

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 356, nays 47, answered “present” 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—356

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart	Jones (NC)
Ackerman	Dickey	Jones (OH)
Allen	Dicks	Kanjorski
Andrews	Dingell	Kaptur
Archer	Dixon	Kelly
Armey	Doggett	Kennedy
Baca	Dooley	Kildee
Bachus	Doolittle	Kilpatrick
Baker	Doyle	Kind (WI)
Baldacci	Dreier	King (NY)
Baldwin	Duncan	Kleczka
Ballenger	Dunn	Knollenberg
Barcia	Edwards	Kolbe
Barr	Ehlers	Kuykendall
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	LaFalce
Bartlett	Emerson	LaHood
Barton	Engel	Lampson
Bass	Eshoo	Lantos
Becerra	Etheridge	Largent
Bentsen	Evans	Larson
Bereuter	Ewing	Latham
Berkley	Farr	Lazio
Berman	Fattah	Leach
Berry	Fletcher	Lee
Biggart	Foley	Levin
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Bishop	Ford	Lewis (KY)
Blagojevich	Fossella	Linder
Bliley	Fowler	Lipinski
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Boehrlert	Frost	Lucas (KY)
Boehner	Galleghy	Lucas (OK)
Bonilla	Ganske	Luther
Bono	Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)
Boswell	Gephardt	Maloney (NY)
Boucher	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Boyd	Gillmor	Martinez
Brady (TX)	Gilman	Mascara
Bryant	Gonzalez	Matsui
Burr	Goode	McCarthy (MO)
Burton	Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)
Buyer	Goodling	McCollum
Callahan	Gordon	McGovern
Calvert	Goss	McHugh
Camp	Graham	McInnis
Campbell	Green (TX)	McIntosh
Canady	Green (WI)	McIntyre
Cannon	Greenwood	McKeon
Capps	Hall (OH)	McKinney
Capuano	Hall (TX)	McNulty
Cardin	Hansen	Meahan
Carson	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Castle	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Chabot	Hayes	Menendez
Chambliss	Hayworth	Metcalf
Clayton	Herger	Mica
Clement	Hill (IN)	Millender-
Clyburn	Hinchey	McDonald
Coble	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Collins	Hobson	Miller, Gary
Combest	Hoeffel	Miller, George
Condit	Hoekstra	Minge
Conyers	Holden	Mink
Cook	Holt	Moakley
Cooksey	Hooley	Mollohan
Cox	Horn	Moore
Coyne	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Cramer	Houghton	Morella
Cubin	Hoyer	Murtha
Cummings	Hunter	Myrick
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Nadler
Danner	Inslee	Napolitano
Davis (FL)	Isakson	Neal
Davis (IL)	Istook	Nethercutt
Davis (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Ney
Deal	Jackson-Lee	Northup
DeGette	(TX)	Nussle
Delahunt	Jenkins	Obey
DeLauro	John	Olver
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
DeMint	Johnson, E.B.	Ose
Deutsch	Johnson, Sam	Owens

Oxley	Sanchez	Taylor (NC)
Packard	Sanford	Terry
Pascarell	Sawyer	Thomas
Pastor	Saxton	Thornberry
Paul	Scarborough	Thune
Payne	Schakowsky	Thurman
Pease	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Pelosi	Serrano	Tierney
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Toomey
Petri	Shadegg	Towns
Phelps	Shaw	Trafigant
Pickering	Shays	Turner
Pitts	Sherman	Udall (CO)
Pombo	Sherwood	Upton
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Velazquez
Porter	Shows	Vento
Portman	Shuster	Walden
Price (NC)	Simpson	Walsh
Pryce (OH)	Sisk	Wamp
Radanovich	Skeen	Watkins
Rahall	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Regula	Smith (MI)	Watts (OK)
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Weiner
Rivers	Smith (WA)	Weldon (FL)
Rodriguez	Snyder	Weldon (PA)
Roemer	Souder	Wexler
Rogers	Spratt	Weygand
Rohrabacher	Stabenow	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Wicker
Rothman	Stenholm	Wilson
Roukema	Stump	Wolf
Roybal-Allard	Sununu	Woolsey
Royce	Talent	Wynn
Rush	Tanner	Young (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Tauscher	
Ryun (KS)	Tauzin	

