bravely risked his own life to save the life of another.

Mr. Speaker, 15-year-old Tyler Macemore of Yadkinville, North Carolina, rescued an anonymous 10-year-old boy caught in a rip tide at Atlanta Beach, North Carolina last year. One might wonder what motivated Tyler to selflessly enter the ocean that day. But it is clear that his choice was in some way guided by the lessons and experiences he has learned as a member of Boy Scout Troop 65 in Yadkinville.

Using only a boogie board, Tyler paddled out to the distressed young boy. With reassuring words and a confident, yet calm, demeanor, he placed the boy on the board and paddled against the dangerous surf back to safety. That day, Tyler Macemore became a true hero. By exhibiting a high level of maturity and bravery, he prevented a tragedy.

Since the rescue, Tyler has furthered his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America. He is now a Life Scout and working on his Eagle Scout.

Ironically, Tyler will be certified in lifesaving at camp this summer, where he will also be awarded the coveted Honor Medal for his courageous act by the Boy Scouts of America. I am proud and honored to recognize this outstanding young citizen.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2601, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 AND 2007

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 365 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 365

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2601) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for the consideration of H.R. 2601, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 2006 and 2007. It is a structured rule with 1 hour of general debate and provides for the orderly consideration of 38 separate amendments specified in the text of the resolution. It is important to note that the rules made in order the majority of the amendments that were filed, even some that will be reconsidered here on the floor, and will provide for a wide-ranging debate on virtually all aspects of U.S. foreign policy. The rule also ensures that the bill fits within the budget resolution, thereby also maintaining fiscal discipline within this year's budget.

H.R. 2601 was reported out of the Committee on International Relations with a unanimous vote which is a testament to the tremendous efforts on both sides of the aisle which have gone into this bill. Even though they have dealt with some of the most controversial issues before us, this bipartisanship demonstrated in the unanimous vote by the Committee on International Relations is all that more remarkable and a testament to the fairness, the professionalism, and the statesmanship of both the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). We will also be joining in an en bloc amendment, further illustrating their unique efforts in this particular matter.

They are to be commended for demonstrating to the rest of us how Members can work through differences in a constructive manner to move legislation forward for the best interest of our country. Indeed, the Prime Minister of India just a few minutes ago on this floor said there is much we can do together, and this committee has illustrated they can do that.

That is not to say there will not be differences of opinions or views on some of the matters. The rule which we are considering would provide for adequate as well as a wide-ranging debate on all sides of different issues.

The bill, H.R. 2601, is a 2-year authorization for the U.S. Department of State, their activities and programs. Since 1985, or for the past 20 years, the foreign assistance authorization measures have been folded into the State Department authorization legislation. H.R. 2601 continues this pattern. It authorizes for fiscal year 2006 $10.8 billion and $10 billion for 2007. Included in that is $1.5 billion to fortify U.S. embassies and $690 million to bolster security for American diplomatic workers abroad.

It was significant that the ranking member did bring before testimony of the Committee on Rules that this bill fully funds the administration request for worldwide security for our embassies and our personnel working abroad. As he illustrated in 2003, one of the terrorist extremists attacked the British consulate and other British interests in the city of Istanbul. When interrogated, he said that he considered the U.S. consulate, but in his terms, even a bird cannot fly in there, which means that our efforts for security since the tragic bombings in East Africa in 1998 have had some success.

□ 1200

This continues on with that particular practice.

$930 million will also be authorized for border security; $67 million to continue broadcasts into Cuba. The ranking member also illustrated that once again there is an initiative to disrupt the nuclear black markets, that this initiative will help prevent nuclear weapons and weapons technology from getting into the hands of terrorists or rogue nations which is extremely important for our national security. The measure also commits new international mechanisms to restrict the trade in missiles and their components. As the ranking member also pointed out, Secretary Rice is continuing the practices of Secretary Powell in trying to reform the Department of State and this bill authorizes adequate resources for a first-class and well-trained diplomatic service and diplomatic corps.

