional 30,000 active-duty military personnel authorized by Congress for FY2005 in order to reduce stress on current forces. Some Members have suggested that these additional personnel will be needed on a long-term basis rather than temporarily because of Afghanistan and Iraq and hence that this expense should be included in DOD's regular budget rather than the supplemental.

The Defense Department has argued that the additional personnel will only be needed temporarily until additional units are created by the Army's modularity initiative in FY2007, additional military spaces are freed up through converting military billets to civilian slots, and "re-balancing" or changing the skill mix of active and reserve Army units to increase skills now needed in greater numbers is completed. Military police, civil affairs and intelligence personnel billets are to be increased while artillery personnel and others are decreased.

Congressional Action — House and Senate Fund Personnel and Operations. Both the Senate Appropriations Committee (SAC) and the House added funds to military personnel accounts with the SAC adds directed to fund the higher death benefits in the bill (see section below). Both bills reduce DOD's \$31 billion in operation and maintenance (O&M) funding (excluding Tsunami relief and the Afghan and Iraq Security Funds) by between \$600 million and \$700 million. The House cuts are directed at funds being provided to reimburse allies for their participation in the "global war on terror" (see section below).³⁴ The Senate-reported version reduces O&M for a duplicate request from DOD to provide "train and equip" funds in both the Army O&M account and the Iraq Security Forces Fund. Unlike previous supplementals, DOD's FY2005 request applies savings in FY2005 from \$1.1 billion in peacetime training of Army forces and \$159 million training for Marine Corps forces to wartime costs.³⁵

Higher Survivor Benefits

DOD's FY2005 Supplemental request includes \$376 million to provide higher death benefits to the families of those killed in action in Iraq and Afghanistan including funds to pay higher benefits retroactively.³⁶ Under the Administration's proposed language, *for the future*, the Secretary of Defense could designate those areas where service members who died in action or as a result of related injuries or illness would be eligible to receive a death gratuity of \$100,000 rather than the current \$12,420 level. In addition, the Administration proposes to increase the limit on Servicemembers Group Life Insurance (SGLI) from the current \$250,000 to \$400,000.

³⁴ These proposed reductions are taken from Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (see **Table 6**). Total for Operation and Maintenance includes funding for working capital funds, Defense Health, and Drug Interdiction.

³⁵ House Appropriations Committee, H.Rept. 109-16, March 11, 2005, p. 12.

³⁶ DOD, *FY2005 Justification*, February 2005, p. 15; [http://www.dod.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2006/fy2005_supp.pdf].

Both changes would be applied retroactively to October 7, 2001 for those who died while serving in the Iraq and Afghan theater of operations; thus, survivors of those killed would receive an additional \$238,000 including \$88,000 in a death gratuity and \$150,000 in higher insurance payments (see **Table 5**).³⁷

There has been considerable debate in Congress about who should receive these proposed enhanced benefits. In testimony, General Myers, Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chiefs of the individual services each voiced personal opinions that these enhanced benefits should be available to any service member who died regardless of the circumstances.³⁸ Several bills have been introduced by members of Congress to provide such benefits including the Standing with Our Troops Act of FY2005 and the Heroes Act.³⁹

Congressional Action — House and Senate Expand Eligibility. Both the House and the Senate are proposing to increase eligibility for survivor benefits in ways that differ from the Administration and differ about who would be eligible for retroactive and future benefits (see **Table 5**). The House version appears to be somewhat broader than the Senate in terms of eligibility of survivors of those service members who have died and those dying in the future.

Retroactive Increase in Benefits. The House version would give an additional \$150,000 to survivors of active duty service member who dies from injury or illness “in the performance of duty,” a coverage broader than proposed by the Administration which covered only those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is not clear who would be covered under this new standard. In floor debate, Congressman Obey (author of the amendment adopted) suggested that the House version would cover deaths of active-duty members who die while “in the line of duty” but not those who die while off-duty, such as in a drunken driving accident.⁴⁰ The cost of the higher benefit is also not clear and could range from \$95 million to \$300 million according to Representative Obey, and up to \$500 million more than in the request according to OMB.⁴¹ Additional funds were not provided to cover this cost but the

³⁷ Office of Management and Budget, FY2005 Supplemental, 2-14-05, p. 57 to P. 58. [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/amendments/supplemental_2_14_05.pdf] For a complete discussion of benefits available to survivors of deceased service members, see CRS Report RL32769, *Military Death Benefits: Status and Proposals*, by David F. Burrelli and Jennifer R. Corwell. The additional insurance payment would be given to all survivors regardless of whether the service member had signed up; 98% of active-duty members elect the coverage.

³⁸ Senate Armed Services Committee, transcript, *Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2006 Budget*, February 17, 2005, p.78.

³⁹ Senate Armed Services Committee, transcript, *Hearing on Death Benefits for Survivors of Military Personnel*, February 1, 2005.

⁴⁰ *Congressional Record*, March 15, 2005, p. H1466.

⁴¹ See Sec. 1114 (b) in H.R. 1268 and CQ, “Panel Endorses \$81.3 billion Emergency Supplemental,” by Gayle S. Putrich, March 8, 2005. See DOD, *FY2005 Justification*, February 2005 for Administration’s proposed language, p.57, and p. 15 for cost. For OMB (continued...)

Defense Department would be obligated to make payments if the language is adopted.

The Senate appropriators adopted a different eligibility criterion that would give \$150,000 to survivors of members who die in the Afghan or Iraqi theater or to those who die of “combat-related activities,” a standard currently defined in statute to include hazardous duty, conditions simulating war or an instrumentality of war.⁴² The Senate bill adds about \$400 million to DOD’s military personnel accounts for the broader benefits that would apply retroactively and in the future. In the Senate bill, however, these benefits would go into effect 90 days after enactment and lapse on September 30, 2005. The authorizers are likely to address this issue in the FY2006 National Defense Authorization. By voice vote on April 13, 2005, the Senate adopted the Kerry amendment, which increased the death gratuity from \$12,000 to \$100,000 for all active-duty service members retroactively to October 12, 2001.

Future Increases in Death Benefits. In the House version, service members in the future could increase their coverage under Servicemembers Group Life Insurance (SGLI) from \$250,000 to \$400,000 (in increments of \$50,000). Service members who opt out of the full coverage must get written concurrence from his or her spouse. The Senate-reported bill also raises the maximum insurance level to \$400,000. Both the pending versions and the Administration would require that spouses be informed if the member opts for insurance less than the maximum. For those serving in a combat zone, the Senate-reported bill would require that DOD — rather than the service member — pay the premium for \$150,000 in coverage.

The House-passed version of the bill also raises the one-time death gratuity from \$12,420 to \$100,000 for any service member who dies in the future rather than leaving it to the discretion of the Secretary of Defense to decide whose survivors would receive the higher payment. The Senate-reported bill increases the death gratuity payment for both those who die in combat and those who die of combat-related activities. In floor debate, the Senate passed by voice vote the Kerry amendment which changes the Senate-reported bill and instead, provides a \$100,000 gratuity to the survivors of *all* active-duty service members who die. If the Senate provision that allows these changes to lapse on September 30, 2005, is adopted, action by the authorizers is likely.

⁴¹ (...continued)

estimate, see Office of Management and Budget, Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 1268, March 15, 2005; [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/legislative/sap/109-1/hr1268sap-h.pdf>]. See *Congressional Record*, March 15, p.H1465-66 for Representative Obey’s later estimate. During floor debate, this amendment was protected from challenge on points of order by an amendment to H.Res 151, the rule governing consideration of H.R. 1268 by the Cole amendment; see *Congressional Record*, March 15, 2005, p.H1429ff.

⁴² *U.S. Code*, Title 10, Section 1413a (e) (2).

Table 5. Proposed Changes in Death Benefits for Active-Duty Servicemembers

Death Benefit	Current Law	DOD Request	House Passed	Senate Markup
Service members Group Life Insurance (SGLI)	Members may purchase up to \$250,000 in life insurance in \$10,000 increments.	<p><i>Retroactive to October 7, 2001:</i> Survivors of members who die in the Afghan or Iraq theater receive \$150,000.</p> <p><i>After enactment:</i> Members may purchase up to \$400,000 in life insurance in \$50,000 increments.</p> <p><i>Effective date:</i> As soon as practicable.</p>	<p><i>Retroactive to October 7, 2001:</i> Survivors of members who die in the “performance of duty” receive \$150,000.</p> <p><i>After enactment:</i> Members may purchase up to \$400,000 in life insurance in \$50,000 increments. Spouses must be informed if member purchases less than maximum.</p>	<p><i>Retroactive to October 7, 2001:</i> Survivors of members who die in the Afghan or Iraq theater and who die as a result of combat or combat-related activities receive \$150,000.^a</p> <p><i>After enactment:</i> Members may purchase up to \$400,000 in life insurance in \$50,000 increments with premiums for \$150,000 to be paid by DOD for those in combat zones. Spouses to be informed if member purchases less than maximum.</p> <p><i>Effective date:</i> 90 days after enactment; lapses 9/30/05.</p>
Death Gratuity	Survivors of members who die receive \$12,200.	<p><i>Retroactive to Oct. 7, 2001:</i> Survivors of members who die in the Afghan or Iraq theater receive \$88,000.</p> <p><i>After enactment:</i> Survivors of those who die as a result of operations as designated by the Secretary of Defense receive \$100,000.</p> <p><i>Effective date:</i> As soon as practicable</p>	<p><i>Retroactive to Oct. 7, 2001:</i> Survivors of members who die in the Afghan or Iraq theater receive \$88,000.</p> <p><i>After enactment:</i> Survivors of all members who die receive \$100,000.</p> <p><i>Effective date:</i> On or after date of enactment.</p>	<p><i>Retroactive to Oct. 7, 2001:</i> Survivors of members who die in the Afghan or Iraq theater or as a result of combat or combat-related activities receive \$88,000.</p> <p><i>After enactment:</i> Survivors of all members who die in a combat zone or who die as a result of combat or combat-related activities receive \$100,000.^a</p> <p><i>Effective date:</i> 90 days after enactment; lapses 9/30/05.</p>

Sources: Department of Defense, *FY2005 Supplemental Request for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), and Operation Unified Assistance*, February 2005; H.R. 1268 engrossed as passed by the House, 3-16-05; [http://www.dod.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2006/fy2005_supp.pdf]; Sec. 1113 - Sec. 1114 in H.R. 1268 as passed by the House and Sec. 1111 and Sec. 1112 as reported by the Senate.

a. Combat-related is defined in U.S. Code, Title 10, Section 1413a to include combat, hazardous service, conditions simulating war and an instrumentality of war.

