

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

groups of killers and are somewhat independent of the Army."

"Here in Colombia," he points out, "the Government seeks to bring guerrillas to the negotiating table."

He concludes by saying, "With the exception of the United States, no foreign source arms or combatants. Instead, the drug trade pervades, corrupts, and finances all sides."

"On deeper examination, this conflict, the western hemisphere's oldest and most brutal, bears only a passing resemblance to Central America."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a gentleman who served with me in El Salvador.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the majority refused to allow debate on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) to add \$1.3 billion for drug treatment and prevention here at home.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, today we will be given very limited debate on a number of important amendments to the Colombia aid package. I strongly oppose this Colombia aid package as it is currently constituted.

Like every Member in this House, I want to support President Pastrana in his efforts to negotiate peace and end the 40-year civil war and to provide economic development for the Colombian people. And like every Member in this House, I want to reduce drug use in the United States. Unfortunately, this package will not further either of those goals.

The three antidrug battalions and related aircraft in this bill are to be deployed in two southern provinces to root out guerrillas that have been entrenched there for 40 years and to eradicate coca crops grown by peasant farmers. The futility of spending billions on eradication should be obvious to anyone who has studied this question, whether those studies are from the Rand Institute or our own GAO.

Coca is so profitable and easy to grow that short-term success has always proven an empty victory. Like mercury hit with a hammer, coca cultivation attacked in one location simply scatters elsewhere.

So what will this package achieve? In the most violent country in the hemisphere, it will only result in more violence. It will ally the United States with the most brutal military in the hemisphere.

Read the Human Rights Watch report. Read the reports of the Colombian Commission of Jurors. Read the reports by the United Nations and the OAS. They paint a picture of the Colombian military that I doubt any

Member of this House would want to be associated with. And the victims, and there will be victims, will be the civilian population.

My colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), says that Colombia is not El Salvador. He is right in one respect. Colombia is 20 times the size of El Salvador.

I think one of the things that we need to do is we need to learn from the lessons of El Salvador and our other interventions in Central America to make sure we do not repeat the mistakes. Better to spend this money on treatment, education, and law enforcement here at home.

The best way to fight drugs is to reduce demand, something this bill does not even attempt to do. Defeat this rule and rethink the Colombia package.

□ 1130

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the distinguished subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time. The rule includes an amendment that will allow as we have heard for additional \$4 billion to be added to the defense accounts. It touches on many of the vital needs that we have in terms of our shortfall for our military. I will have an opportunity to discuss that later. I will not later be talking about the Colombia piece, and I would like to take just a moment to address that. I would like my colleagues to know that this brings back amazing memories. For the first time I ever focused upon my chairman the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) who today was presenting the difficulty of our schedules and our ranking member the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), it was at a time that we were discussing Central America and Latin America.

In those days, the debate flowed around El Salvador and Nicaragua, Guatemala, indeed the voices that swirl around the ranking member today were very similar in those days. They were opposed to America's involvement in Central America. Today, we see that region thriving in democracy. Indeed today Colombia is asking us for our assistance with a very, very significant drug problem. Indeed, America cannot solve Colombia's entire problem; but they have asked for our help. It would be a grave error for us to make the same mistake that those same voices would have suggested we make in El Salvador in the country of Colombia. I urge us to pass the rule and indeed to support this bill in its final form.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would suggest the gentleman go back and recheck my record.

I did not oppose our efforts in Salvador. I opposed certain efforts that did not provide for the support of legitimate democratic forces, but I also supported funding for Salvador.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Taking back my time, there is little doubt that the voices were almost identical to those that flow today regarding this issue. There is little question, they did not want us involved in El Salvador or Nicaragua, and there is democracy there today because of America's involvement in part. Colombia has a major problem. They are asking for our assistance. I would suggest that we provide them with a small amount of assistance.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Institutional memory, Mr. Speaker, is the ability to recognize a mistake and make it again. Let us hope we do not do it again today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday morning, the House passed the Republican budget resolution by all of four votes. Today, the Republican leadership would override it because if this rule passes, the House will take up and probably pass a supplemental appropriations bill that, with amendments, will put spending \$4 billion above the level assumed in the budget resolution we passed just days ago. And since the extra costs will not be offset, the budget surplus for 2000 will drop and so will the budget surplus for 2001. Indeed, by our calculation, this supplemental, together with other activities, actions already or likely to be passed will reduce the surplus, the on-budget surplus for this year from \$26.5 billion to \$5.1 billion.

Last week when the House debated the budget resolution, we predicted that over 10 years the Republican resolution which passed would spend all of the non-Social Security surplus and \$68 billion of the Social Security surplus. We pointed out that the resolution assumed discretionary spending cuts of \$117 billion over 5 years which we seriously doubted Congress would ever make; and if those cuts were not made, we predicted that you would have to dig even deeper into Social Security. We were convinced that eventually this resolution would be overridden as it was in 1999 and again in 1998, but we never thought you would do it in less than a week.