These are some of the issues that were brought forth with a plethora of amendments that were adopted on both sides of the aisle during the International Relations Committee markup of this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 356 provides for a structured rule and makes in order the majority of the amendments which were filed in the Rules Committee. Once again, it is a fair, comprehensive and balanced rule. I urge its adoption as well as the adoption of the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this restrictive rule. At a time when America's role in international affairs is greater than it has been in over 60 years, it is reprehensible that the majority is trying to block all but a select few from offering amendments to improve the underlying bill.

Yesterday afternoon in the Rules Committee, 70 amendments were brought to the committee. Seventy amendments, Mr. Speaker. Predictably, under the rule, barely 50 percent of those amendments were actually made in order. And of the 39 amendments made in order under the rule, only nine of them are Democratic amendments. In stark contrast, Republican Members will be permitted to offer 24 amendments under this rule, almost three times as many as those on this side of the aisle will be able to offer. And of those 24 amendments, two are downright inflammatory and completely unnecessary.

For starters, as public support for the war in Iraq wavers, Republicans are pulling out every political maneuver they can to regain the support of the American people for a war that has not uncovered any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and certainly not made us any safer today than we were 3 years ago. Later today, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) will offer an amendment in direct contrast to language that her committee unanimously included in the underlying legislation regarding the war in Iraq. The bill rightfully urges the President to develop and provide to Congress a plan for the establishment of a stable government in Iraq that will permit a decreased presence. Three years after this war began and 1,700 American casualties later, the Ros-Lehtinen amendment would provide the President with the same blank-check, open-ended support that got us into this mess in the first place. Have we not learned anything?

Additionally, the rule also fails to make in order amendments offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) regarding Haiti. While I am not 100 percent supportive of any of their approaches toward bringing about peace and stability in Haiti, doing nothing should not be an option. Congressional silence in improving the lives of Haitians and Haitian refugees is completely unacceptable. I am deeply disappointed that the Republican leadership has blocked the House from debating the issue today.

Realize, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the underlying bill is generally a decent bill. As a member of the Helsinki Commission and as the president of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's parliamentary assembly, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for the bill's commitment to the United States' role in the OSCE and the OSCE sphere, including authorizations for OSCE religious tolerance and anti-Semitism awareness programs.

The underlying legislation includes crackdowns on the trading of nuclear material on the black market, establishes the Rangel Fellowship Program to encourage minority recruitment at the State Department, reexamines our export control laws, reaffirms Congress' position that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, and calls for a crackdown on terrorist activities in the Gaza strip and West Bank.

Despite all of these positive measures, Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned about what the bill does not do regarding the Sudan. The underlying legislation includes a sense of Congress that the United States should work with the International Criminal Court to bring to justice those accused of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity. I support this provision but am deeply disappointed that nothing exists in the bill that will actually bring an end to the genocide in Sudan. When will the United States say enough is enough and do the right thing to end the heinous act of genocide in Darfur? Our inaction in Rwanda cost the lives of nearly 1 million and our absence in Darfur has permitted instability to manifest itself into murder and ethnic cleansing. I ask, at what point did we decide that the life of an African is worth less than the life of anyone else? We must place ending genocide anywhere in the world above anything else. Frankly, the ignorance in the House about this particular issue is appalling.

Mr. Speaker, when history judges this Congress and this President, we will be judged not only by what we do during these trying times but also by what we have neglected. America must act responsibly not only in helping to facilitate democracy in the world but also in combating poverty, disease, famine and hunger in the world's poorest countries. In all of these areas, despite the honest efforts of a few, we are failing. Blocking Members from offering amendments that speak to these and many other issues of critical importance to the United States' role in the world today is irresponsible. I urge my colleagues to reject this restrictive rule and take into account my concerns throughout consideration of the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) with whom I serve on the Rules Committee.