NAYS—47

Aderholt	Hefley	Sabo
Baird	Hill (MT)	Sandlin
Billbray	Hilleary	Schaffer
Bionir	Hilliard	Stark
Borski	Kingston	Strickland
Brady (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Stupak
Brown (OH)	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Chenoweth-Hage	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Costello	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Crowley	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Pallone	Udall (NM)
English	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Filner	Pickett	Waters
Gibbons	Ramstad	Weller
Gutierrez	Riley	Wu
Gutknecht	Rogan	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—30

Barrett (NE)	Hulshof	Quinn
Bateman	Hyde	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Salmon
Clay	Kasich	Sanders
Coburn	Klink	Scott
Crane	Kucinich	Slaughter
Everett	LaTourette	Spence
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Vitter
Gekas	McDermott	Wise
Granger	Norwood	Young (AK)

□ 1052

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 2418, ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, Members will want to know that this afternoon a Dear Colleague letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of April 3 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 2418, the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies

and a brief explanation of the amendment by 12 noon on Monday, April 3, to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 in the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to assure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3908, 2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 450 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 450

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 58, lines 9 through 17. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment printed in part A of the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report. The amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for

electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend and colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate on this issue only.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Rules parlance, we describe H.Res. 450 as an open rule plus; that is, we have provided an open rule which ensures that any amendments in order under the standing rules of the House may be offered. Additionally, we have provided protections for a variety of Members that require waivers.

There has been a great interest among Members in this bill. In fact, we had more than 40 amendments presented to the Committee on Rules yesterday and yesterday evening, and we spent the better part of yesterday evening, actually well into the night, attempting to craft this rule. In the end, the rule provides for waivers for 14 separate amendments above and beyond whatever amendments may be offered under the regular order of an open amendment process.

While we were unable to make provisions for each of the amendments submitted, we did seek to thread the needle and ensure adequate debate on the major issues raised by this bill.

□ 1100

In my view, this rule accomplishes that objective. I should note for those who like to keep score, that this type of "open rule plus" procedure is the same format that was used for last year's supplemental. Also, a bit of Committee on Rules history shows that 53 of the last 65 rules granted for supplementals have been open rules.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 450 is an open rule providing 1 hour general debate equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and waives points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unau-

thorized appropriations of legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, except as specified in the rule.

This exception pertains to a provision in the bill under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, a legislative provision which did not have the concurrence of the authorizing committee.

The rule further provides, prior to the consideration of any other amendment, for consideration of the amendments printed in part A of the Committee on Rules report, which may be offered only in the order printed in the report.

The rule provides for the consideration of the amendments printed in part B of the Committee on Rules report, which may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill.

The rule provides that all of the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report and waives points of order during consideration of the bill against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI, prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have caused their amendments to be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule also allows for the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

And, lastly, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions as usual.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion voiced about this bill so far. Questions and concerns raised from many, many different perspectives. Some Members are uncomfortable with the defense funding, others have concerns about the counternarcotics package for Colombia. We have Members who believe this bill spends too much money, and we have other Members who seek more spending in other areas. We have Members who want to allocate more of the existing surplus to debt reduction, and we have Members who seek to realign priorities in the bill. With this rule, we have found a way to accommodate a great many of those Members.

With respect to the defense spending in this bill, an amount that reflects a sizable increase over what was requested by the President, this is nec-

essary because the administration has consistently underfunded and over-committed our Armed Forces to the point where readiness, training, equipment, and morale have all suffered, undeniably.

Whatever one's views about the wisdom of our policy in Kosovo, and I too have very deep misgivings about what we have been doing there and about what our definition of success is for that troubled region, though I have no misgivings about the brilliant performance of our military, the fact remains that President Clinton got us into that quagmire and now we have an obligation to foot the bill. We have to pay the President's bill.

We have been robbing Peter to pay Paul for too long when it comes to committing our military forces, causing in fact an emergency situation today. I fully support efforts in this bill to reverse that trend.

