

such birds, pursuant to House Resolution 353, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

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

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 275, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA AND ITS EFFORTS TO COUNTER THREATS FROM U.S.-DESIGNATED FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 358) expressing support for the democratically elected Government of Colombia and its efforts to counter threats from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 358

Whereas the democratically elected Government of Colombia, led by President Andres Pastrana, is the legitimate authority in the oldest representative democracy in South America;

Whereas the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury, is required to designate as foreign terrorist organizations those groups whose activities threaten the security of United States nationals or the national security interests of the United States pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

Whereas the Secretary of State has designated three Colombian terrorist groups as foreign terrorist organizations, including the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and the National Liberation Army (ELN);

Whereas all three United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations regularly engage in criminal acts, including murder, kidnapping, and extortion perpetrated against Colombian civilians, government officials, security forces, and against foreign nationals, including United States citizens;

Whereas the FARC is holding five Colombian legislators, a presidential candidate, and Colombian police and army officers and soldiers as hostages and has recently escalated bombings against civilian targets, including a foiled attempt to destroy the city of Bogota's principal water reservoir;

Whereas, according to the Colombian Government, the FARC has received training in terrorist techniques and technology from foreign nationals;

Whereas, since 1992, United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations in Co-

lombia have committed serious crimes against United States citizens, kidnapping more than 50 Americans and murdering at least ten Americans;

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration believes that members of the FARC and the AUC directly engage in narcotics trafficking;

Whereas individual members of Colombia's security forces have collaborated with illegal paramilitary organizations by, inter alia, in some instances allowing such organizations to pass through roadblocks, sharing tactical information with such organizations, and providing such organizations with supplies and ammunition;

Whereas while the Colombian Government has made progress in its efforts to combat and capture members of illegal paramilitary organizations and taken positive steps to break links between individual members of the security forces and such organizations, further steps by the Colombian Government are warranted;

Whereas in 1998 Colombian President Andres Pastrana began exhaustive efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the FARC and implemented extraordinary confidence-building measures to advance these negotiations, including establishing a 16,000-square-mile safe haven for the FARC;

Whereas the Government of Colombia has also undertaken substantial efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the ELN;

Whereas the United States has consistently supported the Government of Colombia's protracted efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the FARC and supports the Government of Colombia in its continuing efforts to reach a negotiated agreement with the ELN;

Whereas the United States would welcome a negotiated, political solution to end the violence in Colombia;

Whereas, after the FARC hijacked a commercial airplane and took Colombian Senator Jorge Eduardo Gechem Turbay as a hostage into the government-created safe haven, President Pastrana ended his government's sponsorship of the peace negotiations with the FARC and ordered Colombia's security forces to re-establish legitimate governmental control in the safe haven;

Whereas President Pastrana has received strong expressions of support from foreign governments and international organizations for his decision to end the peace talks and dissolve the FARC's safe haven; and

Whereas the Government of Colombia's negotiations with the ELN are continuing despite the end of the negotiations with the FARC: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) expresses its support for the democratically elected Government of Colombia and the Colombian people as they strive to protect their democracy from terrorism and the scourge of illicit narcotics; and

(B) deplores the continuing criminal terrorist acts of murder, abduction, and extortion carried out by all United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations in Colombia against United States citizens, the civilian population of Colombia, and Colombian authorities; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President, without undue delay, should transmit to Congress for its consideration proposed legislation, consistent with United States law regarding the protection of human rights, to assist the Government of Colombia protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations and the scourge of illicit narcotics; and

(3) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of State

should designate a high-ranking official to coordinate all United States assistance to the Government of Colombia to ensure clarity of United States policy and the effective delivery of United States support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. 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 the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. In our ongoing war on terrorism, we have an extremely volatile situation in our own hemisphere that cannot be ignored any longer: the threat against democracy in Colombia.

Colombia has been beset by many years of violence that have culminated in numerous terrorist attacks in the past month. This oldest representative democracy in South America is under attack as we speak by terrorists known as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, otherwise known as the FARC, another violent left-wing group, the National Liberation Army, known also by its Spanish acronym ELN, and illegal right-wing paramilitary groups. The Secretary of State has designated all three groups as foreign terrorist organizations that threaten the security of the United States and our citizens.