Other Benefits Increases. In the “Hope at Home Act” proposed by Representative Lantos, the federal government would make up the difference between military and civilian pay for reservists who are federal civilian employees and employers would be given partial tax credits for doing the same. That proposal was discussed and later withdrawn.⁴³ An amendment to continue hazardous duty pay for injured service members until they are re-assigned was also considered and withdrawn (see **Table 4** above). The Senate-reported bill does not address other benefit issues but several senators mentioned during markup that they would be proposing floor amendments on benefits issues. By voice vote, the Senate adopted the Kerry amendment which would give dependents of all active-duty service members who have died since October 7, 2001, basic housing allowance for one-year rather than six months (see **Table 2** above).

Recapitalization, Modularity and Construction Costs Grow

In the FY2005 supplemental, DOD is requesting a total of \$17.8 billion for investment, substantially above the \$3 billion in the FY2004 supplemental (see **Table 3**).⁴⁴ This \$17.8 billion includes:

- \$16.1 billion for procurement;
- \$0.5 billion for research, development, test and evaluation projects (RDT&E); and
- \$1.3 billion for military construction, \$1 billion for construction overseas, and \$0.3 billion for the Army’s modularity initiative.

This funding is directed at several new DOD thrusts: a major push to provide additional equipment for units not only to replace battle losses, but also to improve capability, increase equipment, and add force protection equipment; accelerating the Army’s plans to reorganize and reequip Army and Marine Corps units; and building barracks and other facilities both within Afghanistan and Iraq and in surrounding countries.

Procurement and Modularity Requests. The \$16.1 billion in procurement is for the following purposes: \$1.3 billion to replace battle losses; \$5.1 billion to provide additional equipment for deploying and returning forces; \$2.7 billion for additional force protection equipment; \$4.1 billion for Army modularity equipment; and \$250 million for Marine Corps Force Structure Review Group Initiative, a similar reorganizing initiative.

A major issue that has already been raised is the funding requested for the Army’s modularity initiative that was originally announced by Chief of Staff General Schoomaker in August 2003 as part of the Army’s transformation. Some Members have already questioned whether this expense passes the test of emergency supplementals where funding is requested for urgent and unanticipated requirements.

⁴³ *Congressional Record*, March 15, p.H1491-95.

⁴⁴ This does not include classified programs funded in procurement for which no details are available.

The Army appears to have accelerated its conversion plans announced last February, intending now to reorganize not only three active brigades but also convert five rather than one brigade and three National Guard brigades. This may explain part of the increase in funding from the \$2.8 billion in the February 2004 plan to the \$5.0 billion in the new supplemental. DOD has announced that it plans to fund the Army's modularity initiative in supplementals in both FY2005 and FY2006, and then transfer that funding to the Army's regular budget starting in FY2007.

Critics have suggested that modularity expenses are more appropriately considered a regular expenditure because they are a predictable, organizational change announced over a year and a half ago. Therefore, these costs, according to some analysts, should be included in DOD's regular appropriations where they would compete with other programs. The Army argues that the modularity initiative is intended not only to transform Army units to be more lethal and more transportable, but that the additional units will decrease the stress on Army forces by providing more units to deploy.

The Army is also requesting many procurement items that would be used to upgrade equipment or provide additional equipment for both deploying units and returning units who are leaving their equipment behind. This type of expense is not normally considered an incremental cost of contingencies as defined in DOD's financial regulations. DOD, in its justification material, argues that the additional capabilities are necessary to deal with the dangers posed by the ongoing insurgency. Some \$2.7 billion of the procurement is for additional force protection equipment, including not only additional armored Humvees, and add-on kits for other tactical vehicles, but also a wide variety of other equipment for soldiers, such as night vision goggles, and other devices intended to improve the military's capability to deal with improvised explosive devices (IEDs).

Military Construction Request. The new request also includes \$1.3 billion for military construction, about \$1 billion overseas and about \$0.3 billion associated with the Army's modularity initiative (e.g. providing additional barracks for newly-formed units). The military construction in and around Iraq and Afghanistan could prove controversial because it could be perceived to signal a long-term U.S. presence, for example, replacing temporary tents with concrete barracks. Facilities may also be constructed at a time when the U.S. has not negotiated bilateral agreements with a permanent Iraqi government as is customarily the case for overseas U.S. military construction projects. The justification for some projects — for example, constructing a supply road in Iraq to link to a new Kuwaiti route that avoids urban areas — may be less convincing than other projects, such as concrete billets, which are justified on safety grounds or force protection.⁴⁵

Congressional Action — Approach to Procurement Differs. Unlike the House, the Senate appropriators cut rather than added funds for procurement. The cuts were primarily to classified programs so details are not available. The House bill adds \$2.1 billion in procurement to DOD's request, raising the total from

⁴⁵ For a discussion of these construction issues, see CRS Memo, "Military Construction in Support of Afghanistan and Iraq," by Amy Belasco, April 11, 2005, available from author.

\$16.1 billion to \$18.2 billion. The House increases of \$1.6 billion for the Army and \$622 million for the Marine Corps would accelerate purchases of trucks, upgrades to Abrams tanks, additional uparmored HMWVs, other force protection, and other equipment, much of which would otherwise be funded in the FY2006 regular DOD appropriations bill. If funding is provided in the FY2005 supplemental, cuts could be made to the FY2006 regular appropriations bill.

In its report, H. Rept.109-16, the HAC states that these additions are intended to fulfill “emergent requirements in force protection, force restructuring and recapitalization ...” and to “accelerate programs for which funding has been requested.”⁴⁶ Although some would argue that these additions are justified because they would be required later, others would argue that these items are not appropriately categorized as emergency requirements.

Examples of increases include:

- an addition of \$401 million for medium trucks and \$207 million for heavy trucks (amounts matching DOD’s FY2006 regular request);
- \$283 million for uparmored HMMWVs and add-on armor, \$75 million for SAPI body armor, and almost \$400 million for night vision equipment, radio systems and jammers, all in addition to the \$2.7 billion for force protection already in the supplemental request.⁴⁷

Full Funding of Army Modularity Request. Both the full House and the Senate Appropriations Committee fully fund the Army’s \$5 billion request for modularity, with the rationale that the funds are “needed to mitigate stress on the current active duty combat force by creating at least 10 additional combat brigades,” and that supplemental funds would ensure that equipment would be available prior to deployment for units “that will deploy to either Iraq or Afghanistan in the next two troop rotations scheduled for later this year and in 2006.”⁴⁸

Congressional Action — Military Construction Concerns. Like the House, the Senate appropriators state concerns about the Administration’s \$1.0 billion request for overseas military construction. In their evaluation of individual projects, the Senate panel looked at whether the spending was “truly of an emergency nature,” and whether “the construction of permanent facilities (where proposed),

⁴⁶ House Appropriations Committee, H.Rept. 109-16, *Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes*, March 11, 2005, p. 24.

⁴⁷ House Appropriations Committee, Press Release, *Full Committee Unanimously reports War Supplemental*, March 8, 2005; [<http://appropriations.house.gov/>]; and DOD, *FY2005 Justification*, February 2005. [http://www.dod.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2006/fy2005_supp.pdf]

⁴⁸ House Appropriations Committee, Press release, “Highlights of the War Supplemental,” March 3, 2005; [http://appropriations.house.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=PressReleases.Detail&PressRelease_id=446].

rather than those of a more expeditionary nature, is appropriate.”⁴⁹ The SAC noted that it was more difficult for construction projects to meet the emergency test of a supplemental because of the duration of the “global war on terror” and the long lead times typical for construction.

The “expeditionary” nature of the U.S. presence suggests that temporary facilities “should be the rule rather than the exception” in the committee’s view.⁵⁰ In those cases where there may be a case for an “enduring presence in the region,” that should be part of a long-term plan, emergency appropriations would make emergency funding less appropriate, the committee argues. The panel concluded that projects which have that character “should be requested in the normal budget process, in which both authorization and appropriations committees have an opportunity to carefully consider the request.”⁵¹

In light of these concerns, the Senate panel cut three military construction projects — a \$57 million fuel tank farm and a \$32 million prime power generation plant at Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan, a \$75 million aerial port in Kuwait, and a \$66 million project to improve the Al Dhafra Air Base in the United Arab Emirates.⁵²

Although the House bill funds all of DOD’s request for military construction except for \$60 million for the Army and \$15 million for the Navy, the appropriators prohibited obligation of some of the funds until DOD submits the comprehensive Master Plan for overseas infrastructure required because the Committee believed the plan “is vital to understanding how the construction projects requested in the supplemental are integrated with the Department’s long-term strategy for the basing of U.S. forces in the Central Command Area of Responsibility.”⁵³ DOD submitted the plan in mid-March 2005 but reportedly it does not address Iraq.