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

Last night, the Republican leadership decided to refuse this House the right to debate U.S. policy towards Colombia. Out of 70 amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee, only two dealt substantively with U.S. Colombia policy. I offered an amendment to match language approved by the Senate that would strengthen the accountability over U.S. funds for Colombia's demobilization of right-wing paramilitary forces. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) offered another amendment to ensure that 40 percent of U.S. aid to Colombia would be used for alternative economic development, human rights, rule of law and strengthening democratic institutions.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to strengthening democratic institutions, the Republican leadership certainly does not believe in teaching the Colombians by example. At the end of June, I stood here on the House floor during debate on military aid to Colombia and was criticized by Republicans for not talking about what kind of policy I stood for. But here we are today taking up a bill that only comes to the House floor every 2 years and is one of the only bills where an amendment on U.S. Colombia policy can actually be offered, and both the Lee and the McGovern amendments are banned from the debate.

Mr. Speaker, once again the Republican leadership has rejected any attempt to bring some kind of accountability to our policy on Colombia. Once again, the Republican leadership is serving as the chief apologist for the Colombian government. When it comes to Colombia, the Republican leadership continues to engage in a policy of see no evil, hear no evil and speak no evil. Once again, the House is being asked to look the other way, to sit down and to shut up, as Colombia moves towards carrying out what appears to be a deeply flawed plan for demobilizing the right-wing paramilitary forces, forces that are on the State Department's list of foreign terrorist organizations. The State Department estimates it will cost about $80 million to carry out the demobilization. Who do you think the Colombian government is going to ask to bankroll this process? The American taxpayer, that is who.

Well, before we spend one more single solitary U.S. tax dollar on this demobilization process, I for one want to make sure that my tax dollars are not paying for some sweetheart deal for Colombian drug lords, terrorists and killers to escape extradition to the United States or serve a couple of years under house arrest at their country estate. These are the paramilitary masterminds and commanders who have flooded our streets and our neighborhoods with cocaine and heroin. Yet on July 1, President Uribe told the Voice of America that their extradition warrants would have to be suspended. If Colombia wants to stand in the way of these drug lords facing U.S. justice, then that is Colombia's decision. They can just do it without U.S. tax dollar support. I want to make sure that my

constituents' hard-earned tax dollars are not paying for a process that will allow paramilitary money laundering and organizational structures to remain intact so that they can transform themselves into Mafia-like political, social and criminal networks.

The OAS has denounced the Colombian law on the paramilitary demobilization. Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International have denounced it. The U.N. High Commissioner For Human Rights in Colombia has raised grave concerns about it. So why, then, Mr. Speaker, is it so hard for this House to even have a debate over having some accountability if the Colombian government asks us to fund this process?

That is all I want, Mr. Speaker, is a little bit of accountability. Quite frankly, the majority on the Rules Committee and the Republican leadership should be ashamed of themselves for running away from this debate and for being complicit in a policy that will very likely end up protecting drug lords, terrorists, killers and their profits from facing any kind of genuine justice.

Oppose this rule. Demand that the House be allowed to debate the Lee and McGovern amendments on Colombia.

[From the New York Times, July 4, 2005]

COLOMBIA'S CAPITULATION

Colombia has just passed a law to demobilize paramilitary fighters that the government calls the ''Justice and Peace Law.'' It should be called the ''Impunity for Mass Murderers, Terrorists and Major Cocaine Traffickers Law.''

Colombia's right-wing paramilitary armies, one party in a 40-year civil war, have massacred thousands of people. They control 40 percent of Colombia's cocaine exports, and many paramilitary leaders are wanted for extradition to the United States. The State Department considers the paramilitaries terrorists.

The new law, which reflects the paramilitaries' considerable political power, will block the extradition of paramilitary leaders wanted for trafficking to the United States and allow them to continue their drug dealing, extortion, land theft and other criminal activities undisturbed. Even those responsible for the most heinous crimes against humanity may go free because of strict time limits for prosecutions. The few who are convicted will likely serve sentences of only 22 months.

Several members of Colombia's Congress proposed a good law that would have given reduced jail time to paramilitaries who confessed in full, paid reparations, turned over their illegal assets and provided authorities with the information necessary to take apart their criminal gangs. The government opposed the bill; it didn't pass.

The current law will bring neither justice nor peace. No confession is required to get the shortened sentences offered by the law. Paramilitary leaders are supposed to disclose their illegal assets and describe their criminal organizations. But there is no credible penalty for lying or hiding their wealth.