□ 1330

These groups regularly engage in criminal acts, such as murder, kidnapping, extortion and narcotics trafficking. They are currently holding captive dozens of Colombian security force officers, soldiers and civilians. The FARC and the ELN have kidnapped more than 50 Americans and have murdered 10 of our citizens.

Colombian President Pastrana invested his presidency, indeed his entire political fortune, in an attempt to negotiate peace with the FARC for the past 4 years. This protracted peace process ended February 20 when the FARC hijacked a commercial airliner and kidnapped a prominent Colombian senator, the leader of the Colombian Senate Peace Commission. The senator is now the fifth legislator being held captive by the FARC.

On that same day, President Pastrana ordered the Colombian military into the 16,000 square mile demilitarized zone that he ceded to the FARC in his efforts to negotiate peace. Since that time, the FARC has waged even more bloody terrorism against the Colombian Government, its democratic

institutions, and its civilian population.

In fact, in the past 5 weeks or so, there have been more than 120 separate terrorist attacks committed by the FARC, including numerous bombings, the kidnapping of a presidential candidate, and a foiled attempt to destroy the city of Bogota's principal water reservoir.

Colombia's elected representatives have been targeted by these terrorists. Seven members of the Colombian Congress have been killed in the past 4 years. This past weekend, yet another legislator, Senator Martha Catalina Daniel, was tortured and murdered.

The FARC and the paramilitary forces are destabilizing democracy in Colombia. Legislative elections are this month. Presidential elections are in May. Colombia is calling on the United States for help in defending itself against terrorism by providing intelligence-sharing, spare parts for equipment, and the unburdening of restrictions on equipment currently being used in counter-narcotics operations. The administration has decided to move forward to respond to some of these concerns. The administration must now quickly complete this policy review and work with Congress to help Colombia save itself from terrorism.

The global war against terrorism is our administration's highest priority. We are training troops in the Philippines, the former Soviet Republic of Georgia, and Yemen all in the name of fighting this global war. However, in the meantime, a conflagration is burning at the foot of the land bridge that joins North and South America.

It is imperative that we recognize the dire consequences of inaction in this horrific situation, not just for Colombians, but for the rest of the hemisphere. It is time to help the Colombian people defend themselves. As a major defender of democracy, we must try to bolster it wherever we see it seriously threatened, especially in our own hemisphere. Passing this resolution is an important first step. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for bringing forth this measure in such a calibrated and thoughtful fashion. I would also like to express my appreciation to our colleague on the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT),

for his enormous contributions to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, Colombia has entered a new and brutal phase in its history. The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, better known by their Spanish acronyms, the FARC and the AUC respectively, and other illegal paramilitary groups have launched unprecedented campaigns of terror against the people and the democratically elected Government of Colombia.

I strongly deplore these criminal acts of murder, abduction, and extortion that the terrorist organizations have inflicted upon the people of Colombia and which the resolution and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) so richly describe. I wish to extend our friendship and our support to President Pastrana and his administration as they confront this menace.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution also calls upon the President to submit his legislative proposals for addressing the crisis in Colombia to Congress for our consideration and deliberation. Let me be clear with regard to this point. While I appreciate the horror of the vile acts which the FARC and the AUC are committing almost on a daily basis in Colombia, I believe that any substantial change in U.S. policy toward Colombia must occur only after we in Congress have had an opportunity to add our voices and our concerns.

Thus, while we have not made any ultimate conclusions on how to assist the Colombian Government better to deal with terrorism and narcotics, we certainly look forward to an active and spirited debate on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that future U.S. policy toward Colombia should be conditioned upon the Government of Colombia dealing with two very stubborn issues: first, the Colombian Government must decisively break all links with illegal paramilitary organizations, and it must launch a serious effort to combat them. According to the Colombian Commission of Jurists and international human rights groups, the paramilitaries account for over 75 percent of all combatant killings in Colombia. The just-released human rights report of our State Department echoes this fact and states: "Members of the security forces sometimes illegally collaborated with paramilitary forces last year." This link must be completely severed.

Second, the Government of Colombia must dramatically increase its own contribution to both the war and the peace effort. By most estimates, the army would need to at least triple in size to take on the FARC and the AUC effectively. Currently, the Colombian Army has about 130,000 members, but only 40,000 of them can be deployed into battle. The rest are at desk jobs or tied down to guarding static infrastructure like pipelines and power lines. The United States cannot fill this need alone, and we would be foolish to try.