Turning to the other major component of the bill, the counternarcotics package centered on "Plan Colombia," I urge my colleagues to look beyond the price tag of today's proposal and consider the cost; the cost in lives, in dollars, and lost productivity; of ducking this fight at this time. I believe we must act now. The administration has already waited too long. The most recent statistics related to Colombia are alarming, and I want to highlight three areas.

First, the amount of drugs coming from Colombia is rising dramatically. Colombia now produces 60 percent of the world's cocaine crop, an astounding 90 percent of which makes its way here to the United States. Now, part of Colombia's problem is caused by our success in fighting the drug war in Peru and Bolivia. Much of the drug problem in terms of supply is now concentrated in Colombia, and that Democratically-elected government has asked for our assistance to deliver the coup de grace to the drug suppliers.

Second, the flow of drugs into the U.S. poses a direct threat to our children. One in every two American school kids will try illegal drugs before graduating high school unless we reverse the trends. We also know that the potency of Colombia's cocaine today and heroin today is rising, making it even more likely that today's curious kids, under peer pressure in school, seeking to try something cool or something new, could get hooked more easily and become tomorrow's addicts.

Illegal drug use costs U.S. society a staggering \$110 billion a year right now and results in more than 14,000 American deaths each year. I am going to say that again: 14,000 American deaths each year; primarily our youth. That is unbelievable. I cannot seriously believe that any Member is going to pull out the flag of surrender and say we are quitting on the war on drugs with those kinds of statistics. This is a meaningful way to deal with that subject.

Third, illegal drug use costs the U.S. society, as I said, not only 14,000 American lives but billions of dollars. We are already in this thing; we need to finish it. Today, we find ourselves at a very critical point. In recent years, the United States has decreased the amount of money we spend on interdiction, lowering our guard and opening the door for well-financed, opportunistic, and ruthless narco-traffickers to boost their shipments and bring more drugs to our school yards and our playgrounds, and, indeed, those are their target areas.

Meanwhile, the political situation in Colombia has spiraled out of control, despite the sincere efforts of a friendly Democratically-elected government in that country that is trying to do the right thing and asking for help, not only from us but from other countries as well. So we find ourselves in a crisis we can no longer afford to ignore, and this is a true emergency.

We have heard arguments against the Colombia package based upon the fear that we will become sucked into another Vietnam and that we will be aiding and abetting human rights' abusers. I reject both of those arguments. We cannot simply put our head in the sand and pretend that the emergence of a narco-State in our own back yard would not adversely impact our national security.

Likewise, with regard to the question of human rights, later in today's debate I will be assisting in offering a bipartisan amendment designed to address those legitimate and important concerns head-on by conditioning military assistance on some tough certification requirements about ensuring that human rights' violators are properly dealt with.

And, lastly, we hear complaints that we are overly focused on the supply side of the equation. The fact is that in recent years we have cut back on interdiction and eradication in favor of more demand reduction and prevention programs here at home. And the statistics speak for themselves: That formula has failed. What we are trying to do in this bill is focus on the serious and growing threat that one of our close southern neighbors is being overrun by the drug traffickers who have sat their sights on unfettered access to the impressionable youth of America.

I believe we have provided for conditionality on the human rights' violations. I certainly want to underscore that it is the Colombians themselves who will be conducting this action. We are providing some training, some logistic support and some equipment for them. We are not sending military troops in the sense that we sent them to Kosovo or other places recently we have read about. We are sending them to help train these people to take care of a problem within their borders.

And on the question of the balance between supply and demand and treatment, I believe that we have to fight the war on drugs on all fronts, not just

one front. And I believe the statistics will show that we are doing well when we stay applied on all fronts.

So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that when all is said and done today, the House will have worked its will on a large complicated spending package that contains many important provisions besides those I have addressed. I urge support for the rule so we can get on with this debate, which I suspect will go well into the evening.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of reasons to oppose this supplemental appropriations bill, one of the most important is the innocent people of Colombia. This bill will provide \$1.3 billion to a military with one of the worst human rights' records in that hemisphere, the Colombian military, over which neither the Colombian government nor the United States Armed Forces have much control.

Mr. Speaker, we have been here before. Maybe not all of my colleagues remember El Salvador, but I do. The Colombian military has strong ties to paramilitaries which commit unspeakable atrocities. The Salvadoran military had strong ties to death squads which used intimidation, torture, and murder to do the dirty work of the Salvadoran army.