Now, I readily agree that this bill contains funds for national defense and domestic priorities that are important. I am not contesting the validity of most of these items. I am making a stronger point. I think this supplemental shows that the budget resolution adopted just days ago contains spending levels for discretionary spending that are a sham.

Last week you were calling for Draconian spending cuts. This week you

are calling for dramatic increases, \$12.5 billion this year. Granted this spending is for this year alone but it is bound to have recurring effects. I cannot believe that what we are doing for Colombia will end this year. I cannot believe that the spare parts we are buying now for 2001 will not be needed next year. We need a realistic budget resolution. I think we should hold in abeyance this supplemental until we come back from conference with a budget resolution that is realistic and it recognizes the costs that we are surely going to incur as this supplemental points out.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I rise in strong opposition to this rule. The emergency spending bill appropriates \$9 billion. However, this rule does not make in order the Wu-Kuykendall-Capps amendment to provide just \$14.2 million to help hard-pressed West Coast fishermen.

Pacific Coast fishermen have had their livelihood restricted by the Federal Government's effort to restore the West Coast groundfish fishery. This is costing hardworking men and women millions of dollars in lost income. It is hurting communities up and down the coast like Morro Bay and Avila Beach in my district.

The governors of California, Oregon, and Washington have requested disaster assistance for fishing communities. The administration recognized their need and asked for this funding. The money would fund important research and stock assessment of the fishery, it would allow for the buyback of permits and boats, and it would help communities cope with the loss of a big industry.

The fishing men and women in my district would rather be on the water hauling in their catch. But if we are going to keep them off their boats, it is imperative that we help them to feed their families. I am disappointed in this rule. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Let me give a response to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) with respect to the dollars that are in this supplemental under the defense heading.

They are there simply because your Marines, your Air Force, your Army, your Navy needs them. Every time the Commandant of the Marine Corps addresses Congress in any forum, he always says, "This is your Marine Corps." And in a very true sense, it is your Marine Corps and all the rest of the services. As my friend the gentleman from South Carolina knows, and I know that is the reason the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is going to join with me and a number of other people in supporting the Lewis-

Spence amendment to bring in about 4 billion extra dollars in spare parts, in safety fixes, in emergency fixes on the military health care system and a number of other areas where there truly is an emergency.

That is why Democrats and Republicans have very carefully asked the services when they came before us, did the \$305 billion defense budget submitted by the administration, does that take care of what your troops need, and they told us no. We said, be specific. And they outlined \$15 billion worth of unfunded requirements; things we had to do.

Let me tell my colleagues why they outlined them to us. They outlined them to us because our planes in many cases are not able to get off the ground and go do the mission. The mission capability is dropping like a rock. That means your plane cannot start up on the tarmac or on a carrier deck, go off, do its mission, and return.

They brought them to us because, in my estimation, the safety record is going down in the services. Eighty crashes of military aircraft in 1998 and 1999, 80 crashes, 90 dead as a result of those crashes. We have got old platforms. We have got platforms without spare parts.

The Air Force is 1,200 pilots short. Some of the money in this amendment, the Spence-Lewis amendment, requests extra money for recruiting, for retention, to keep skilled people in the services. This is probably our most important job, keeping our Nation secure. This amendment gives about 25 percent of what our services told us they have to have to keep the wheels turning, to keep this reduced force going, to keep the equipment repaired, to keep the spares coming.

When we went to Kosovo, Air Force readiness went down 50 percent State-side because we had to move all the spare parts and all the available mechanics because we did not have very many of them, we had to move them into theater. So we dropped mission capability 50 percent in the units that were remaining. We are stretched very thin. Please work with us. Moderates, liberals, conservatives, vote for the Spence-Lewis amendment. It helps America's people in uniform.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, a rule that will not allow Democrats by and large to offer amendments on this most important supplemental appropriation, the first one, I might add, for the 21st century. Eighty percent of the amendments are by the majority party. We were not able to offer many.

One of the most important amendments is an amendment that would provide treatment on demand for those Americans who found themselves un-

fortunately addicted to drugs, drugs I might add that more than any other country in the world Colombia supplies the heroin and the cocaine that has infested our families and our neighborhoods across America.

In this supplemental, we are providing \$1.7 billion to Colombia and not a penny for drug treatment. I think it is horrible that the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) was not allowed, and I think we should vote against this rule.

Additionally, Mozambique. We are told that the assessment must be made for Mozambique. The assessment I understand will be done on Friday. I offered an amendment in committee, \$60 million, \$20 million for child survival, \$20 million for development assistance, \$20 million for international disaster relief, but withdrew the amendment because they said we had to have the assessment.

The chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), have agreed that this money should come forth and the money is in the accounts now to be released for Mozambique. Release the money. It ought to be a part of the rule. We ought to be able to debate it. We are not able at this time.