New Flexible Accounts to Train and Equip Afghan and Iraqi Security Forces

The FY2005 supplemental proposes to establish two new accounts to train Afghan and Iraqi security forces ranging from Army to police forces:

- \$1.3 billion in the Afghan Security Forces Fund; and
- \$5.7 billion in the Iraq Security Forces Fund.

For both funds, language of the request would allow the Secretary of Defense to use the funds until funds are expended “notwithstanding any other provision of law ... to provide assistance to the security forces of [Afghanistan or Iraq] including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair,

⁴⁹ S.Rept. 109-52, p. 31.

⁵⁰ S. Rept. 109-52, p. 31.

⁵¹ S. Rept. 109-52, p. 31.

⁵² S. Rept. 109-52, p. 34 and p. 35.

⁵³ See H.Rept. 108-342, p. 17 and H.Rept. 109-16 on FY2005 Supplemental, p.32.

renovation, and construction, and funding.”⁵⁴ This language would exempt DOD from any restrictions applying to current training of foreign military forces and would allow the Secretary of Defense or his designee to use these funds for any purpose and for any type of security force — Army, national guard, or police. Nevertheless, the Administration states that it does not intend to use these funds for training Afghanistan police forces, and has requested \$400 million elsewhere in the supplemental for the State Department’s International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement office to support such police training.

The train and equip provision would effectively transfer policy and funding authority from the Secretary of State, where authority for training foreign military forces is currently lodged, to the Secretary of Defense. In recent testimony, Secretary of State Rice supported this transfer and Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld argued that the authority reflects the current wartime situation. This transfer would remove this traditional foreign policy tool from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State.

The authority requested, and the DOD justification material provided, is broader than currently available to the Secretary of State. DOD has provided only an illustrative breakdown of the funds but no details about the number and types of personnel, the rate of training anticipated, the types of equipment to be purchased, or the specific uses of the funds. The State Department, especially within its quarterly report on the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, provides substantial details regarding how it has used and plans to use in the future funds to train and equip foreign military forces.

According to DOD, the \$5.7 billion for Iraqi security forces that would cover costs through July 2006, may be distributed to:

- \$3.1 billion for front line security forces including up to two mechanized divisions;
- \$809 million for support forces;
- \$1.5 billion for police and other forces;
- \$180 million for “quick response” funding; and
- \$104 million for institutional training.⁵⁵

These funds would be in addition to the \$5 billion already provided in Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Funding that was provided to the State Department in the FY2004 Supplemental, and \$210 million in “train and equip” funds provided through DOD.

There has been considerable debate in Congress about the effectiveness of training of Iraqi security forces thus far. In testimony on February 16, 2005, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld reported that 136,000 Iraqi forces had been trained thus far, including 57,000 Ministry of Defense Forces (army, national guard, intervention forces, special operations, air force and

⁵⁴ Office of Management and Budget, *FY2005 Emergency Supplemental Request*, February 14, 2005.

⁵⁵ Department of Defense, “Iraq/Afghanistan Security Forces: DoD’s FY05 Supplemental Request,” February 2005; and DOD, *FY2005 Justification*, February 2005, p. 78-79.

navy) 79,000 Ministry of Interior forces (police, civil intervention, emergency response forces, border enforcement, highway patrols, dignitary protection, special police commandos).⁵⁶ DOD's justification material states that thus far, Iraq's transitional government has fielded over 90 battalions but that "All but one of these battalions, however, are lightly equipped and armed, and have very limited mobility and sustainment capabilities."⁵⁷

Congressional Action — House and Senate Bills Add Oversight Mechanisms. Both the SAC and the House approve DOD request for \$1.3 billion to train and equip Afghan security forces and \$5.7 billion to train and equip Iraqi security forces but add several reporting requirements. Although the proposed language would still provide the funds to the Secretary of Defense "notwithstanding any other provision of law," the funds would be available until the end of FY2006 rather than until expended.

In addition, DOD would need to have the concurrence of the Secretary of State on the use of the money and to notify congressional defense committees in writing five days in advance of transfers from the funds, and report on transfers quarterly. The original DOD language did not include any notification or reporting requirements. DOD would still have the prerogative to distribute these funds to any activities related to training and to any type of security forces from the Army to police as well as being able to receive contributions from other nations for these purposes.

Flexible Funds to Provide Support to Allies

In addition to its requests for \$7.0 billion in flexible funds for Iraq and Afghanistan security forces, the Administration requests \$2.9 billion in other types of support for allies in the "global war on terrorism." Those funds include:

- \$1.37 billion for coalition support to "key cooperating nations," who provide logistical and military support;
- \$627 million for "Lift and Sustain" funds for security forces in Iraq, Afghanistan and other nearby nations;
- \$825 million for the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP) in which military commanders fund local projects;
- \$250 million to reimburse the services for providing equipment to the Afghan Army;
- \$99 million to set up a new Special Operations Training Center in Jordan; and
- \$257 million for DOD's counternarcotics program.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Senate Appropriations Committee, transcript, *Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 Emergency Supplemental*, February 16, 2005, p. 30-31.

⁵⁷ Department of Defense, FY2005 Supplemental request for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), and Operation Unified Assistance, February 2005 (hereinafter, DOD, FY2005 Justification), p. 78; [http://www.dod.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2006/fy2005_supp.pdf].

⁵⁸ Department of Defense, *FY2005 Justification*, p. 80-81.

Since the 9/11 attacks, DOD has received substantial funds in these flexible accounts that may be distributed to U.S. allies in and around Iraq and Afghanistan to reimburse them or provide logistical support for their participation in the “global war on terror.” Although the DOD request would require concurrence of the Secretary of State and 15-day advance notification to congressional committees reporting for coalition support — as was included in previous supplementals — the request includes no reporting for funds provided for “lift and sustain,” for the Commanders Emergency Support Program, or for DOD’s counternarcotics programs. The State Department also receives counternarcotics funds (see below).

Congressional Action — House Cuts and Senate Supports Request.

The House bill cuts DOD’s request for several types of coalition support for allies working with the United States while the Senate-reported bill largely supports the DOD request. For example:

- the House bill provides \$300 million and the Senate provides the request for \$627 million for “lift and sustain,” an additional source of funds for Afghan, Iraq, and neighboring security forces while the Senate-reported bill;
- the House cuts and the Senate retains the \$1.4 billion request for “coalition support” for Pakistan, Jordan, and other cooperating nations in the “global war on terror;” and
- both bills support the \$854 million request for the Commanders Emergency Response Program (CERP), a program where unit commanders dispense funds locally.⁵⁹

DOD Request for FY2005 by Appropriation Account

Table 6 below shows DOD’s estimate and Congressional action of the FY2005 Supplemental request. To provide context, the table shows total DOD needs for FY2005 including both the amount provided in Title IX and the current FY2005 Emergency Supplemental Request, as well as DOD’s obligations, or contractual costs in FY2004 based on accounting reports. In FY2004, DOD obligated all of the funds appropriated.

The lion’s share of the request is for the Army, a reflection of the predominant role of ground forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. The greatest difference between FY2004 and FY2005’s estimate is the amounts requested for investment accounts — procurement, RDT&E, and military construction — and DOD’s request for \$7.0 billion to train and equip Afghan and Iraqi forces.

The House adds \$1.8 billion to the Army and \$630 million to the Marine Corps, whose forces play the major role in Iraq and Afghanistan. The House decreases the

⁵⁸ (...continued)

[http://www.dod.mil/comptroller/defbudget/fy2006/fy2005_supp.pdf].

⁵⁹ House Appropriations Committee, *H. Rept. 109-18*, p. 12 and p. 14.

Navy's total by \$373 million, the Defense-wide total by \$300 million and adds \$178 million to the Air Force request. In the Senate-reported bill, funding levels are close to amounts requested by the Defense Department (see **Table 6** below).