Complicating matters, there are reasons to doubt the commitment of some of Colombia's political and economic elite to sacrifice for the war effort. For example, currently Colombian law excludes high school graduates, meaning all but the poor, from serving in combat units. I think that is an outrage.

Furthermore, U.S. policy toward Colombia should include more than counternarcotics and, potentially, counterterrorism support. Colombia's long-running war is deeply rooted in historical, social, and economic causes that must also be addressed if any sustainable peace is to be achieved. Here, dramatic expansion of support to the provision of basic services to the Colombian people, but particularly in the long neglected rural areas, is absolutely paramount.

Mr. Speaker, Colombia and U.S. policy toward that country is at a crossroads. How we choose to help the people of Colombia confront not only terrorism but its sources as well will determine the quality of the lasting peace we hope will be able to help them build in the region. I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and I have been to Colombia many times on many occasions since I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere. I have seen a terrible situation unfold in that troubled nation. On my last trip in January, we met with President Andres Pastrana as he was forced to issue an ultimatum to the FARC in a last-ditch effort to get them to come back to the negotiating table.

No one has done more to hold the door open to a negotiated, political solution to end the violence in Colombia than President Pastrana. His perseverance and forbearance have made one thing clear: it is the FARC's willful disregard for the rule of law and human rights that led President Pastrana to make the decision to end the safe haven and send in Colombia's security forces to reestablish legitimate government authority.

Colombia today is a nation under siege by three terrorist organizations. Two of these terrorist organizations, the FARC and the ELN, have kidnapped over 50 Americans and murdered at least 10 Americans. The third, the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, is a vicious, violent terrorist organization that indiscriminately murders Colombians. Individuals who aid those terrorists dishonor and discredit themselves and the institutions that they represent.

All three of these terrorist groups have been designated by the Secretary of State as foreign terrorist organizations because it has been determined that they are a threat to our Nation's

security. Terrorism in Colombia is financed by illegal trafficking in narcotics that kill and destroy the lives of our young people in the United States.

The FARC has, in essence, declared war on the Colombian people. This group is attacking Colombia's democratic institutions. Five Colombian legislators are being held hostage by the FARC. The FARC has been attacking the infrastructure. It attacks police stations with propane gas cylinder mortars that indiscriminately kill innocent people.

The Colombian Government is continuing its efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the ELN, and we should support those efforts.

It is time, however, that we reassess our policy towards Colombia. This resolution expresses the sense of the House that the President, without undue delay, should transmit to Congress for its consideration proposed legislation, consistent with United States law regarding protection of human rights, to assist the Government of Colombia protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations and the scourge of illicit narcotics.

We cannot afford to fail to help the people of Colombia in their darkest hour. Colombia is a democracy and an ally of the United States, and it is under attack by terrorist organizations funded by illegal drugs. Colombia is not asking us to send troops. The democratically elected Government of Colombia is asking that we make it possible for us to help them defend their democracy from these terrorists. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this reasonable, bipartisan resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), who has worked tirelessly on this issue and is one of the nationally recognized authorities on Colombia.

□ 1345

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the gentleman for his generous words and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as others have alluded to, almost 4 years ago, President Andres Pastrana embarked on what was truly a courageous effort to bring peace to his nation. He began negotiations with the FARC and the ELN, the country's two main guerilla groups. He did so because he realized that, after almost 40 years of conflict, a negotiated agreement was the only answer to end the violence.

These efforts focused world attention on Colombia. For the first time, the international community was brought directly into the negotiations. Hope prevailed that the brutal violence that has plagued that nation for decades would at long last end. I shared that hope. At President Pastrana's request, I myself went to the so-called demilitarized zone. I met with the FARC,

which is the largest party to this conflict.

I left, hopeful that the FARC was genuinely serious about the search for peace. They claimed that they were prepared to work to create a new Colombia that would embrace social and economic justice and bring peace to a population exhausted by violence.

Sadly, they have proven they were not serious. At great political cost, President Pastrana gave the FARC every opportunity to prove their good faith. But they, the FARC, could not summon the political resolve, the will, the courage, if you may, to choose peace. Sadly, they were not serious.

From an insurgency that once based its legitimacy on a promise of social and economic justice for all Colombians, the FARC have degenerated into criminal syndicates that traffic in drugs, that extort, that kidnap and that murder civilians. The FARC have failed to meet the challenge of peace. They have failed the Colombian people. So now I share what I know to be the profound disappointment felt by President Pastrana and the people of Colombia.