Treat those Americans who are addicted to much of the drugs that come from Colombia. We are not allowed to debate; we are not allowed to offer it. It is a bad rule. Vote against it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in this supplemental, there is \$40 million to deal with the citrus canker problem in Florida, a problem that the Department of Agriculture said could have been handled probably with \$5 million had they jumped on it immediately.

The Department of Agriculture now is saying if we do not jump on the plum pox virus problem again, we are not going to have a \$5 million problem, we are going to have a several billion dollar problem. This citrus problem is probably going to cost at least \$200 million.

What has happened in Europe and what has happened in Spain and Chile is that their stone fruit crop was wiped out. If you happen to produce peaches, apricots, plums, cherries, almonds, avocados in your particular districts, they will be wiped out.

I have four orchards in my district now. They had to destroy the entire orchard. You cannot destroy the infected tree. You have to destroy the entire orchard. They waited 10 years to get profit, all of a sudden they must burn that crop and must wait 2 years then to replant the trees and then wait another 5

years to get any profit from that production. The Department of Agriculture says it spends \$6 million now to stop it in its tracks or let it spread through Washington, California, Michigan, Maryland, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Georgia and wherever else they grow peaches, prunes, apricots, avocados, et cetera.

And they have asked for the money, because they realize that it is their watch and if they do not stop it now, it becomes a billion-dollar problem. Unfortunately, OMB has not released the money as they have not released the \$40 million for the citrus problem in Florida.

□ 1145

So I hope that everybody understands, we will pay \$6 million this year, or we will pay billions and billions of dollars in the future when many of my colleagues will still be in the Congress of the United States. So I would hope my colleagues would come back with an appropriation to allow them to wipe out this virus immediately, rather than see it spread all over the United States.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the rule today. We appeared before the Committee on Rules late last night with a bipartisan, commonsense approach to a real emergency, a real disaster: emergency aid to West Coast fishers and owners of small fishing boats. This real emergency is caused by a fish population decline and by bad Federal policy. It affects the entire West Coast.

Simply put, there are too many fishing boats, too few fish, and too many Federal fishing restrictions based on spotty data.

The bipartisan commonsense amendment we offered, offered by me, by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs), and by the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL), that is two Democrats and two Republicans, would have addressed these challenges with better science and better fish counting, with a buy-back of boats to reduce fishing capacity, and financial aid to affected families.

Mr. Speaker, this commonsense, bipartisan amendment was rejected by the Committee on Rules in the dead of night. I guess it is easy for common sense and compassion to die late at night.

I ask my colleagues who care about hard-working fishing families to vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 9 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts would like to continue the rotation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his realization that my 9 minutes is more important than his 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in utter consternation that the Republican majority has not allowed Democrats to offer worthy amendments under this so-called open rule.

First of all, allowing only 10 minutes to debate war in Colombia and a major U.S. commitment that will be long term is absolutely reprehensible.

Secondly, on the domestic scene, when we look at oil prices and our total dependence on foreign sources of supply into this economy, and the fact that we have not been allowed to offer amendments that would ask our Secretary of Energy to begin to move toward renewables here at home, giving him the right to purchase ethanol and bio diesel, to fill that strategic petroleum reserve, which, by the way, 90 percent of it has been imported foreign oil.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield to the gentleman; I do not have enough time right now. The gentleman did not give me the right to offer these amendments.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would offer the gentlewoman time right now if she would like to yield to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman does control the time. The gentleman may proceed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, that is the gentleman that denied me the right to offer my amendments on this floor.

Now, I want to say on this oil business that for us to continue foreign dependence is absolutely a military vulnerability to the United States of America. We had an amendment that would have allowed the Secretary of Energy to purchase domestically produced product and put it in the reserve and we have been denied that opportunity here on the floor.

Finally, in the area of farm crisis here at home, low prices across this country, our farmers biting the dust, small and medium-sized farmers; we had an amendment in here that would have permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to offer equity capital in loans to those small and medium-sized farmers trying to reposition in this cruel marketplace today. We were disallowed the ability to do that. This is the year of 2000. They cannot hang on until next year.

I want to say that many of our Members here also went up to the Committee on Rules yesterday. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who was just here on the floor asking for plum pox which is going to destroy the fruit crop in Pennsylvania

and it will spread to other States. The gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) for special crop disasters in New York and California and other places; the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mr. DELAURO) on lobster fisheries; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) on the spread of bovine tuberculosis in the State of Michigan; and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) who just appeared on fisheries on the West Coast.

Vote "no" on the rule. Too many of our Members have been excluded.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I would like to, if I could, have the attention of my very good friend from Toledo to explain and clarify.

I understand that she is very concerned about this rule, but I would like to explain it. This is an open rule. We have an open amendment process, which allows any germane amendment to be considered and fully debated, without any time limitation whatsoever. So if my friend would choose to offer a striking amendment, if my friend would choose to offer anything that falls within the rubric of germaneness, she clearly has a right to do that.

Now, she talked about 10 minutes that is allowed for her amendment. The ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), has the full general debate time, a half an hour, during which that entire time can be expended talking about this issue, if he so wishes.