Table 6. Defense Department FY2005 Supplemental Request and Prior Funding
(billions of dollars)

Service/Account	FY2004 Obligations	Title IX, P.L. 108-287	FY2005 Total Based on Request	FY2005 Request	House Passed	Senate Markup	Conference
SPECIAL ACCOUNTS SUBTOTAL	NA	3.800	10.785	6.985	6.985	6.985	
Iraq Freedom Fund	NA	3.800	3.800	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Afghan Security Forces Fund	NA	NA	1.285	1.285	1.285	1.285	
Iraq Security Forces Fund	NA	NA	5.700	5.700	5.700	5.700	
ARMY SUBTOTAL	43.382	15.381	56.597	41.217	42.938	40.934	
Mil. Pers. :Defense SubComm. (SC)	11.972	0.916	14.215	11.757	11.780	13.609	
Mil.Pers.: Quality of Life SubComm (QOL SC)	NA	NA	1.542	1.542	1.542	Included above	
Reserve Pers, Army	0.000	0.000	0.040	0.040	0.040	0.040	
National Guard Personnel, Army	0.000	0.000	0.429	0.429	0.429	0.291	
O&M, Army: Defense SC	29.908	13.550	30.817	17.201	17.366	16.768	
O&M, Army: QOL SC	NA	NA	0.066	0.066	0.066	Included above	
O&M, Army Reserve	0.000	0.000	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.021	
O&M, Army Nat'l Gd	0.000	0.000	0.189	0.189	0.189	0.327	
Aircraft Proc, Army	0.000	0.000	0.459	0.459	0.459	0.459	
Missile Proc, Army, 05/07	0.000	0.000	0.294	0.294	0.341	0.280	
Proc, Wpns & Combat Tracked Vehicles	0.457	0.050	2.475	2.425	2.679	2.406	
Procurement, Ammo	0.000	0.110	0.585	0.475	0.533	0.475	
Other Proc, Army	0.954	0.755	6.071	5.316	6.549	5.323	

CRS-37

Service/Account	FY2004 Obligations	Title IX, P.L. 108-287	FY2005 Total Based on Request	FY2005 Request	House Passed	Senate Markup	Conference
RDT&E, Army	0.000	0.000	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.037	
Mil Con, Army	0.090	0.000	0.990	0.990	0.930	0.897	
NAVY SUBTOTAL	3.818	0.504	5.438	4.935	4.562	4.939	
Military Personnel, Navy	0.857	0.028	0.553	0.525	0.534	0.535	
Reserve Personnel, Navy	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.009	0.011	0.009	
Operation and Maintenance	2.555	0.367	3.791	3.424	3.031	3.431	
O&M, Navy, Tsunami	0.000	0.000	0.124	0.124	0.124	0.124	
O&M, Navy Reserve	0.000	0.000	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	
Aircraft Proc, Navy	0.211	0.000	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	
Weapons Proc, Navy	0.000	0.000	0.072	0.072	0.072	0.066	
Proc Ammo, Navy & MC	0.000	0.079	0.213	0.134	0.142	0.134	
Other Proc, Navy	0.189	0.030	0.116	0.086	0.078	0.078	
RDT&E, Navy	0.007	0.000	0.179	0.179	0.202	0.179	
Mil Con, Navy	0.000	0.000	0.107	0.107	0.093	0.107	
MARINE CORPS SUBTOTAL	2.846	2.057	7.279	5.222	5.855	5.289	
Military Personnel, MC	0.918	0.242	1.488	1.246	1.252	1.358	
Reserve Personnel, MC	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	
Operation and Maintenance, MC	1.567	1.665	2.635	0.970	0.982	0.970	
O&M, MC, Tsunami	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	
O&M, MC Reserve	0.000	0.000	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.025	

CRS-38

Service/Account	FY2004 Obligations	Title IX, P.L. 108-287	FY2005 Total Based on Request	FY2005 Request	House Passed	Senate Markup	Conference
Procurement, Marine Corps	0.360	0.150	3.124	2.974	3.588	2.929	
AIR FORCE SUBTOTAL	9.765	0.594	11.586	10.463	10.641	10.447	
Military Personnel, AF	3.272	0.065	1.381	1.317	1.473	1.685	
Reserve Personnel, AF	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
National Guard Personnel, AF	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Operation and Maintenance, AF	6.131	0.419	6.550	5.602	5.769	5.529	
O&M, AF, Tsunami	0.000	0.000	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.030	
Aircraft Procurement, AF	0.053	0.000	0.269	0.269	0.279	0.269	
Proc Ammo, AF	0.021	0.000	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	
Other Proc, AF	0.286	0.110	2.944	2.834	2.659	2.654	
RDT&E, AF	0.001	0.000	0.103	0.103	0.122	0.133	
Mil Con, AF	0.000	0.000	0.302	0.302	0.301	0.141	
DEF.-WIDE/OTHER SUBTOTAL	5.824	2.565	8.686	6.121	5.834	5.968	
O&M, Defensewide	2.108	0.404	3.925	3.521	3.061	3.308	
O&M, Defensewide, Tsunami	0.000	0.000	0.029	0.029	0.029	0.029	
Office of Inspector General	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Drug Interdiction (for transfer)	NA	0.000	0.257	0.257	0.257	0.227	
Defense Health: HAC QOL & SAC Defense	0.888	0.683	0.859	0.176	0.176	0.226	
Defense Health, Tsunami	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	
Overseas Humanitarian	NA	0.000	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.000	

CRS-39

Service/Account	FY2004 Obligations	Title IX, P.L. 108-287	FY2005 Total Based on Request	FY2005 Request	House Passed	Senate Markup	Conference
Overseas Humanitarian, Tsunami	0.000	0.000	0.036	0.036	0.036	0.036	
Procurement, Defense-wide	0.199	0.050	0.641	0.591	0.646	0.591	
National Gd & Reserve Equipment	0.039	0.050	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000	
RDT&E, Defense-wide	0.062	0.000	0.154	0.154	0.160	0.204	
Defense Working Capital Fund	0.002	1.478	2.789	1.311	1.411	1.311	
Working Capital Fund, Navy	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
National Defense Sealift Fund	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	
Def. Agencies, Special Ops & Other	2.584	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Transferred to Coast Guard	0.000	-0.100	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	
GENERAL PROVISIONS	[3.000]	[5.000]	[12.500]	[11.00]	[7.500]	[7.685]	
General Transfer Authority: FY05 Supp	[3.000]	[1.500]	[6.500]	[5.000]	[2.000]	[2.000]	
General Transfer Authority: FY05 DOD Appropriations	[NA]	[3.500]	[6.000]	[6.000]	[5.500]	[5.685]	
Defense Cooperation Transfer Account	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.012	0.012	0.000	
TOTAL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT	65.635	24.900	99.944	74.953	76.815	74.563	
INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.089	
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	65.697	24.900	100.194	75.203	77.065	74.652	

Sources: CRS calculations based on Defense Finance and Accounting Service, *Consolidated Department of Defense (DoD) Terrorist Response Cost Report (Revised), FY2004 Supplemental Appropriation As of September 30, 2004*; P.L. 108-287; Department of Defense, *FY 2005 Supplemental Request for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Operation Enduring Freedom J(OEF), and Operation Unified Assistance*, February 2005; and H.Rept.109-18, Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for FY2005, March 11, 2005.

Foreign Policy Supplemental Request and Congressional Review

The President seeks \$6.3 billion in FY2005 supplemental funding supporting a broad range of foreign policy activities:

- U.S. diplomatic costs in Iraq
- Afghanistan reconstruction and counternarcotics programs
- Darfur humanitarian relief and peace implementation aid in Sudan
- War on Terrorism assistance, including funds for Jordan and Pakistan
- Palestinian aid
- Ukraine assistance
- U.N. peacekeeping contributions
- Broadcasting programs in the Middle East
- Tsunami recovery and reconstruction

If enacted as proposed, FY2005 total spending for foreign policy programs would be roughly 50% higher than the international affairs budget immediately prior to the 9/11 attacks (see **Table 7**).

Table 7. Foreign Policy Budget, FY2001-FY2006
(billions of dollars)

FY2001 Total	FY2002 Total	FY2003 Total	FY2004 Total	FY2005 Enacted	FY2005 Supp Request	FY2005 Total	FY2006 Request
\$24.409	\$25.455	\$33.490	\$49.618	\$29.727	\$6.294	\$36.021	\$33.635

Sources: OMB, Department of State, CRS calculations.

House and Senate Action — Summary

H.R. 1268, as passed by the House on March 16, approves \$4.92 billion for foreign policy programs. This level is \$1.37 billion less than requested. During House Appropriations Committee markup on March 8, the panel excluded items that it felt were not well justified, could be funded by other international donors, or did not require immediate funding and could be considered as part of the regular FY2006 appropriation. The House Committee further redesignated \$995 million as non-emergency spending and offset these costs by rescinding \$1 billion in unspent economic aid appropriated in FY2003 for Turkey.⁶⁰ During House floor debate,

⁶⁰ Congress appropriated \$1 billion in the FY2003 Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 108-11) that could be used by Turkey to guarantee loans of about \$8.5 billion to bolster its ailing
(continued...)

Members approved an amendment by Representative Jackson adding \$100 million in humanitarian relief for the Darfur region in Sudan. The Jackson amendment brought the \$4.82 billion Committee-reported bill to the House-passed total of \$4.92 billion.

Table 8. Foreign Policy Amendments: House Floor

Sponsor	Purpose/Congressional Record page reference	Status
Jackson	Adds \$100 million in disaster and refugee aid for the Darfur region of Sudan. (p. H1467)	Approved (voice)
Maloney	Increases by \$3 million the Tsunami Relief and Recovery Fund, and to decrease by \$3 million ESF funds. (p. H1467)	Approved (voice)
Upton	Prohibits the use of funds in the bill for embassy security, construction, and maintenance. (p. H1482, H1486)	Approved (258-170)
Tancredo	Prohibits the use of funds in the bill for tsunami relief. (p. H1479)	Rejected (voice)
Weiner	Prohibits the use of funds in the bill for aid to Saudi Arabia. (p. H1484, H1487)	Rejected (196-231)
Weiner	Prohibits the use of funds in the bill for the Palestinian Authority and for West Bank and Gaza projects. (p. H1497)	Rejected (voice)
Kelly	Prohibits funds for aid to the Nigerian government. (p. H1489)	Withdrawn

The Senate Appropriations Committee, on April 6, approved a modified version of H.R. 1268, providing \$5.98 billion in new appropriations for foreign policy activities, a level about \$315 million less than the President's request, but over \$1 billion more than passed by the House. Like the House, the Senate reported version of H.R. 1268 offsets the foreign policy total by rescinding \$1 billion in FY2003-enacted economic aid for Turkey, bringing the net amount down to \$4.98 billion. But unlike the House, the Senate measure designates the entire foreign policy portion as an "emergency" appropriation. During the first four days of Senate debate, lawmakers altered the Committee-reported bill in several ways, including amendments to: 1) direct funds in the Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund to be used to address the avian flu virus in Asia (McConnell and Leahy/Obama); 2) fully fund the request for the State Department's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization and for the ready-response corps, offset by a reduction for the Global War on Terrorism Partners Fund (Lugar/Biden); and 3) add

⁶⁰ (...continued)

economy. With substantial economic recovery during the past two years, Turkey has not drawn on the \$1 billion loan guarantee funds.