They say this is very different. They say there is a president in Colombia who is determined to stand up to the military and the drug leaders. Maybe so, Mr. Speaker, but in El Salvador we had two presidents, both of them were educated at Jesuit universities, one at Georgetown and one at Notre Dame, and they were determined to do the same. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that in both El Salvador and Colombia the government has very little control over the military.

Both countries were embroiled in a brutal civil war. Colombia's Civil War has already cost 30,000 lives in the last 10 years. El Salvador's civil war killed 75,000 noncombatants over a period of 10 years. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker: The civil war in El Salvador, funded by the United States of America, killed 75,000 noncombatants.

Twenty years ago, Mr. Speaker, we were in the exact same situation that we are today. Twenty years ago we had a choice to make, Mr. Speaker, and we made the wrong choice. Today, the answer is clear. We must oppose this aid to a murderous Colombian military with a list of human rights' violations a mile long.

Now, just listen to a few of them. Just last January, Colombian paramilitaries, with ties to the Army, dragged 27 worshipers out of a church and shot them in cold blood. From January 7 to January 10 last year,

paramilitaries committed 19 separate massacres, leaving 143 people dead and hundreds more displaced from their homes. And just last month, Mr. Speaker, paramilitaries linked to the Colombian army danced and drank as they tortured, as they beheaded, at least 28 villagers in northern Colombia.

Yet today, Mr. Speaker, the House is considering a \$1.3 billion military aid package for military aid, training, helicopters, and arms to that very same military. I am reminded of a letter that Salvadoran Archbishop Oscar Romero wrote to President Carter 20 years ago today begging him, in the interest of human rights, to stop the military aid to El Salvador. One month later, 20 years ago, Bishop Romero was murdered by a Salvadoran military death squad as he was saying mass.

Downstairs in my office hangs a picture of Archbishop Romero. Every day I look at it and every day I remember the grievous wrongs our country did helping to perpetuate those killings in his country. Mr. Speaker, let us not remember the 20th anniversary of Archbishop Romero by making the same mistakes in Colombia.

I have stood at the place where the Jesuits were killed, where their brains were splattered on a wall, blood all over the ground, and I just cannot stand by and watch our country do to Colombia what we did to El Salvador. The administration is wrong and my Republican colleagues are wrong. We are endangering thousands more lives in El Salvador, in Colombia. It should not be done. I would think the United States should have learned its lesson by now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the military aid to Colombia.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Speaker of the time on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 25 minutes remaining.

□ 1115

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say I am going to vote against this rule for a number of reasons. First of all, if we look at spending issues, we will see that the bill as reported is \$4 billion above the amount requested by the President. Before it is finished, this bill will have added to it an additional \$4 billion not requested by the President.

It is clear that only 1 week after this House passed a budget resolution promising to live within spending ceilings that the \$4 billion that will be added under the rule today is simply an attempt to get around those budget ceilings so that there will be \$4 billion

more room in the defense appropriation for Members' projects. A very interesting exercise in fiscal discipline, it lasted one week.

Secondly, we are now being asked to enter into a huge new long-term commitment to underwrite a war in Colombia. We have been told it will last at least 5 years, and I suspect it will last probably 10.

For 35 years, the date of August 7, 1964, has lived in infamy in history because that was the day that Congress roared through the Gulf at Tonkin resolution on this very same floor with 40 minutes of debate.

Today, we are going to be given only 20 minutes to discuss the advisability of entering into this long 5- to 10-year commitment to underwrite this war in Colombia. That means that those of us who think this is not a good idea will have exactly 10 minutes to make our case. That is amazing.

Thirdly, despite the fact that the Rand Corporation has done a study financed in part by the U.S. Army which says that a dollar spent on reducing demand for drugs here at home is 23 times more effective than a dollar spent in reducing drug use through interdiction and supply reduction abroad, this rule denies us the opportunity to even vote on the Pelosi amendment, which would allow us to provide more funding to deal with the drug problem here at home by expanding drug treatment programs. That is, in my view, ill-advised.