So I think it is important to note that we have time limits imposed on those which we granted waivers to which are beyond the standard Rules of the House; and what we have done is we have allowed full, no time limits whatsoever on any germane amendment.

That is why I want to urge my colleagues, since this is an open amendment process, and yes, we have provided waivers for 14 additional amendments which have been made in order so that we can have a full debate on a lot of different issues; but the fact of the matter is, for people to come down here and vote against an open rule, I am really concerned about the prospect of that.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I believe that it is the right thing, and we will have a very full day.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on a daily basis I hear my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, lament the fact that Americans

are deployed all around the world, usually without congressional approval.

I asked the Committee on Rules to approve an amendment that would have limited American troop strength in Colombia to 300 personnel. I did that because Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution says that Congress has the power to declare war and only the Senate can involve this country in mutual defense treaties. I did that so that the \$1.8 billion that is going to Colombia would not bring American troops with it.

Mr. Speaker, as we are getting ready to spend our money there, the Colombians have just changed their law so that if one has a high school diploma, one does not get drafted. They have just cut their spending for defense. My hunch is the Colombians think we are going to fight their war for them.

If it is the will of Congress to do so, then I think Congress ought to vote on this. However, far too often, both Republican and Democratic Congresses, by omission and commission, have not done their job and decided where and when young Americans will be called on to fight.

I am going to oppose this rule because, once again, the Committee on Rules has seen to it that we will not make that decision.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his great leadership on human rights throughout this hemisphere and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to listen to the chairman of the Committee on Rules claim that this is an open rule. Perhaps the word "open" to him means open only to Republicans; Democrats need not apply with amendments.

This bill has been called an emergency because we have an emergency in the drug abuse situation in our country. Indeed, we do. Mr. Speaker, 5.5 million people in America are in need of substance abuse treatment, but this rule is closed to any consideration of those people. It allows 10 minutes for an amendment to consider military assistance to Colombia in order to eradicate the coca leaf which flies in the face of all of the research on how we reduce demand in the U.S.

But do not take my word for it.

As the distinguished ranking member referred to earlier, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the Rand report, which was put together, the research was sponsored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, by the U.S. Army, and the Rand's Drug Policy Research Center, this report says that for every dollar spent on treatment on demand is 23 times more effective than coca leaf eradication in the source country. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that if one wants to reduce substance abuse in this country 1 percent, one would spend \$34 million, \$34 million on treat-

ment on demand; and that 1 percent reduction in the source country would be \$723 million for the same result.

Yes, we have an emergency in our country. Mr. Speaker, 5.5 million, as I said, Americans are in need of substance abuse treatment. Two million of them are receiving it, and 3.5 million people are in need.

My amendment for \$600 million would have addressed the need of 5 percent of those people, 5 percent; and yet this rule closed us down to have these Members on both sides of the aisle recognize the need in our own country for treatment on demand and for prevention. It is a dollar better spent. Everyone agrees to that. It has a result that is documented, and yet we could not even have an amendment.

How can we have a drug bill on this floor that talks about the emergency of substance abuse in our country that does not allow \$1 to be spent on prevention and treatment on demand? It simply does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill also because of not allowing a fuller debate on the subject of our military assistance to Colombia. Perhaps we should go that route. We do not know, my Republican colleagues do not know, because we have not discussed it.

I urge my colleagues, with no reluctance at all, to vote resoundingly against this closed rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to all Members, as they all know, that an open rule is an open rule under the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency supplemental. Let me cite some emergencies for our colleagues: Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Andrew, Hurricane Hugo, the wildlands fires in California and in the west States of Oregon and Washington, the Midwestern States. How about the World Trade Center bombing. How about the Murrah Building bombing in Oklahoma City. How about the earthquakes at Loma Prieta and North Ridge. Or how about the recent fire that killed 5 firefighters in Worcester, Massachusetts, or just last night in Fort Worth, Texas where a tornado in downtown Fort Worth killed 4 people.

What is common with all of these emergencies, Mr. Speaker? They were all handled by our domestic defenders, our 1.2 million fire and EMS people who have not received one dime of support from this body in the past.

Today, an amendment will be offered that will, for the first time, provide \$100 million for the fire and EMS personnel across America, 85 percent of whom are volunteers, 32,000 departments, on average, 60 to 80 in every congressional district represented in this body. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot pass that Weldon-Hoyer bipartisan amendment supported by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

PASCARELL); supported by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS); supported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) unless we pass the rule.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, we cannot pass the amendment unless colleagues on both sides of the aisle join in supporting the bipartisan Weldon-Hoyer-Smith-Pascarell-Andrews amendment for the fire service.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot provide the \$100 million of short-term funding and access to \$4.8 billion of long-term funding unless we pass the supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues who have joined in support of the Pascrell bill, over 260 of us, to support the fire service of this country. Today is our chance. Fire fighters across America are going to man the phones. Now is Members' chance to show their support for them with a real vote to help deal with the emergencies of this country.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have a very critical problem in America today. It is called, training our military on the East Coast. The only place we can really put this thing together happens to be a little island outside of Puerto Rico called Vieques.