\$5 million for democracy programs in Lebanon, offset by a further reduction in the Partners Fund (Salazar).

Major recommendations included in H.R. 1268 as passed by the House and reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee include:

- Afghanistan reconstruction and police training — \$1.4 billion in the House bill, roughly two-thirds of the President's request. Cuts are proposed for selected reconstruction projects. The Senate measure approves the full \$2.05 billion request, although with some changes in counter-narcotics and police training allocations.
- Darfur humanitarian aid — \$342.4 million in the House bill, \$100 million higher than proposed, for refugee, food, and disaster programs. The Committee voted 32-31 to restore \$150 million in food assistance that had not been included in the Chairman's mark, and the full House added the extra \$100 million. The Senate Committee version approves \$242.4 million, as requested.
- Sudan peace implementation aid — \$37 million in the House measure, deleting the \$63 million in rehabilitation and reconstruction funding. The Senate bill includes the entire \$100 million request.
- Palestinian aid — \$200 million in the House bill, as requested. The Senate measure also provides \$200 million supporting the Palestinians, with \$50 million set aside for Israel to help facilitate the movement of Palestinian people and goods in and out of Israel.
- Pakistan military aid — \$150 million, as requested, in both bills.
- Jordan economic and military aid — \$200 million, as requested in both House and Senate measures.
- Iraq embassy — \$592 million, \$66 million below the request, provided in both bills. The House measure, however includes an amendment that bars the use of the funds for construction of the embassy.
- Peacekeeping — \$580 million in the House bill, and \$680 million in the Senate measure, each below the \$780 million proposal.
- Tsunami relief and prevention — \$659 million for relief and \$22.6 million for prevention in the House bill. The Senate measure includes \$656 million and \$25.4 million, respectively. The House bill denies \$45 million proposed for debt reduction; the Senate-reported measure had recommended the same, but a floor amendment restored authority to use up to \$45 million to cancel debt owed by tsunami-affected countries.

- Partners Fund and Solidarity Fund — \$225.5 million in the Senate measure, as reduced by amendments during full Senate debate, for the two contingency funds. The Administration proposed \$200 million for each fund. The House includes no funds for these purposes.
- Ukraine aid — \$33.7 million in the House bill. The Senate measure provides the full \$60 million request, plus an additional \$10 million for other regional aid requirements in Belarus and the North Caucasus.

Each of these elements and others are discussed in more detail below. **Table 8** (below) summarizes the spending request.

U.S. Diplomatic and USAID Operations in Iraq

The supplemental request includes a total of \$1.37 billion for U.S. Mission operations in Baghdad (\$690 million), the construction of a new embassy compound (\$658 million), USAID operating expenses in Iraq (\$24 million) and USAID Inspector General costs in Iraq (\$2.5 million).

For U.S. Mission operations and embassy construction, the supplemental funds are intended to cover costs for the balance of FY2005 and most expenses in FY2006. Previously, Congress appropriated in several spending measures \$991 million for Mission operations for FY2004 and FY2005, of which \$769 million remained for this year. The Administration estimates that the State Department will need \$1.06 billion in FY2005 to manage activities of about 1,000 American personnel located in Baghdad and four regional offices. The State Department is seeking \$290 million for Mission operations, including logistics and security, for the rest of FY2005, and \$400 million for “extraordinary” security and logistical expenses in FY2006. The regular FY2006 budget, submitted to Congress on February 7, 2005, includes \$65 million that will serve as a “funding base for basic embassy operations” and assumes that the U.S. Mission in Baghdad will reach a “basic operations” status at some point in the future.⁶¹

The State Department plans to build the new embassy over the next 24 months and argues that it needs the entire funding now so Mission staff can move out of temporary facilities as quickly as possible as promised to the new Iraqi government. The \$658 million sought represents the entire estimated construction costs, plus “reasonable” contingency amounts to manage possible risks of the project. According to the Department, planning for the new embassy will be completed by March 15, 2005, with an anticipated contract award date of mid-May 2005, subject to passage of the supplemental. Under this time schedule, the project would be

⁶¹ Department of State, *FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations Financial Plan*, February 2005, pp. 21-22; and remarks of Joe Bowab and Eric Hembree, Deputy Assistant Secretaries of State for Resource Management, during a State Department news briefing, February 14, 2005.

completed in May 2007.⁶² Critics note, however, that Congress has already appropriated about \$20 million in previous supplementals specifically for construction of the embassy. Moreover, they say, plans for a new facility were far enough along in calendar 2004 that the Administration should have amended its FY2005 regular appropriation request to accommodate the sizable funding additions needed for embassy construction. To them, the proposal does not meet the test of an “emergency” requirement.⁶³

Congressional Action. H.R. 1268, as passed by the House, fully funds the Administration requests for Mission operations and USAID operating and IG costs. Funding for construction of a new embassy in Baghdad, however, is denied.

Initially, the House Appropriations Committee recommended a reduction of \$66 million for embassy construction, stating that even with this cut, remaining funds would be sufficient for the compound to be constructed within the Administration’s two-year schedule. During floor debate, however, the House adopted (258-170) an amendment by Representative Upton, prohibiting the use of any funds in the bill for embassy security, construction, or maintenance. Supporters of the amendment argue that since planning for a new Baghdad facility has been underway for at least a year, this should not be funded as an emergency requirement. Instead, the Administration should have submitted a proposal for consideration in the regular FY2005 appropriation or requested funds in the regular FY2006 spending measure. Before adoption of the Upton amendment, the White House had expressed concern over the Committee’s \$66 million cut for embassy construction. Officials argued that full funding of the \$658 million request was important for a “secure work and living environment for Americans serving in Baghdad,” and that construction postponement would delay the movement of U.S. staff into “more safe, secure, and functional facilities.”⁶⁴

In the Senate, the Appropriations Committee supports State Department construction plans for a graduated design that can be scaled back as requirements in Baghdad change. The \$592 million provided by the Committee — \$66 million less than the request — is, in the Committee’s view, sufficient given reduced mission staffing levels. H.R. 1268, as reported in the Senate, fully funds other State Department and USAID operating costs in Iraq and Afghanistan at requested levels.

Afghanistan Reconstruction, Counternarcotics, Police Training, and Other Activities

The supplemental proposes \$2.046 billion for Afghanistan out of foreign policy budget accounts.⁶⁵ By comparison, enacted FY2005 appropriations for economic,

⁶² *FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations Financial Plan*, pp. 25-29.

⁶³ For further information, see CRS Report RS21867, *U.S. Embassy in Iraq*.

⁶⁴ OMB, Statement of Administration Policy: H.R. 1268. March 15, 2005, p. 2.

⁶⁵ Elsewhere, in the DOD portion of the supplemental, the Administration seeks \$1.285 billion to assist Afghan security forces and an additional \$257 million for drug interdiction (continued...)

law enforcement, and security assistance to Afghanistan total about \$1 billion, and between \$1 billion and \$1.1 billion is proposed for FY2006. The Administration argues that the supplemental is necessary in order to support the newly elected Karzai government plan for the upcoming Parliamentary elections and to complete high impact projects that could be done in the near term.⁶⁶ The supplemental funds for Afghanistan are divided into several components.

- U.S. Mission operations and security — \$60 million.
- Infrastructure and economic development — \$795.8 million. These funds would be used to continue ESF-funded secondary road construction (\$125 million), power transmission and generation capacity (\$300 million), health sector reforms and services (\$69 million), school construction and teacher training (\$68 million), Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) infrastructure (\$75 million), clean water and agriculture projects (\$82 million), and other reconstruction activities.
- Capacity-building of the Afghan government, including strengthening democratic institutions — \$265 million. This would cover government salaries, infrastructure, support for parliamentary elections, and other rule of law and democracy promotion activities. Included is \$25 million to complete the Kabul airport.
- Anti-terrorism training and protection — \$17.1 million for providing security for President Karzai. Congress approved \$18.8 million in the regular FY2005 Foreign Operations appropriations for similar programs funded under the Non-Proliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR) account for Afghanistan. For FY2006, the State Department seeks an additional \$18.4 million for NADR account activities.
- Police training — \$400 million. These funds are intended to accelerate on-going efforts that will be expanded further by FY2006 requested appropriations. Activities include Task Force Police training (\$285 million), police equipment (\$74 million), and salary payments (\$40 million).
- Counternarcotics (eradication and interdiction) — \$260 million. Of this total, \$95 million would cover costs already incurred to begin crop eradication, establish a National Interdiction Unit, and support public information programs. The balance of \$165 million would expand efforts for eradication (\$89 million), interdiction (\$51

⁶⁵ (...continued)

and counter-drug activities in Afghanistan and Central Asia. Furthermore, there is \$7.6 million requested for Drug Enforcement Agency participation in U.S. counternarcotics activities in Afghanistan.