But, fortunately, the peace process with the ELN is still continuing. Like the FARC, the ELN claim to want to address the social inequities that are at the root of the conflict. But the ELN have actually proposed how to do that; and, at least at this point in time, they appear to have the will to make peace. However, tragically, even while negotiating, the ELN also continue their armed campaign of kidnapping and sabotage.

But what disturbs me most profoundly is the recent rapid growth of right-wing paramilitary groups, commonly referred to as the AUC. They commit more than 70 percent of the massacres in the course of the Colombian conflict, and their brutality knows no bounds of human decency. Their leadership readily admits to deriving most of their funding from drug trafficking. Klaus Nyholm, the head of the U.N. drug control program in Colombia, says that they are substantially more involved in the drug trade than the FARC.

Most significantly for U.S. policy, the AUC, as mentioned by the gentleman from California, the ranking member, have extensive links with the Colombian military, according to our own Department of State report that was issued this week. That explains the reluctance of so many of us in this body to provide unconditional military assistance to the Colombian armed forces.

While President Pastrana and Colombian armed forces chief Fernando Tapias deserve credit for taking steps to professionalize the military, unfortunately, far too many of these unsavory links remain. Until all relationships, at every level, between the military and the AUC are ended, the U.S. can and should condition its assistance.

Unbelievably, these paramilitary groups rationalize their acts of terrorism as what is needed to fight the guerillas. They say they traffic in drugs only to support that fight. They say that what they really want is peace. They even claim that they are the Northern Alliance of Colombia, ready to help the United States fight the FARC.

They are not Colombia's Northern Alliance. They are Colombia's al Qaeda.

Let us be clear. There is no place for an AUC in a democracy. In a democratic society, it is the exclusive role of the armed forces and the police, working under the legitimate government, to maintain public order, to defend the nation, and protect individual civil liberties. And there is a legitimate government in Colombia duly elected by the Colombian people. The AUC are not the answer to Colombia's problems. In a very real way, the AUC are cooperating with the FARC and the ELN in sending Colombia into chaos and more bloodshed.

We know what the FARC's position is. We have learned it the hard way. Now it is very important for us to be clear with both the ELN and the AUC. Let me say to them, now is the time to reveal your true selves, to show the world what you really want for your nation. You say you want peace. You put it on your websites. You make these public statements. Prove it. Declare an immediate, unilateral ceasefire and an immediate suspension of all criminal activities. Lay down your arms. You can do it today. Now.

That way, the Colombian military can concentrate its efforts on the FARC; and the world can see that the other parties to the conflict are willing to act for peace, not just talk about it.

So Senor Gabino, who is the leader of the ELN, and Carlos Castano, the leader of the AUC, now is the time, now, to decide which side you are on. Are you with the Colombian people who desperately want to end 40 years of horror? Or are you with those who would drown your nation in the blood of its own citizens?

This resolution today makes clear which side the United States is on. This is just the beginning of our debate. We still must have an extensive review, including hearings, on the details of any U.S. assistance, just as there should be a peaceful debate inside Colombia on how to address that country's very real problems, particularly its glaring social and economic inequities.

But there should be no doubt as to which side the United States is on. We are with the Colombian people.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago, I went with members of the Committee on Agriculture to Colombia. We were fortunate enough to have dinner one evening with President Pastrana at

his version of Camp David, which is in Cartagena. During that evening, we were able to get well acquainted. He described his being kidnapped by guerrillas a few years ago and all that he went through and the general lay of the land down there and his struggles with the FARC and the ELN and the AUC.

In the progress of that evening, what we learned is that there are roughly 600,000 acres of coca plants under cultivation in the country of Colombia. This allows them to provide roughly 90 percent of the cocaine that comes into the United States. As a result, FARC and these other vigilante groups are very well funded. I would imagine that their funding may exceed that of other legitimate enterprises within the country of Colombia. And so the people in Colombia have paid a great price.

Last year, we were told that 29,000 civilians lost their lives in this conflict. They are caught in between the various groups. In many cases, they have no place to go and no place to hide. As has been mentioned earlier, seven members of Congress have been killed in the last 4 years, and five lawmakers are currently hostages in that country.

So the present negotiations, or the negotiations that have gone on for the last 3 or 4 years, have broken down and now Colombia is basically under a reign of terror, where some of the things that we have seen around the world are now being perpetrated on the Colombian people. We have seen bridges blown up, water supplies such as in Bogota have been damaged and threatened.