There is the final test for the Navy and Marines. That is where they go and do the live fire. That is where they go out prepared to take on any commitment that the United States has.

Now we find ourselves in a position, Mr. Speaker, where trespassers have come in, occupied the ground, gone through the gates, squatted on the ground, and we cannot do it any longer. It just totally amazes me. Our officers have gone to the Attorney General and said, kick these people off. Our Attorney General will not do it.

So we find ourselves in the position, Mr. Speaker, of, what do we do at this point? How important is this training? Let me tell the Members what the Secretary of the Navy says: "This training wins wars. Many Americans in uniform owe their lives to this crucial training. Many would perish without it."

The chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have both testified that the combined live fire training at Vieques is the most effective training we can do.

We have an amendment, the Fowler-Hansen amendment, that will be coming up. It does this. I hope people pay attention. One, there can be no trespassers on this live fire area. Like most people in the United States, we all have in every State live fire going on and we do not have trespassers.

It restores the integrity of the range. It tells the Attorney General to get these people off, and live fire would resume before the \$40 million goes to them.

I would hope people would support this commonsense amendment.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if Members want to know why the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is unhappy, just recognize this: The majority runs this institution. The majority wrote this bill. They used the Budget Act then to fence out amendments.

Out of the 14 amendments being allowed under this bill, two are being offered by Democrats, ten by Republicans, and two have a bipartisan tone. That in my view is not a balanced approach.

I would also urge Members to recognize that we should not spend a lousy 10 minutes debating whether we are going to be at war in Colombia for the next 5 years. I would remind Members of what James Hoagland, the distinguished columnist, asked; that now, in the rush into this quagmire, what is happening:

"What happens when it becomes clear that the considered judgment of U.S. Air Force officers that the Colombia military will not be able to maintain the Black Hawks under the condition in which they will be flying is shown to be correct? Will the United States replace the helicopters that crash or are shot down, at \$13 million a copy? Will large numbers of U.S. advisers be provided to maintain the helicopter force?"

"Clinton, of course, will not be around to provide answers. The helicopters will not arrive until 6 months after he leaves office. His successor will inherit an open-ended military obligation that can be trimmed back or abandoned only at domestic political cost."

It says, ". . . House Republicans have championed supersized aid to Colombia, with an eye to blasting Clinton and GORE if it is not passed. They are the true catalysts for this foreign policy fiasco. They blithely ignore the fact that American demand is at the root of the drug problem more than Columbian supply. They voted down efforts by Representative NANCY PELOSI to add funds for drug treatment at home in the catch-all bill that provides aid to Colombia. They sliced out of that same bill \$211 million in debt relief for the world's poorest countries. They will shoot away the problems of the Third World.

"That has been tried elsewhere, with similar fuzzy and contradictory thinking in Washington at the take-off. I can only wonder: Where is the Vietnam Syndrome when we need it?"

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad today this rule will allow us to debate this Vieques range. The range is

the only place on the East Coast where we can do live fire training of all the combined forces. That means Marines ashore, Navy in ships, airmen in aircraft, whether we are shooting or missiles or live fire artillery, and we are doing it in conjunction with our forces. That is training that is invaluable when we have to go fight a war.

For the last decade, nearly every deployment this Nation has had from the East Coast of the United States has sent American military forces directly into combat operations. Whether it is the Persian Gulf War or Kosovo, other Balkan operations, or operations like Operation Desert Fox, where we went immediately into bombing in Iraq as part of the no-fly zone enforcement, or getting inspectors back into the country, live information training is essential.

I as a young artilleryman in the Marine Corps trained at a live fire range in Oklahoma. I was only 3 miles away from U.S. citizens in my training. Here we have at least an 8-mile piece of safe zone. This amendment needs to be approved. Vote for the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the previous question and the rule. Our military has been underfunded. We cannot protect America with a neighborhood crime watch. Congress should be bolstering up our defenses.

I will also notify the Congress I will be offering a buy American amendment to this that will say, when you are spending this money, try and buy American-made products, try and buy American services to keep the ball rolling.

I think it is a good rule and it is a good bill. We should support both.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my dear friend, my colleague, the gentleman from California, said we should fund the Colombia military because there is peace in El Salvador today. I would remind my colleague that peace in El Salvador did not start until we cut off the military aid to El Salvador. After 12 years of brutal war and 75,000 innocent lives lost, the parties did not come anywhere near the negotiating table until we cut the military aid to El Salvador. As long as we were funding the war, it continued. As long as we fund the Colombian military and as long as we provide them weapons, they will use those weapons and the war will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope the rule does not pass.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to quickly point to a few things.

First of all, I am not sure that everybody really understands that the FARC

is not just another political opposition group. This is a vicious guerilla band of people that this past weekend killed 26 policemen in Colombia, in one city, in Bahia del Puerto. They beheaded the chief of police and killed four children between the ages of 3 and 7, to say nothing of their mothers and other innocent victims.

