

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

Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (MI)	Taylor (MS)	Vitter
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Smith (NJ)	Taylor (NC)	Walden
Capito	Hayes	Mica	Smith (TX)	Terry	Walsh
Capps	Hayworth	Miller, Dan	Smith (WA)	Thomas	Wamp
Capuano	Hefley	Miller, Gary	Snyder	Thompson (CA)	Watkins (OK)
Cardin	Herger	Miller, George	Souder	Thompson (MS)	Watt (NC)
Carson (IN)	Hill	Mink	Spratt	Thornberry	Watts (OK)
Carson (OK)	Hilleary	Mollohan	Stark	Thune	Waxman
Castle	Hilliard	Moore	Stearns	Thurman	Weiner
Chabot	Hinchev	Moran (KS)	Stenholm	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)
Chambliss	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)	Strickland	Tiberi	Weldon (PA)
Clay	Hobson	Morella	Stump	Tierney	Weller
Clayton	Hoeffel	Murtha	Stupak	Toomey	Whitfield
Clement	Hoekstra	Myrick	Sullivan	Towns	Wicker
Clyburn	Holden	Nadler	Sununu	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Coble	Holt	Neal	Sweeney	Udall (CO)	Wolf
Collins	Honda	Nethercutt	Tancred	Udall (NM)	Wu
Combest	Hooley	Ney	Tanner	Upton	Wynn
Cooksey	Horn	Northup	Tauscher	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Costello	Hostettler	Norwood	Tauzin	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Cox	Houghton	Nussle			
Coyne	Hoyer	Oberstar			
Cramer	Hulshof	Obey			
Crane	Hunter	Oliver			
Crenshaw	Inslee	Ortiz			
Crowley	Isakson	Osborne			
Culberson	Israel	Ose			
Cummings	Issa	Otter			
Cunningham	Istook	Owens			
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Oxley			
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pallone			
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Pascarell			
Davis, Jo Ann	Jefferson	Pastor			
Davis, Tom	Jenkins	Paul			
Deal	John	Payne			
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi			
DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Pence			
Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)			
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)			
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Petri			
DeMint	Jones (OH)	Phelps			
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Pickering			
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Pitts			
Dicks	Keller	Platts			
Dingell	Kelly	Pombo			
Doggett	Kennedy (MN)	Pomeroy			
Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Portman			
Dreier	Kerns	Price (NC)			
Duncan	Kildee	Pryce (OH)			
Dunn	Kind (WI)	Putnam			
Edwards	King (NY)	Quinn			
Ehlers	Kingston	Radanovich			
Ehrlich	Kirk	Rahall			
Emerson	Klecza	Ramstad			
Engel	Knollenberg	Rangel			
English	Kolbe	Regula			
Eshoo	Kucinich	Rehberg			
Etheridge	LaFalce	Reyes			
Evans	LaHood	Reynolds			
Everett	Lampson	Riley			
Farr	Langevin	Rivers			
Fattah	Lantos	Rodriguez			
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Roemer			
Flake	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)			
Fletcher	Latham	Rogers (MI)			
Foley	LaTourette	Rohrabacher			
Forbes	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen			
Ford	Levin	Ross			
Fossella	Lewis (GA)	Rothman			
Frank	Lewis (KY)	Roukema			
Frelinghuysen	Linder	Royce			
Frost	Lipinski	Rush			
Gallegly	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)			
Ganske	Lowe	Ryun (KS)			
Gekas	Lucas (KY)	Sabo			
Gephardt	Lucas (OK)	Sandlin			
Gibbons	Luther	Sawyer			
Gilchrest	Lynch	Saxton			
Gillmor	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer			
Gilman	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky			
Gonzalez	Manzullo	Schiff			
Goode	Markey	Schrock			
Goodlatte	Mascara	Scott			
Gordon	Matheson	Sensenbrenner			
Goss	Matsui	Serrano			
Graham	McCarthy (MO)	Sessions			
Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg			
Graves	McCollum	Shaw			
Green (TX)	McCrery	Shays			
Green (WI)	McDermott	Sherman			
Greenwood	McGovern	Sherwood			
Grucci	McHugh	Shimkus			
Gutierrez	McInnis	Shows			
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Shuster			
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Simmons			
Hall (TX)	McKinney	Simpson			
Hansen	McNulty	Skeen			
Harman	Meehan	Skelton			
Hart	Meek (FL)	Slaughter			

NAYS—1

Conyers

NOT VOTING—26

Bentsen	Kilpatrick	Sanchez
Blagojevich	Lee	Sanders
Calvert	Lewis (CA)	Solis
Condit	Lofgren	Trafigant
Cubin	Millender	Waters
Dooley	McDonald	Watson (CA)
Doolittle	Miller, Jeff	Wexler
Filner	Napolitano	Wilson (NM)
Hyde	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey

□ 1450

Mr. TERRY and Mr. CROWLEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 50 on congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 50, I was conducting official business in my San Diego, California district. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to business in the District, I respectfully request a leave of absence from legislative business scheduled for today, Wednesday, March 6. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 48 on approving the Journal; “no” on rollcall No. 49, the motion to proceed to the previous question during the consideration of H. Con. Res. 275; and “aye” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S.J. Res. 32.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was attending important business in my Congressional District on March 6th, which included activities relating to the Primary election in California.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 48, “no” on rollcall No. 49, and “yea” on rollcall No. 50.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker’s an-

nounced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GANSKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CEASEFIRE BETWEEN THE SRI LANKAN GOVERNMENT AND THE LTTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to bring to the attention of my colleagues a historic peace initiative between the Sri Lankan Government and the LTTE.

On February 22, 2002, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, the Honorable Wickremesinghe, and the leader of the LTTE, Mr. Prabhakaran, signed an agreement that established a long-term cease fire by both sides that signifies the beginning of peace talks and, simply, a new era of peace for war-torn Sri Lanka.

For nearly 2 decades now, there has been a civil war taking place between the Government of Sri Lanka and the LTTE, one of the world’s most dangerous guerilla groups. The cease fire was negotiated by Norway and will be overseen by Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark.

I am optimistic about this movement towards peace and feel the United States should extend its support for this agreement to end years of violent blood shed. Indeed, the LTTE will have to show great will to bring an end to its violent attacks that have claimed tens of thousands of innocent lives. However, the current global situation has provided a glimpse of hope that this cease fire will be a successful endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, since the September 11 attacks, there has been a desire throughout the world to move away from senseless violence; and clearly, we began a new campaign against terrorism. This new atmosphere may potentially foster improved relations between Sri Lanka and the LTTE. Additionally, the LTTE may have been more apt to agree to this peace agreement since their popularity and their financial support was waning through countries that formerly favored them or provided support.