⁶⁶ *FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations Financial Plan*, p. 1.

million), law enforcement (\$22 million), and public information (\$3 million). Authority is also sought to transfer up to \$46 million of the amount to ESF programs, presumably in support of alternative livelihood activities.

- Counternarcotics (alternative livelihood programs) — \$248.5 million. A portion (\$139 million) of this amount would replenish reconstruction and development aid accounts that had been drawn on previously to address alternative livelihood activities. The balance (\$110 million) would be used to expand programs into a total of seven provinces.

In total, including Defense Department and DEA accounts, the FY2005 supplemental seeks \$773 million for counternarcotics in Afghanistan and Central Asia.

Congressional Action. The House-passed bill supports \$1.4 billion of the total \$2 billion supplemental request for Afghanistan, with full funding provided for police training. H.R. 1268, however, rejects \$46 million for aerial eradication efforts and denies funding for a number of reconstruction projects, including money for the Kabul Airport, a new law school in Kabul, a power plant, industrial parks, a courthouse, and a community housing project. Some of the projects will be reviewed by the House Appropriations Committee during consideration of the regular FY2006 Foreign Operations appropriations. In its report on H.R. 1268, the Committee noted that it expected that some of these projects could be financed by other countries, the Asian Development Bank, and the World Bank.

In the Senate, H.R. 1268 provides the full \$2.05 billion proposed by the Administration. The Committee-reported measure, however, shifts \$46.5 million of the request from operation and maintenance (O & M) of a helicopter fleet to eradicate illicit crops to a pilot program to train local Afghan police forces. The Committee noted in its report that an earlier reprogramming proposal for procuring the helicopters had been denied, making the O & M funds unnecessary. The Senate measure further specifies \$5 million for assisting Afghan internally displaced persons and recommends \$7 million for programs conducted by the Voice for Humanity in support of parliamentary elections.

Sudan North-South Peace Support

The Administration requests \$100 million for immediate support of the January 9, 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the government in Khartoum and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement in the south. In justifying the request, the State Department notes that when FY2005 appropriation decisions were finalized, a peace accord was uncertain. The supplemental programs, officials say, will help ensure that the peace agreement is effectively implemented.⁶⁷

Most of the supplemental proposal targets needs in southern Sudan. The proposal includes \$22 million for assisting the National Commissions required under

⁶⁷ *FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations Financial Plan*, p. 6.

the peace accords and supporting governance and political party development, \$10 million for security sector reform in southern Sudan, \$63 million for rehabilitation and reconstruction, primarily in southern Sudan, and \$5 million for UNHCR, International Organization for Migration, and NGO repatriation programs for Sudanese refugees. The \$100 million total supplemental request for Sudan compares with about \$200 million allocated for all activities in FY2005 and \$112 million proposed for FY2006.

The supplemental proposal for Sudan also reflects a new initiative proposed more broadly in the regular FY2006 budget request for post-conflict, fragile countries. The Administration recommends shifting assistance that has traditionally been channeled through USAID's Development Assistance account to the Transition Initiative (TI) account. TI funds are available under more flexible programming authorities than regular development assistance, and according to the Administration, will permit more effective and better targeted types of support that post-conflict states require in the near-term. Four countries — Sudan, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Haiti — are scheduled for this funding transfer in the FY2006 request. Included in the \$100 million, the supplemental proposal also seeks \$63 million for Sudan rehabilitation and reconstruction under the TI account.

Congressional Action. While fully supporting the requests for security, governance, and refugee repatriation programs, the House bill does not include \$63 million for reconstruction programs in southern Sudan. The Senate-reported measure provides the full \$100 million requested for programs related to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.⁶⁸

Darfur Region and Eastern Chad

The supplemental seeks \$242 million for emergency humanitarian relief for the Darfur region of Sudan and for eastern Chad. These funds would add to the roughly \$375 million currently allocated or planned for emergency programs with existing FY2005 funds. As the crisis worsened throughout 2004, the demands for a broader U.S. response exceeded those assumed in the FY2005 budget request, according to the Administration. The supplemental request includes \$48.4 million in refugee aid, \$44 million for both replenishing previously expended disaster relief funds and meeting new emergency shelter, clean water, and medical requirements in the region, and \$150 million in food aid. The food aid request is intended to relieve some of the current pressure on the enacted FY2005 food assistance budget in meeting not only the needs in Darfur, but in a number of crisis situations around the world.

Congressional Action. The House-passed supplemental adds \$100 million — for a total of \$342.4 million — to the Administration's request for humanitarian assistance to the Darfur region. The initial House Committee draft bill had provided \$92.4 million. During Appropriations Committee markup, the House panel voted 32-31 to approve an amendment by Representative Jackson to restore \$150 million in

⁶⁸ The Senate bill, however, directs that \$2.5 million of the \$63 million in Transition Initiative funds be used for the management of criminal cases, case tracking, and the reduction of pre-trial detention in Haiti.

food assistance that had been requested but not made part of the Chairman's draft bill. Earlier, however, the Committee had rejected (29-30) a more expansive amendment by Representative Jackson that would have provided the additional food aid, plus \$100 million for more refugee and disaster relief in the Darfur region. Subsequently, during debate on March 15, the House adopted by voice vote an amendment by Representative Jackson adding the same \$100 million for Darfur that had been rejected in Committee.

H.R. 1268, as reported in the Senate, provides \$242.4 million for humanitarian aid for the Darfur region and eastern Chad, the same as the request.

Global War on Terrorism-Related Programs

The Administration proposes \$750 million in direct aid for Jordan, Pakistan, and other coalition partners in the war on terrorism, some of which may be challenged for not meeting the criteria of an emergency supplemental requirement or as open-ended contingency resources that lack sufficient controls and congressional oversight.

- Jordan economic and military aid — \$200 million. These funds, which would be evenly split between economic and military aid, are justified as necessary to help Jordan offset the costs of hosting Iraq training initiatives, address increasing threats from Iraqi insurgents and problems on the Syrian and Saudi borders, and high oil prices.⁶⁹ The supplemental package would come on top of \$452 million already appropriated for Jordan in the regular FY2005 appropriation and \$456 million requested for FY2006.
- Pakistan military aid — \$150 million. As part of a multi-year, \$3 billion Presidential aid pledge to Pakistan, the Administration requested in the regular FY2005 appropriation \$700 million for Pakistan, \$300 million of which would support military activities. Congress directly appropriated \$148.8 million (post rescission) of the military aid request and authorized the President to draw an additional \$150 million from prior-year unobligated appropriations. The Administration thus far has not acted on the transfer authority, arguing that it does not want to adversely affect other key aid programs. Instead, the President seeks an additional direct appropriation of \$150 million that he did not receive in the FY2005 enacted spending measure. The Administration's Pakistan aid request for FY2006 again totals \$700 million, with \$300 million proposed for military aid.
- Solidarity Fund — \$200 million. The supplemental proposes \$200 million in military and security assistance for countries that have deployed troops in Afghanistan and Iraq to meet "extraordinary" defense costs of such operations. According to State Department officials, the funds would not be used to directly reimburse these

⁶⁹ *FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations Financial Plan*, p. 4.

countries for costs sustained in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such reimbursements are provided through DOD's Coalition Support Fund. Rather, the Solidarity Fund would help partners address general budget problems related to their presence in both countries by repairing or replacing defense articles and supporting a number of countries currently or about to deploy forces.⁷⁰

- Global War on Terrorism Partners Fund — \$200 million. This new account would provide economic aid to countries supporting the U.S. in the Global War on Terror. It would be constructed as a contingency fund, exempt from restrictions and conditions in any other provision of law, from which the Secretary of State could transfer resources to any Federal agency in support of the objectives of the Fund. Secretary of State Rice told the Senate Appropriations Committee on February 17, 2005, that the need for such a Fund became clear after the regular FY2005 appropriation had been submitted. She noted that a number of countries, although not deploying troops in Iraq or Afghanistan, had taken steps, such as securing their borders from terrorist infiltration, to take pressure off U.S. forces.⁷¹

These proposals to support coalition partners have raised a number of concerns among Members of Congress. Some question whether circumstances have changed to justify additional aid to Jordan and Pakistan, especially given the large aid packages approved for both countries in the regular FY2005 appropriation and congressional approval of a transfer authority to accommodate \$150 million in military aid for Pakistan. Others also ask why financial support for countries with troops on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan was not part of the FY2005 regular request or proposed for FY2006. Another concern relates to possible redundancy between the proposals outlined above and the roughly \$2.2 billion in the DOD portion of the supplemental for similar support to coalition partners.

The request for creation of the Global War on Terrorism Partners Fund has drawn particular challenges from several Members due to its broad flexibility and

⁷⁰ State Department news briefing, February 14. Examples of countries that might benefit, according to these officials, would include Fiji, Poland, Ukraine, El Salvador, Bulgaria, and Romania. During testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee on February 17, Secretary of State Rice stated, for example, that Poland had spent nearly \$500 million in troop deployment costs.