So it appears at this time that the only solution is that the United States provide help. We already have provided quite a bit. But the big issue is helicopters, because the pilots that are doing the spraying of the coca to try to eliminate it are certainly under a great deal of duress.

So we need also some commitment from Colombia, but they need our aid.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), an indefatigable fighter for social justice in the hemisphere.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and appreciate all his work on behalf of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution. I want to be very clear about my concerns regarding this bill and the critical crossroads confronting U.S. policy in Colombia.

Like every Member of this House, I support the democratically elected government of Colombia. I have met with President Pastrana, including in Colombia, and I am a strong supporter of his efforts for social and economic reform. Having traveled to Colombia, I know how very complex the society and the conflict are. I have seen the harm done to the Colombian people by the guerrillas, by paramilitary groups and by the Colombian army. I believe

very strongly that Congress should not rush to signal support that would increase our involvement in Colombia's escalating civil war.

The Colombian civil war has been going on for nearly 40 years. The armed actors remain nearly unchanged. Leftist guerilla groups battle the Colombian army for control of the territory, while right-wing paramilitaries increase their own involvement in the war and violence against civilians. All of these armed actors, including the Colombian military, have been involved in drug trafficking. All have a history of human rights abuses. Human rights groups continue to document the close ties between the Colombian army and the paramilitaries who commit the majority of human rights abuses in Colombia.

Colombia is hardly a new front in the war on terrorism. Terrible acts of terror, assassinations, kidnappings, bombings and disappearances, are part and parcel of their 40-year civil war. But Colombia is not part of the internationally supported campaign to dismantle and destroy al Qaeda and other international terrorist networks.

So let us not hide behind euphemisms. A so-called war on terrorism in Colombia is simply a set of code words to become even more deeply engaged in a counterinsurgency war that has been going on for nearly 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong supporter of President Pastrana, but the message we send today will be heard and acted upon more by his successor when elections take place in the coming months. The leading presidential candidate has long rejected any type of negotiations process, and he has the support of the right-wing paramilitary groups, the very groups we rightly are condemning today.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, our current policy in Colombia has been a failure. It has not stemmed the production of coca. It has not provided peasant farmers with alternatives to growing coca. It has not lessened the number of internally displaced people. It has not broken the ties between the Colombian army and the paramilitaries. It has not decreased the number of civilians who are victims of human rights abuses and violence. And it has not promoted the administration of justice.

The current attorney general, unlike his predecessors, is not an advocate for human rights. He has dismissed or stopped investigations on many of the cases involving high-level military and government officials. As a result, most of the key officers and prosecutors in the Justice Ministry responsible for investigating and prosecuting human rights and corruption cases have resigned or been forced out of office.

For our part, Mr. Speaker, and I say this sadly, the United States demonstrates its commitment to human rights by consistently waiving the conditions on our aid every 6 months because the Colombian military continues to fail to comply.

□ 1400

Now, in my view, Mr. Speaker, this resolution wants to give a green light to involve the U.S. more deeply and directly in Colombia's escalating civil war, and I simply cannot support this.

I have high regard for the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman BALLENGER). These Members have done a great deal to focus attention on human rights challenges in Latin America. But I must dissent, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in opposing this resolution.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 358, which expresses support for the Government of Colombia.

There were many in Colombia that criticized President Pastrana for making the peace process a priority above almost any other issue that faced the Colombian people, but none I think would criticize the commitment that he made to bringing peace to that troubled country. Now, rightly, in my opinion, he has called off the negotiations. He has moved troops into the demilitarized zone. He is facing a long struggle against a renewed urban terrorism campaign that is targeting the country's most important infrastructure assets.

But we are proceeding as nothing has changed, as if Colombia is only fighting a counternarcotics war. I believe we have to face several realities and counter with a clear U.S. policy in response.

The aggressive timetable that Plan Colombia was to follow, eradicating coca, providing alternative development, cannot be adhered to during a full scale war with the FARC and the paramilitaries. The alternative development plans were already failing from a lack of basic security for non-governmental organization workers and transport of alternative commodities, thereby putting the entire program at risk.

It is true that Colombia is a source of 90 percent of the cocaine in the United States; but conversely, the United States is Colombia's largest trading partner of legal industries. As such, it is in the interest of the United States to promote better stability in Colombia by helping it to address these longstanding approximate and more recent escalations.