This is, unfortunately, routine business. This is the face of a terrorist insurrection against a democratic government.

Secondly, I would like to point out, the much-discussed Rand report talking about how much more we get out of our money for treatment, that is interesting if we are talking about treatment, but we are talking about trying to stop people from becoming victims. We do not want them to become addicts. We do want to treat the addicts, but we want to stop our youth from becoming addicts by making sure there is no supply for them. That is a legitimate part of what we are about.

The third thing is, there are many elements to this bill that were not discussed today: Kosovo burdensharing, a critical bipartisan amendment that I know will get a lot of attention as the day goes on.

The fourth thing, some talk about entanglement. We are not sending an expeditionary force, we are sending training and logistics support.

Fifth, what does this matter to the average American who does not necessarily know where Colombia falls on the map of the world? I will tell Members what it matters, it matters about our kids, our kids who are tempted by the scourge of drugs. We are dealing with our children and our grandchildren and their future.

If Members do not like that, we are dealing with the price of gas, because gas comes from this area, too. Destabilization in this area is just going to keep the price of gas higher longer.

So there are lots of ways Members can bring this personally to themselves and into their lives, to their pocketbook, to their quality of life. But nothing, nothing should take second place to the well-being of our kids and us doing our job to make sure they are properly protected.

This is a good open rule, it is a fair rule. I urge support for the rule.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, early last Friday, the House passed the Republican budget resolution for Fiscal Year 2001 by all of 4 votes. Today, the Republican leadership overrides it. If this rule passes, the House will take up a supplemental appropriations bill that, with likely amendments, is \$4 billion above the spending level assumed in the budget resolution the House just passed. Since the extra cost will not be offset, the budget surplus for 200 will drop and so will the surplus for 2001. In fact, by our calculation, this supplemental, along with other actions already taken or likely to be taken, will reduce the on-budget surplus this year from \$26.5 billion to \$4.9 billion.

Last week, when the House debated the budget resolution, we predicted that over ten years, the Republican budget would spend all

of the non-Social Security surplus and \$68 billion of the Social Security surplus. We pointed out how the Republican resolution assumed spending cuts of \$117 billion over five years, cuts we doubted Congress would make. And if those unrealistic cuts weren't made, we warned that you would dig even more into the Social Security surplus. We were convinced that this resolution would be overridden by more spending, as were the budget resolutions in 1999 and 1998, but we never thought you would do it in less than a week.

I readily agree that this bill contains funds for national defense and domestic priorities that are important. I am not contesting the validity of most of these items. I am contesting the validity of your budget resolution, for this supplemental shows that your spending levels are a sham.

A few days ago, you were calling for draconian spending cuts. Now you are asking for dramatic increases, \$12.5 billion in one year, much more than the President requested.

The President requested \$2.2 billion for non-defense programs for the supplemental. The bill reported out of committee takes that request up to \$3.2 billion, an increase of almost 50 percent. About \$600 million of this \$1.0 billion uses fiscal year 2000 funding to buy fiscal year 2001 items: \$282 million for domestic electronic surveillance of drug activities, and \$318 million for anti-drug efforts in Columbia.

For defense, the President requested a supplemental of \$2.3 billion. The bill the committee reported more than doubles that to \$5.2 billion. The Spence-Lewis amendment would add \$4.0 billion to that. Much of this would use fiscal year 2000 money to buy fiscal year 2001 items, easing the strain on 2001. But many of the defense adds are recurring costs, such as defense health care funding and spare parts and maintenance for weapon systems like Apache helicopters and Navy ships. By making this add, Republicans are disavowing the spending level for defense specified in last week's budget resolution, and not just for 2001. In all probability, Congress will have to continue appropriating these additional sums in future years.

Does anyone here honestly believe that this is a one-time request for Colombia?

This supplemental is a clever way to turn the flank of the resolution passed last week. It's a scheme that allows Congress to pay some fiscal year 2001 costs using fiscal year 2000 money. I understand the need. But if Republicans find the 2001 spending levels too tight, how will you find the spending levels in 2002, when the discretionary spending cuts get deeper? And at the same time the spending cuts get deeper, the tax cuts get larger. What does this portend for Social Security? Will you be forced to tap even more into the Social Security surplus?

This supplemental shows that the Republican budget is not serious. Until Congress has passed a conference report with realistic spending levels and responsible tax cuts, we should hold this supplemental in abeyance.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, which specifically makes in order twelve amendments offered by Republicans and waives all points of order against these amendments. Only two amendments offered by Democrats were made in order by this partisan rule.

I plan to offer an amendment to restore a mere \$210 million in funding, which was re-

quested by the President to provide debt relief to Mozambique and other heavily indebted poor countries. This Republican rule does not allow my amendment.