⁷¹ Selected examples of the types of aid that would be provided under the Partners Fund include basic development assistance for Yemen, which is uprooting Al Qaeda members in its country; election and governance support for the Krygyz Republic which hosts a coalition airbase; development, governance, and border control aid for Morocco, a close U.S. ally; poverty-focused assistance for El Salvador, a country that has deployed troops to Iraq; judicial reform, anti-corruption, and law enforcement support for Mongolia, another coalition member supplying troops in Iraq and Afghanistan; and development assistance for Djibouti, a nation providing the United States with the only military base in sub-Saharan Africa. (*FY2005 Supplemental Appropriations Financial Plan*, February 2005, pp. 17-19.)

lack of specificity for how the funds would be directed.⁷² This request follows recent efforts by the Administration to gain congressional approval of a flexible contingency fund that could be drawn on to respond to complex foreign emergencies. Congress has rejected these types of requests four times in the past three years. The Administration seeks \$100 million for a Conflict Response Fund for FY2006, although the focus of that account would be on post-conflict and weak states, not partners in the War on Terror.

Congressional Action. H.R. 1268, as passed by the House and reported in the Senate, fully supports the additional assistance for Pakistan and Jordan. The House measure, however, denies the \$400 million requested for the Partners Fund and the Solidarity Fund, while the Senate bill provides partial funding. The Senate measure includes the full \$200 million in peacekeeping resources for the Solidarity Fund, recommending the assistance be provided to Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Ukraine, Mongolia, Georgia, Lithuania, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Albania. The Senate-reported bill provided \$40 million for the Partners Fund, urging support for Yemen, the Krygyz Republic, Morocco, El Salvador, Mongolia, and Djibouti. During floor debate, however, the total for the Partners Fund was reduced to \$26.5 million in order to increase amounts for the State Department's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization and to add \$5 million for democracy programs in Lebanon.

U.N. Peacekeeping Operations

The Administration seeks \$780 million to support a number of existing, recently established, and prospective U.N. peacekeeping missions. According to officials, in addition to the \$484 million FY2005 enacted peacekeeping appropriation, there remains a \$780 million "gap" in current funding requirements. This, officials say, occurred because new U.N. operations — in Cote d'Ivoire, Burundi, and Haiti — and an anticipated operation in Sudan arose after the FY2005 budget was submitted in early 2004. The Administration, however, did not seek a budget amendment during congressional consideration of the regular FY2005 appropriation. The conference committee on the Commerce, Justice, and State Department funding measure noted its concern that the U.S. had voted to support the expansion or the creation of new U.N. operations without submitting a plan for covering the costs of such commitments. The Administration's FY2006 request is \$1.035 billion, an amount that reflects these new and expanded U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Congressional Action. The House-passed supplemental provides \$580 million of the \$780 million requested for international peacekeeping. Included in the total are funds for creating a U.N. mission in Sudan and permission to use up to \$55 million for the establishment of a Sudan war crimes tribunal. H.R. 1268, as reported in the Senate, includes \$680 million, \$100 million below the request, but offers the Administration the flexibility to reprogram funds or use the appropriation through the first quarter of FY2006 for any peacekeeping mission created after enactment of the

⁷² See remarks raised by several Representatives and Senators during hearings with Secretary of State Rice on February 16 and 17, 2005, before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

bill. Unlike the House, however, the Senate measure denies funds for a Sudan war crimes tribunal.

Palestinian Aid

In his State of the Union address on February 2, 2005, the President announced a \$350 million aid package for the West Bank and Gaza, \$200 million of which is proposed in the FY2005 supplemental. The FY2006 request includes the balance of \$150 million. The funds would be available, notwithstanding any provision of law, and the Administration says that some of the funds would be channeled directly to the Palestinian Authority (PA), including support for training and equipping civilian security services. Existing law includes several restrictions and conditions on aiding the PA related to concerns over accountability, transparency, and corruption. Secretary of State Rice defended the proposal, including the need for direct PA funding, arguing that the U.S. needs to move quickly to help the Palestinians prepare for governing Gaza following Israeli withdrawal.⁷³ Regular U.S. assistance for the West Bank and Gaza has averaged about \$75 million annually and generally channels aid through non-governmental organizations. The President, however, waived restrictions on direct aid to the PA in December 2004 and July 2003 in order to permit a portion of U.S. assistance to support Palestinian Authority costs.

Congressional Action. H.R. 1268, as passed by the House, fully funds the \$200 million Palestinian aid request, but adds the requirement for the GAO's Comptroller General to conduct an audit and investigation into the treatment, handling, and uses of West Bank and Gaza assistance provided in FY2005. During Committee markup, Members adopted an amendment offered by Representative Kolbe adding a requirement that the President report to Congress within two months after enactment of the supplemental appropriation regarding several issues, including efforts taken to purge individuals with terrorist ties from Palestinian security services, PA steps to dismantle terrorist infrastructure, PA efforts to promote peace with Israel, PA efforts to strengthen good governance, PA cooperation in U.S. investigations of Yassar Arafat's finances, and how much aid the PA receives from other donors. The amendment further bars the transfer of any supplemental cash aid to the PA and denies the President the use of national security waiver authorities to directly aid the PA with supplemental funds. This restriction, however, would not apply to \$75 million provided in the regular FY2005 Foreign Operations for the West Bank and Gaza, allowing the President, with the appropriate determinations and waivers, to transfer direct assistance to the PA. During House consideration, Members defeated (voice vote) an amendment by Representative Weiner to delete the Palestinian aid proposal.

The Senate-reported bill also approves \$200 million, but with somewhat different allocations, restrictions, and reporting requirements than the House. Of the \$200 million total, \$50 million is allocated to Israel to help facilitate the movement of Palestinian people and goods in and out of Israel. The measure further recommends \$3.5 million for the Holy Family Hospital in Bethlehem.

⁷³ Testimony before the House Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, February 16, 2005.

While the Senate Appropriations Committee report notes and supports the Administration plan not to provide any direct assistance to the PA, the bill does not include the House restriction barring any funds in the measure for the PA. The Committee, however, reminded the Administration of existing conditions on West Bank/Gaza aid and PA restrictions included in the FY2005 Foreign Operations appropriations (P.L. 108-467), and that they would apply to supplemental funds as well. Unlike the House-passed measure, however, the Senate provision would allow the President to use the national security waiver authority provided in P.L. 108-467 for direct aid to the PA with supplemental funds if he made such a determination in the future. The Senate bill also requires a report within 30 days of enactment regarding threats posed to civilian aircraft by reported smuggled missiles, and how the PA has dealt with reducing such threats.

Ukraine Aid

Following the recent elections in Ukraine, the Administration proposes \$60 million in supplemental economic support for Kiev. The additional resources would support anti-corruption and rule of law programs (\$19 million), economic reforms (\$13 million), civil society outreach (\$10 million), HIV/AIDS activities (\$4.5 million), nuclear safety (\$5.5 million), parliamentary election assistance (\$5 million), and political transition aid for the new government (\$3 million). These amounts would come on top of the \$79 million regular appropriation for FY2005. The State Department proposes \$88 million for FY2006.

Congressional Action. The House-passed measure includes \$33.7 million for Ukraine, a little more than half the level requested. In its report on H.R. 1268, the House Appropriations Committee stated its intent that the funds be used for programs that will demonstrate quickly U.S. support for the Yushenko government and assist in the upcoming parliamentary elections. The Senate bill provides the full \$60 million, recommending an increase of \$3.65 million in planned support for Ukrainian civil society organizations. The measure further adds \$10 million for democracy programs in Belarus and for humanitarian and conflict mitigation needs in Chechnya, Ingushetia, and elsewhere in the North Caucasus.

Broadcasting to Arab and Muslim Audiences

The supplemental includes \$4.8 million for the Voice of America, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, and the International Broadcasting Bureau supporting programming in the Middle East, South Asia, and Europe, especially in countries with significant Muslim and Arab populations. An additional \$2.5 million would support an upgrade of transmitting systems located in Tajikistan and boost broadcasting signals to Pakistan and Central Asia.

Congressional Action. The House supplemental includes the \$4.8 million for broadcasting activities, but rejects the request for transmitting systems upgrades. The Senate measure fully supports both items.

Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization

In mid-2004, the State Department created a new Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (O/CRS), an entity designed to strengthen U.S. capacity to prepare for and respond to post-conflict reconstruction situations and to help weak states. The supplemental includes \$9.4 million for start-up personnel costs of the Office that was not budgeted in the regular FY2005 appropriation. The request for FY2006 proposes about \$24 million to expand the O/CRS by 57 positions. The supplemental request further includes \$7.8 million to develop an initial corps of civilian staff to create a ready-response capacity within the State Department.

Congressional Action. H.R. 1268, as passed by the House, provides \$3 million for the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, about one-third the amount sought, and deletes \$7.8 million proposed for the ready-response corps. The Senate-reported bill included \$7.7 million for the Coordinator's Office, with the expectation that funds will be used for personnel in Washington and Sudan. Like the House bill, the Senate-reported measure included no funds for the ready-response corps. During floor debate, however, the Senate adopted an amendment by Senator Lugar to add \$9.5 million for the Coordinator's Office, thereby fully funding the request for the Office and for the ready-response corps. The Lugar amendment offset the additional costs by reducing appropriations for the Global War on Terrorism Partners Fund.

Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction

The tragedy of the December 26, 2004 tsunami that took the lives of perhaps as many as 200,000 people in 12 southeast Asian, South Asian, and east African nations has elicited over \$12 billion in aid pledges and commitments from governments, multilateral institutions, and private individuals. The United States made an early pledge of \$350 million for immediate relief efforts, but the Administration has increased this amount by seeking \$600 million in its request for a \$950 million FY2005 supplemental. Of this total, \$120 million would replenish USAID emergency aid accounts that had been drawn in support of the initial American government response. Likewise, the supplemental also proposes \$226 million to make similar reimbursements to Defense Department accounts that were used in the immediate aftermath of the tsunami.