I might remind my colleagues in the other body that of all the requests from the Government of Colombia, at the top of their list is the renewal of the Andean Trade Pact.

Because it shares borders with five other countries, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Panama, Venezuela, Colombia's instability is a threat to regional stability.

While only 3 percent of U.S. oil consumed comes from Colombia, 14 percent comes from neighboring Venezuela. Oil imports from South America play a vital role in our strategy to diversify the sources of U.S. oil.

The Colombian economy has faced a number of economic shocks that have limited its ability to contribute to Plan Colombia and the defense of its own people. Oil pipelines have been bombed, the price of oil has fallen, the price of coffee has fallen, foreign investment in Colombia has fallen. The internal shocks are only going to be made worse by the escalation of war.

Colombians have traditionally shown a long-term tolerance for violence, but this is changing; and we can see evidence of this in the popularity of presidential candidates in Colombia that strongly support countering the FARC guerillas.

The deteriorating economic conditions not only have threatened the Colombian Government's commitment to Plan Colombia, but the worsening unemployment only encourages the narcotics industry in Colombia. It has become a vicious cycle.

I would urge my colleagues to recognize the changed situation in Colombia and that we must respond by clarifying U.S. policy. Let us begin an open debate about our role in Colombia and not rely on State Department lawyers to look for loopholes in current law. This resolution begins that debate, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this carefully crafted and balanced resolution.

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the Colombian Army has made progress in this area, and, while not perfect, no one is. At least they are trying and have made good progress.

I also note that an alternative to a well-trained and respectful Colombian Army is the AUC, and that right-wing paramilitary respects no one's rights, engages in terrorism, illicit drugs, and kills innocent civilians.

No one here is proposing that we repeal the Leahy amendment that prohibits aid to the units of Colombian military that engage in human rights abuses. Leahy is existing law. The Leahy restriction will remain law and has my strong support, and human rights concerns will not be thrown out the window in a new Colombian policy.

I also note the counter-drug aid that we provided to the Colombian police, their antinarcotics unit, has been delivered and used in the last 2 years without even one allegation of a human rights abuse; I repeat, not even one allegation.

The Colombians can and will respect human rights if we help them and we

train them and we stand shoulder to shoulder next to them in the fight. The police antinarcotics unit is a case of study for engagement.

Absent a new U.S. policy, the right-wing paramilitaries will fill the void in Colombia, and the human rights of no one, especially civilians, will be safe. We can stay on the sidelines or help our neighbor. The answer is clear, especially since September 11. We need to fight global terrorism whenever and wherever it raises its ugly head.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this resolution on Colombia. I am troubled as to why we are voting on this resolution today. It concerns me that the purpose of this resolution is for the Congress to give this administration the green light to become more heavily involved in the civil war in Colombia.

I have the utmost respect for President Pastrana, but at the same time I am not in favor of expanding our involvement in Colombia by using our response to the terrorism threat after September 11 as a justification to participate in Colombia's civil war. The FARC might be on the terrorist list, but the reasons that have been given for our involvement in Colombia have been counternarcotics and not counterterrorism. I do not want to erase this important distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I read the Spanish press, and let me assure you that in Latin America and in my congressional district the support does not exist for having the United States exert its military power in Colombia. There are atrocities committed on all sides of this conflict.

Today, Secretary Powell testified before the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcommittee, on which I am the ranking member, and I told him that I understand that drug trafficking is a problem in Colombia, but that has never before been a reason to send American troops. Let me be clear that the new threat of terrorism is not and never should be a reason to change our policy toward Colombia.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word in support of the bipartisan resolution on Colombia and the need for a change in our policy, now before the House.

While, I have long followed events in Colombia, I long gave the benefit of the doubt to the Pastrana administration in Colombia with its protracted negotiations and its Switzerland sized DMZ safe haven provided the FARC, that naivete has finally ended, hopefully not too late.

The FARC has attacked cities, towns, police stations, bridges, dams, and power lines all across Colombia since the peace talks ended last month. Let there be no mistake, the FARC are terrorists, and I have been financed by illicit drug proceeds.

Along with their ELN terrorist friends in the last 10 years, the FARC and ELN have kidnapped 50 Americans in Colombia and killed at least 10 of them. Their trade in illicit drugs help take numerous American lives here at home as well from their illicit drugs. For example, it is noted that the DMZ, now abandoned in Colombia, was loaded with opium growth for heroin production eventually destined for American streets and communities.