Mozambique—one of the world's poorest countries—has recently experienced its worst flooding in 50 years. There are now hundreds of thousands of displaced people who are in desperate need of food, clean water, medicine, blankets and tents. The government of Mozambique cannot possibly address the needs of these displaced people or repair its damaged infrastructure while continuing to make debt payments to foreign governments. Debt relief has never been more important for Mozambique than it is now.

Debt relief for the world's poorest countries is supported by a worldwide movement of churches, religious groups and non-governmental organizations. This movement, known as Jubilee 2000, was begun by Christians who believe that the year 2000, the two thousandth anniversary of the coming of Christ, is a Jubilee Year. According to the Bible, the Lord instructed the people of Ancient Israel to celebrate a Jubilee—or a Year of the Lord—every 50 years. During a Jubilee Year, debts were forgiven. Debt forgiveness for poor countries is the moral thing to do.

This partisan rule also did not allow consideration of the Pelosi amendment, which would have added funding for drug treatment and prevention programs. This bill contains \$1.7 billion for international counter-narcotics programs. We need to focus on demand reduction here in the United States, which fuels the production of drugs abroad.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this unfair and shortsighted rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum 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 241, nays 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—241

Aderholt	Boehlert	Chenoweth-Hage
Andrews	Boehner	Coble
Archer	Bonilla	Coburn
Armey	Bono	Collins
Bachus	Boyd	Combest
Baker	Brady (PA)	Cook
Baldacci	Brady (TX)	Cooksey
Ballenger	Bryant	Cox
Barr	Burr	Cubin
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Cunningham
Bartlett	Buyer	Davis (VA)
Bass	Callahan	Deal
Bateman	Calvert	Delahunt
Bereuter	Camp	DeLauro
Biggart	Campbell	DeLay
Bilbray	Canady	DeMint
Bilirakis	Cannon	Diaz-Balart
Bishop	Castle	Dickey
Bliley	Chabot	Dicks
Blunt	Chambliss	Doolittle

Dreier	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Kuykendall	Ros-Lehtinen
Dunn	LaHood	Roukema
Ehlers	Largent	Royce
Ehrlich	Larson	Ryan (WI)
Emerson	Latham	Ryun (KS)
English	LaTourette	Sanford
Ewing	Lazio	Saxton
Farr	Leach	Scarborough
Fletcher	Lewis (CA)	Shaffer
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Fossella	Linder	Sessions
Fowler	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)	Shaw
Gallegly	Maloney (CT)	Shays
Ganske	Manzullo	Sherwood
Gekas	Martinez	Shimkus
Gibbons	McCollum	Shuster
Gilchrest	McCrery	Simpson
Gillmor	McHugh	Sisisky
Gilman	McInnis	Skeen
Goode	McIntyre	Skelton
Goodlatte	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Goodling	Metcalfe	Smith (NJ)
Goss	Mica	Smith (TX)
Graham	Miller (FL)	Souder
Green (WI)	Miller, Gary	Spence
Greenwood	Mollohan	Stearns
Gutknecht	Moran (KS)	Stump
Hall (TX)	Moran (VA)	Sununu
Hansen	Morella	Sweeney
Hastert	Murtha	Talent
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Tancredo
Hayes	Nethercutt	Tauscher
Hayworth	Ney	Tauzin
Hefley	Northup	Taylor (NC)
Herger	Norwood	Terry
Hill (MT)	Nussle	Thomas
Hilleary	Ortiz	Thornberry
Hobson	Ose	Thune
Hoeffel	Oxley	Tiahrt
Hoekstra	Packard	Toomey
Horn	Paul	Traficant
Hostettler	Pease	Upton
Houghton	Peterson (PA)	Vitter
Hulshof	Petri	Walden
Hunter	Pickering	Walsh
Hutchinson	Pickett	Wamp
Hyde	Pitts	Watkins
Isakson	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Istook	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Jenkins	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Johnson (CT)	Pryce (OH)	Weller
Johnson, Sam	Radanovich	Whitfield
Jones (NC)	Ramstad	Wicker
Kanjorski	Regula	Wilson
Kasich	Reyes	Wolf
Kelly	Reynolds	Young (AK)
King (NY)	Riley	Young (FL)
Kingston	Rogan	
Knollenberg	Rogers	

NAYS—182

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Ackerman	DeFazio	Jackson (IL)
Allen	DeGette	Jackson-Lee
Baca	Deutsch	(TX)
Baird	Dingell	Jefferson
Baldwin	Dixon	John
Barcia	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Barrett (WI)	Dooley	Jones (OH)
Becerra	Doyle	Kaptur
Bentsen	Edwards	Kennedy
Berkley	Engel	Kildee
Berman	Eshoo	Kilpatrick
Berry	Etheridge	Kind (WI)
Blagojevich	Evans	Klecza
Blumenauer	Fattah	LaFalce
Bonior	Filner	Lampson
Borski	Forbes	Lantos
Boswell	Ford	Lee
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Levin
Brown (OH)	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Capps	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Capuano	Gephardt	Lofgren
Cardin	Gonzalez	Lowe
Carson	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Clay	Green (TX)	Luther
Clayton	Gutierrez	Maloney (NY)
Clement	Hall (OH)	Markey
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Mascara
Condit	Hill (IN)	Matsui
Costello	Hilliard	McCarthy (MO)
Coyne	Hinchee	McCarthy (NY)
Cramer	Hinojosa	McDermott
Crowley	Holden	McGovern
Cummings	Holt	McKinney
Danner	Hoolley	McNulty
Davis (FL)	Hoyer	Meehan