The largest portion of the Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction supplemental account — \$581 million — would be used for small transition and longer term large infrastructure activities. Of this amount, up to \$45 million could be used to provide debt relief to the affected countries if their governments request such debt reduction. An additional \$22.6 million would support creation of tsunami warning systems in the region, activities carried out by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the U.S. Geological Survey. Out of the total \$950 million request, \$701 million falls under international affairs budget accounts managed by USAID and the State Department.

Congressional Action. The House-passed measure provides funds for all items proposed under the Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund, except for the

\$45 million proposed for debt reduction. In approving the tsunami relief money, the House Appropriations Committee noted its support for education and women and children programs, and recommended that \$10 million be used for training and equipment for women-led NGOs in tsunami-affected countries.

In the Senate, H.R. 1268 also provides full funding for the Tsunami Relief and Recovery Fund, minus \$45 million. Initially, as reported by the Committee, the measure denied use of funds for debt reduction. As the result of an amendment by Senator McConnell, authority to use up to \$45 million to cancel debt owed by tsunami-affected nations is restored. The Senate Appropriations Committee further notes several specific funding items: \$5 million for environmental recovery activities; \$12 million for programs assisting disabled individuals; \$1.5 million for trafficking in persons prevention activities; and \$3 million for teacher training programs in Aceh and Sri Lanka where there has been a high death rate among teachers. The Senate measure further increases NOAA funding by \$2.8 million for additional expansion of tsunami warning capacity.

Tsunami relief issues were also the subject of debate during House floor consideration of H.R. 1268. The House defeated (voice vote) an amendment by Representative Tancredo that would have barred the use of any funds in the bill for tsunami relief. The amendment's author believed that the more than \$1 billion in private donations for victims of the tsunami represent a significant outpouring of American support for relief and recovery efforts, and that given existing budget constraints and disaster needs in the U.S., further American taxpayer funds were not warranted. Opponents noted that a portion of the request would repay foreign aid accounts from which immediate tsunami relief assistance had been drawn, and would disrupt these other aid activities if funds were not restored. Moreover, they argued, the enormity of the tsunami destruction, extensive loss of life, and the long-term reconstruction requirements justified the full U.S. government pledge.

In further debate, the House adopted (voice vote) an amendment offered by Representative Maloney that increased the Tsunami Fund by \$3 million. Although not directly stated in the text of the amendment, the intent of its supporters is to provide \$3 million for a U.S. contribution to the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA) related to organization's work in tsunami-affected countries. In order to cover the additional costs of responding to unanticipated tsunami disaster needs, UNFPA issued a \$28 million "flash appeal" to which supporters of the amendment hope the United States would respond with a \$3 million contribution. Other Members note, however, that the text of the amendment does not direct the Administration to use the \$3 million as a UNFPA contribution, but only to supplement the Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund. The Maloney amendment offset the additional tsunami funds by reducing the appropriation for programs funded under the Economic Support Fund (ESF) account by \$3 million. The effect of this reduction would be to cut funds for either Afghanistan reconstruction activities, economic aid to Jordan, or Sudan peace implementation programs, each that would receive assistance from the supplemental's ESF account. Aid to the Palestinians, which is also provided through the ESF account, would not be effected because H.R. 1268 includes a specific earmark for the Palestinians.

U.S. funding for UNFPA has been a controversial issue for some time because of the organization's continuing programs in China, where most agree that coercive family planning and involuntary sterilization activities have been applied by the government for many years. The Bush Administration determined in July 2002 that UNFPA was in violation of U.S. law (the "Kemp-Kasten provision" in annual Foreign Operations appropriations) banning contributions to organizations that are involved in the management of coercive family planning programs. Executive branch determinations have blocked U.S. transfers to UNFPA, FY2002-FY2004, and a review of the FY2005 funding status is expected later this year.⁷⁴

Table 9. Foreign Policy Funds in FY2005 Supplemental
(in millions of dollars)

Activity (account)*	Request	House Passed	Senate Comm	Conf.
Iraq:				
U.S. Mission operations (DCP)	\$690.0	\$690.0	\$690.0	—
New Embassy Compound in Baghdad (Embassy Security/Construction)	\$658.0	\$592.0 ^a	\$592.0	—
USAID operating expenses (USAID/OE)	\$24.4	\$24.4	\$24.4	—
USAID Inspector General (USAID/OE/IG)	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	—
Subtotal, Iraq	\$1,374.9	\$1,308.9	\$1,308.9	—
Afghanistan:				
U.S. Mission operations (DCP)	\$60.0	\$55.5	\$60.0	—
Police training (INCLE)	\$400.0	\$400.0	\$444.5	—
Counternarcotics (INCLE)	\$260.0	\$194.0	\$215.5	—
Counternarcotics related activities (ESF)	\$248.5	\$248.5	\$248.5	—
Reconstruction & Democratic institutions/Government capacity building (ESF)	\$1,060.8	\$490.7	\$1,060.8	—
Anti-terrorism training and protection programs (NADR)	\$17.1	\$17.1	\$17.1	—
Subtotal, Afghanistan	\$2,046.4	\$1,405.8	\$2,046.4	—
Sudan/Darfur:				
Refugee relief for Darfur and Chad (MRA)	\$48.4	\$98.4	\$48.4	—
Humanitarian relief for Darfur (IDFA)	\$44.0	\$94.0	\$44.0	—
Emergency food aid for Darfur (PL 480)	\$150.0	\$150.0	\$150.0	—
Peace implementation aid for southern Sudan (ESF)	\$22.0	\$22.0	\$22.0	—

⁷⁴ For more information regarding UNFPA and U.S. contributions, see CRS Report RL32703, *The U.N. Population Fund: Background and the U.S. Funding Debate*.

Activity (account)*	Request	House Passed	Senate Comm	Conf.
Security sector reform in southern Sudan (PKO)	\$10.0	\$10.0	\$10.0	—
Rehabilitation/reconstruction, mainly in southern Sudan (TI)	\$63.0	\$0.0	\$63.0	—
Repatriation of Sudanese refugees (MRA)	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	—
Subtotal, Sudan/Darfur	\$342.4	\$379.4	\$342.4	—
Other Global War on Terrorism Related:				
Global War on Terrorism Partners Fund	\$200.0	\$0.0	\$40.0	—
Security aid for coalition partners with troops in Iraq and Afghanistan (PKO)	\$200.0	\$0.0	\$200.0	—
Jordan econ. & military (ESF & FMF)	\$200.0	\$200.0	\$200.0	—
Pakistan military aid (FMF)	\$150.0	\$150.0	\$150.0	—
Subtotal, Other Global War on Terrorism	\$750.0	\$350.0	\$590.0	—
Other:				
Palestinian economic aid (ESF)	\$200.0	\$200.0	\$150.0	—
Israel (ESF)	—	—	\$50.0	—
Ukraine economic assistance (FSA)	\$60.0	\$33.7	\$60.0	—
Belarus/North Caucasus (FSA)	—	—	\$10.0	—
Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction & Stabilization (DCP)	\$17.2	\$3.0	\$7.7	—
Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Fund classified (NADR)	\$15.0	\$0.0	\$15.0	—
Peacekeeping, mainly for operations in Haiti and Africa (CIPA)	\$780.0	\$580.0	\$680.0	—
Refugee admissions backlog	—	—	\$25.9	—
Africa refugees needs	—	—	\$29.1	—
Middle East Broadcasting (BBG)	\$4.8	\$4.8	\$4.8	—
Broadcasting system upgrade (BBG)	\$2.5	\$0.0	\$2.5	—
Reduction in ESF account	—	(\$3.0)	—	—
Subtotal, Other	\$1,079.5	\$818.5	\$1,035.0	—
Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction:				
Replenish USAID for immediate response & relief	\$120.0	\$120.0	\$120.0	—
Recovery and reconstruction, of which up to \$45 million for debt reduction	\$581.0	\$539.0	\$536.0	—
Replenish DOD's immediate response	\$226.1	\$226.1	\$226.1	—
Tsunami warning system (NOAA and US Geological Survey)	\$22.6	\$22.6	\$25.4	—

Activity (account)*	Request	House Passed	Senate Comm	Conf.
Subtotal, Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction	\$949.7	\$907.7	\$907.5	—
Less, non-Foreign Policy funds	(\$248.7)	(\$248.7)	(\$251.5)	—
Net, Foreign Policy Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction	\$701.0	\$659.0	\$656.0	—
Rescission of FY2003 Turkey aid	—	\$1,000.0	\$1,000.0	
TOTAL, Foreign Policy Funds	\$6,294.2	\$3,921.6	\$4,978.7	—

* Account acronyms: BBG = Broadcasting Board of Governors; CIPA = Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities; DCP = Diplomatic and Consular Programs; ESF = Economic Support Fund; FMF = Foreign Military Financing; FSA = Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union; IDFA = International Disaster and Famine Assistance; INCLE = International Narcotics & Law Enforcement; MRA = Migration and Refugee Assistance; NADR = NOAA = National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs; PKO = Peacekeeping Operations; PL 480 = Food for Peace; TI = Transition Initiative; USAID/OE/IG = US Agency for International Development Operating Expenses and Inspector General.

- a. H.R. 1268, as passed by the House, includes \$592 million for a new U.S. embassy in Baghdad. However, an amendment adopted by the House during floor debate prohibits the use of any funds in bill for embassy security, construction, and maintenance.