Bogota, the capital of Colombia, is only 3 hours from Miami, and the beleaguered democratic nation of Colombia is up against the wall

from these narcoterrorists and right wing paramilitaries all financed with the illicit drug trade and all engaged in terrorism per our own U.S. State Department.

While our Nation is engaged in fighting global terrorism in Afghanistan, Yemen, Georgia, and the Philippines, we still maintain the fiction that the battle in Colombia in our nearby neighborhood is only about illicit drugs, and our aid has been limited to counternarcotics.

We have maintained the fiction of counternarcotics aid only for Colombia long enough. The same people who kidnap, blow up pipelines, and who kill Americans trade in illicit drugs to finance their other criminal and terrorist activities. Only our State Department maintains the drugs only fiction, on the ground the reality was different and the Colombian democracy slipped further and further away.

This resolution calls for our administration to take off its rose color glasses that President Pastrana and our State Department wore for far too long and let Colombian democracy slip away. It is time we get serious and fight terrorism and the illicit drugs that finances it in Colombia and threatens American national interests in our very back yard.

Protecting pipelines from terrorist attacks is but one way to help Colombia. It is not enough for a Colombian policy and as the Bob Novak column noted this week, it is a sorry excuse for a real antiinsurgency strategy in Colombia. We need to do more.

We must help the Colombian police antikidnaping unites with helicopters to rescue victims, including Americans in the often hard to reach terrain. We ought to also restore the clarity we need by giving the anti-drug mission in Colombia mainly to the excellent antidrug police, who have a stellar human rights record.

Our assistance to the Colombian military should be antiterrorist assistance, and not operate under the failed antidrug fiction of the past. Let us bear in mind that no one here, nor anyone in Colombia has ever asked for, or called for American combat troops for Colombia.

The Colombians want and deserve the equipment and training they need to defend themselves and their democracy from the terrorist threat at their and at our door.

Accordingly, I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support and solidarity with the people of Colombia in their pursuit of stability and peace. Along with my colleagues, I condemn the horrible violence that has been inflicted on the Colombian people by the AUC, ELN, and the FARC. But, I cannot in good faith support a resolution that expresses praise to Colombia for improving its human rights record, when in fact it has eroded.

Many Member of Congress have joined me in expressing their profound concern to the Colombian Government over the many murders of trade union leaders that have gone without investigation or prosecution. The scourge of murders of trade unionists in Colombia is the highest in the world, thereby making Colombia notorious as the most dangerous place in the world to be a union member. The government of Colombia has over and over again demonstrated their unwillingness to pursue prosecution of these attacks on organized labor. Columbia's de facto immunity extended to these assassins has been

clearly condemned by the International Labor Organization, United Nations Human Rights Commission, Amnesty International, and our own Department of State.

Columbia can drastically reduce the violence against trade unionists. It begins with effectively halting the impunity enjoyed by these perpetrators, many of which have credible ties to the military and police. Columbia must aggressively prosecute these criminals and restore its people's confidence in justice.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution fall short in condemning the impunity enjoyed by human rights violators and the violence perpetrated against all levels of society, including organized labor. Many of my fellow Members have actively engaged the Colombian Government with these concerns but without success. Passing a resolution basically congratulating Columbia on improving its human rights record is wrong and counterproductive.

It is my hope that Columbia will choose to aggressively improve its human rights record, so in the future we may pass a similar resolution, with unanimous consent.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House International Relations Committee and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I would like to state my strong objections to the manner in which this piece of legislation was raised. I was only made aware of the existence of this legislation this morning, just a couple of hours before I was expected to vote on it. There was no committee markup of the legislation, nor was there any notice that this legislation would appear on today's suspension calendar.

This legislation represents a very serious and significant shift in United States policy toward Colombia. It sets us on a slippery slope toward unwise military intervention in a foreign civil war that has nothing to do with the United States.

Our policy toward Colombia was already ill-advised when it consisted of an expensive front in our failed "war on drugs." Plan Colombia, launched nearly 2 years ago, sent \$1.3 billion to Colombia under the guise of this war on drugs. A majority of that went to the Colombian military; much was no doubt lost through corruption. Though this massive assistance program was supposed to put an end to the FARC and other rebel groups involved in drug trafficking, 2 years later we are now being told—in this legislation and elsewhere—that the FARC and rebel groups are stronger than ever. So now we are being asked to provide even more assistance in an effort that seems to have had a result the opposite of what was intended. In effect, we are being asked to redouble failed efforts. That doesn't make sense.