Meek (FL)	Rahall	Stupak
Meeks (NY)	Rangel	Tanner
Menendez	Rivers	Taylor (MS)
Millender-	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
McDonald	Roemer	Thompson (MS)
Miller, George	Rothman	Thurman
Minge	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Mink	Rush	Towns
Moakley	Sabo	Turner
Moore	Sanchez	Udall (CO)
Nadler	Sanders	Udall (NM)
Napolitano	Sandlin	Velazquez
Neal	Sawyer	Vento
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Obey	Scott	Waters
Olver	Serrano	Watt (NC)
Owens	Sherman	Waxman
Pallone	Shows	Weiner
Pascarell	Slaughter	Wexler
Pastor	Smith (WA)	Weygand
Payne	Snyder	Wise
Pelosi	Spratt	Woolsey
Peterson (MN)	Stabenow	Wu
Phelps	Stark	Wynn
Pomeroy	Stenholm	
Price (NC)	Strickland	

NOT VOTING—12

Barton	Everett	Kucinich
Boucher	Franks (NJ)	McIntosh
Conyers	Granger	Quinn
Crane	Klink	Salmon

1231

Ms. SANCHEZ and Ms. CARSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. REYES and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 450, the resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 450 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3908.

1232

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the House today the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill.

The Committee on Appropriations ordered this legislation reported by a nearly three to one bipartisan vote. It is reflective of a compilation of input from many sources on a large spectrum of issues. The request was thoroughly reviewed, hearings were held, input from Members outside the committee was received, and our committee painstakingly marked up the bill. The result of all of this is the bill before us.

The bill includes \$1.7 billion for counternarcotics activities in the Colombian and Andean region. By and large, the bill provides what the President requested for Colombia. In addition, the bill takes a more regional approach by providing increased help to the anti-drug efforts of Colombia's neighbors. Before any of the funds going to South America can be spent, the Secretary of State is to report on how the money will be used. The bill also funds high priority anti-drug activities in the Departments of Justice and Defense.

Also included in this bill is nearly \$5 billion for national security matters. The President's emergency request for \$2 billion for operations in Kosovo and East Timor is met. I must remind our colleagues that this money replenishes funds that have already been spent for both of these operations. In fact, the money has been spent and borrowed from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance accounts of all of the military services. So that money has to be repaid, or the training activities in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year for our Nation's military will have to stand down dramatically.

This bill also includes \$1.6 billion to help cover increasing fuel costs facing the Defense Department. As we drive up to the gas tanks and fill up our cars, we see a tremendous increase in the cost of fuel. The ships that we drive, the airplanes that we fly, the trucks and the tanks that we drive, all of these things that use fuel are experiencing the same thing. So we do provide the money to make up for the increased fuel costs.

The bill also includes \$854.5 million to the financially troubled Defense Health Program, a health program that promises medical care for members of the military, their families, and those retirees who are eligible for military medical care. There are doctors, there are nurses, there are pharmacies, and there are medical people who provide medical care who have provided their services but have not been paid. We are in arrears to at least that amount of money. So we include it in this bill. The President did not request these two items; but they are urgently needed, and we will have to provide the money sooner or later.

In the natural disaster and other emergencies areas, the bill includes \$2.2 billion. This includes \$400 million for USDA administered agriculture assistance, \$250 million for wildland fire management, \$600 million for LIHEAP, Low Income Home Energy Assistance, and \$600 million for emergency highway reimbursements to States.

Mr. Chairman, the committee tried to clean up all of the loose ends that we had relative to hurricane and flood disasters in the last year, and we believe this bill does complete all our responsibilities and obligations here.

There are many other important issues addressed in the bill. The report provides a very complete description of them. The bill is somewhat difficult and a little controversial in places, and I respect the fact that there are multiple opinions on the bill. But I think the Committee on Appropriations listened to and respected the differing positions on the various provisions in the bill, including the strong support of the President of the United States. However, as usual with an appropriations bill, we could not report a bill that included everyone's position.

Now the bill is before the entire House for consideration. It is important that we move this bill through the House today and we get it to the other body where deliberations can begin. We need to get this off of our schedules today because, Mr. Chairman, we have 13 other appropriations bills that we are trying to bring to this House in regular order and ahead of last year's schedule and certainly the year before's schedule, because this is a busy year for Members of Congress because of our national conventions, home work periods. So we need to get this bill out of here, get it into the negotiation with the other body.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a table showing the details of this bill, as reported.

[The table follows:]