There is also no provision allowed under which we could even put on the floor the President's request for debt relief for countries such as Bolivia and Honduras.

Lastly, I would say that there were over a dozen Democrats who asked to be allowed to offer amendments to this proposition. Only two were given the opportunity to offer those amendments. We have 10 amendments that are going to be offered by majority party Members and two others that are bipartisan, with lead sponsors being the majority party.

In other words, the majority party first crafted the initial bill to its liking. Now they insist on being able to offer over 80 percent of the amendments that are going to be offered on the floor on this day. And then they wonder why there is not more support on this side of the aisle. I think those numbers speak for themselves.

This bill is a mistake. I will vote against the rule. I will vote against the bill. If we are going to get involved in a long-term war commitment in this hemisphere, we owe it to our constituents to spend more than 10 minutes discussing the consequences.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, unlike my friend and colleague, the previous speaker, I am going to support this rule. We need to get this rule passed. We need to get this supplemental on the floor, and we need to get it down to the other body so that then our friend and colleague, Senator STEVENS, can work his magic and get us a supplemental appropriations bill.

Now, time is not on our side in the case of the supplemental or our entire appropriations process. But let me just mention time in one regard. American soldiers are in Kosovo today. Americans are involved in a situation in Kosovo where we are putting up most of the assets. Many of our European allies are not responding to us with the support that they had promised to provide in Kosovo.

It is the humble opinion of this Member that the Kosovo experience is not going to be a positive one for the United States. And I hate to say that, because our troops do such a good job. But in order to eliminate the hatred and stop the killing that is taking place between not the organized groups in Kosovo but just the people themselves, neighbor to neighbor, the hate, the killing, we would have to put a soldier on every street corner in every city and town and hamlet in Kosovo. And, obviously, we cannot muster that kind of a major operation.

But the problem with Kosovo is that the money is already being spent. It is committed. The President deployed troops. The money is spent.

Now, where did the money come from? The money came from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance accounts of all of the military services. That means, if we do not replace this money, whether we like it or not, the fourth quarter training exercises of the United States military will have to stand down, many of them, because their fourth quarter money has already been spent.

Now, look at the calendar that I show here. All of this red is the fiscal year that has already gone by. This is today, March 29. This part of the fiscal year is gone. If we look closely at the blue colors on this chart, those are colors that the Congress will be in recess for the political conventions this summer for the work periods back home in our districts at 4th of July and other times of the year. And so, the white numbers are the only really working days left to get this work done.

We have got to get this supplemental over to the Senate where Senator STEVENS, as I said, can work his magic. This will help us begin to replace this money for the military. Whether we like it or not, the President has already spent the money. When we pass this rule, we can deal with some of the other issues we will hear on the floor today.

We will deal with a number of the issues that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), raised. Some of them are very legitimate, and

they should be considered and they should be debated. But we have got to move along. We need to adopt this rule this morning and get on to the consideration of this bill.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The Chair will remind Members that although it is permissible to refer to the sponsor of a measure in the Senate, further personal references should be avoided.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a personal reference to a dear friend of mine and yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time. And he is my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that I disagree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY). It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the incredible work that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) did in Central America during the 1980s. More than any other individual in this institution, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) can take credit for saving thousands and thousands of lives, and I want to acknowledge that.

But I do disagree. Colombia is not Central America. Colombia is not El Salvador. There was recently an article in a report called the International Policy Report. The agency or the think tank that produces this particular publication is headed by the former ambassador to El Salvador, Robert White, who, by the way, was discharged from that ambassadorship because of his position on the issue of El Salvador by President Reagan.

Now, in fairness, I have to acknowledge that Ambassador White was clear that he disagreed with this particular package, but on other grounds. This article that was written by his associate I think captures the fact that the analogy between Central America and Colombia is inaccurate. I am going to read some excerpts:

"Colombia's decades-old conflict and the effort to end it are far more complicated than the violence El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua suffered during the 1980s."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to point out: "Unlike the groups in El Salvador's FMLN and Guatemala's URNG, Colombia's three guerilla groups fight separately, violating human rights frequently, and are held in low esteem by most citizens. The paramilitary death squads operate in the open, resembling private armies more than shadowy