At the time Plan Colombia was introduced, President Clinton promised the American people that this action would in no way drag us into the Colombian civil war. This current legislation takes a bad policy and makes it much worse. This legislation calls for the United States "to assist the Government of Colombia protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations . . ." In other words, this legislation elevates a civil war in Colombia to the level of the international war on terror, and it will drag us deep into the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, there is a world of difference between a rebel group fighting a civil war in a foreign country and the kind of international

terrorist organization that targeted the United States last September. As ruthless and violent as the three rebel groups in Colombia no doubt are, their struggle for power in that country is an internal one. None of the three appears to have any intention of carrying out terrorist activities in the United States. Should we become involved in a civil war against them, however, these organizations may well begin to view the United States as a legitimate target. What possible reason could there be for us to take on such a deadly risk? What possible rewards could there be for the United States support for one faction or the other in this civil war?

As with much of our interventionism, if you scratch the surface of the high-sounding calls to "protect democracy" and "stop drug trafficking" you often find commercial interests driving U.S. foreign policy. This also appears to be the case in Colombia. And like Afghanistan, Kosovo, Iraq, and elsewhere, that commercial interest appears to be related to oil. The U.S. administration request for FY 2003 includes a request for an additional \$98 million to help protect the Cano-Limon Pipeline—jointly owned by the Colombian Government and Occidental Petroleum. Rebels have been blowing up parts of the pipeline and the resulting disruption of the flow of oil is costing Occidental Petroleum and the Colombian Government more than half a billion dollars per year. Now the administration wants the American taxpayer to finance the equipping and training of a security force to protect the pipeline, which much of the training coming from the U.S. military. Since when is it the responsibility of the American citizen to subsidize risky investments made by private companies in foreign countries? And since when is it the duty of American service men and women to lay their lives on the line for these commercial interests?

Further intervention in the internal political and military affairs of Colombia will only increase the mistrust and anger of the average Colombian citizen toward the United States, as these citizens will face the prospect of an ongoing, United States-supported war in their country. Already Plan Colombia has fueled the deep resentment of Colombian farmers toward the United States. These farmers have seen their legitimate crops destroyed, water supply polluted, and families sprayed as powerful herbicides miss their intended marks. An escalation of American involvement will only make matters worse.

Mr. Speaker, at this critical time, our precious military and financial resources must not be diverted to a conflict that has nothing to do with the United States and poses no threat to the United States. Trying to designate increased military involvement in Colombia as a new front on the "war on terror" makes no sense at all. It will only draw the United States into a quagmire much like Vietnam. The Colombian civil war is now in its fourth decade; pretending that the fighting there is somehow related to our international war on terrorism is to stretch the imagination to the breaking point. It is unwise and dangerous.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the people of Colombia and ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

The people of Colombia have suffered through years of violence, deprivation, and discord. They have seen their country torn

apart in a violent war between their government and various rebel factions.

Despite the best efforts of President Pastrana, the murder and kidnapping of Colombian citizens, government officials, and even American visitors have increased. His efforts to reach a peaceful settlement have been rejected by the rebel groups.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has made a commitment to addressing the root cause of these problems in Colombia—the drug trade. Through Plan Colombia we are working with our Andean allies to destroy drug production and interrupt drug traffic.

Our assistance will help Colombia's Government lead the country and, eventually, end drug production and stabilize the Andean region.

As Colombia continues working to secure lasting peace, the United States should continue to offer support and assistance.

This resolution is an important expression of that support, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.Res. 358.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONGRATULATING THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT ON ITS BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 32.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 32, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Bartlett	Bono
Ackerman	Barton	Boozman
Aderholt	Bass	Borski
Akin	Becerra	Boswell
Allen	Bereuter	Boucher
Andrews	Berkley	Boyd
Armey	Berman	Brady (PA)
Baca	Berry	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Biggert	Brown (FL)
Baird	Bilirakis	Brown (OH)
Baker	Bishop	Brown (SC)
Baldacci	Blumenauer	Bryant
Baldwin	Blunt	Burr
Ballenger	Boehert	Burton
Barcia	Boehner	Buyer
Barr	Bonilla	Callahan
Barrett	Bonior	Camp