The Bush administration could have pushed President Alvaro Uribe to pass a good bill. Instead, Ambassador William Wood enthusiastically backed the new law, giving Washington's endorsement to Colombia's capitulation to a terrorist mafia.

IACHR ISSUES STATEMENT REGARDING THE ADOPTION OF THE ''LAW OF JUSTICE AND PEACE'' IN COLOMBIA

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) has been advised of the passing by Congress of the so called ''Law of Justice and Peace'' in the Republic of Colombia. This legislation, that requires the presidential signature in order to enter into force, establishes a legal framework for the demobilization of members of illegal armed groups involved in the commission of serious crimes against the civilian population in the context of the armed conflict.

In view of the recent adoption of this bill, the IACHR makes public its general observations regarding the contents in light of its mandate to promote the observance and defense of human rights, as well as the task delegated to it by the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States (OAS) in the sense of ''ensuring that the role of the OAS be completely in accordance with the commitments of the member states regarding full compliance with human rights and international humanitarian law'' in the process of dialogue between the Colombian government and the paramilitary in Colombia.

In its reports on the general situation of human rights in the countries of the Hemisphere and on individual cases, the IACHR has consistently insisted on the states' obligation to establish adequate mechanisms to achieve truth, justice and reparation for victims of human rights violations. Establishing the truth about what happened during the conflict, searching seriously for justice through the determination of the responsibility of the perpetrators vis-a-vis the victims, and the reparation of the damage cause—far from generating obstacles for the agreements that can lead to peace building—constitute basic pillars of its strength.

Regarding the Law of Justice and Peace in Colombia, the IACHR notes that the determination of the historical truth regarding what happened during the last few decades of the conflict does not appear as an objective. Nor does the determination of who has sponsored paramilitarism or of the degree of involvement of different participants in the perpetration of crimes against the civilian population by action, omission, collaboration or acquiescence.

The adopted bill concentrates upon the mechanisms to establish individual criminal responsibility in individual cases and involves demobilized members of illegal armed groups receiving procedural benefits. However, its provisions fail to establish incentives for a full confession of the truth as to their responsibility in exchange for the generous judicial benefits received. Consequently, the established mechanism does not guarantee that the crimes perpetrated will be duly clarified, and therefore in many cases the facts may not be revealed and the perpetrators will remain unpunished. The provisions of the law might favor the concealment of other conduct that, once brought to light at a future date, could benefit from the same alternative penalties. These procedural benefits not only reach conduct directly related to the armed conflict, but also can be invoked regarding the commission of ordinary crimes such as drug trafficking.

The IACHR also observes that the institutional mechanisms created by the law to administer justice—in particular the Prosecutor's National Unit for Justice and Peace, composed of 20 prosecutors—lacks the strength necessary to undertake effectively the task of prosecuting thousands of massacres, selective executions, forced disappearances, kidnappings, tortures, forced displacement and usurpation of lands, amongst other crimes, committed by several thousand demobilized individuals during the many years that paramilitary structures have operated in Colombia. Regarding the seriousness and complexity of the crimes perpetrated, the short time limits and procedural stages provided for in the legal mechanisms to investigate and prosecute the demobilized individuals benefiting from the law also fail to offer a realistic alternative to establish individual responsibility in full measure. This circumstance will prevent the uncovering of what happened to many of the victims, thus frustrating the reparations process they are entitled to. The investigation of serious violations of human rights requires adequate time limits and the opportunity for necessary procedural activity.

In terms of the reparation of the damage caused by those responsible for the commission of heinous crimes, the law places special emphasis on the restitution of unlawfully acquired property rather than on the mechanisms that might serve the full reparation of the victims. Particularly, it does not provide for specific mechanisms to repair the damage caused to the social fabric of the indigenous peoples, the afro-descendant communities, or the displaced women, often heads of household, who rank among the groups more vulnerable to violence by the participants in the armed conflict. The law fails to provide as part of the reparation owed to the victims, measures directed to preventing the repetition of the crimes committed, such as disqualification or separation from official functions of state agents involved by action or omission.

The IACHR acknowledges that, in such a complex, painful and prolonged situation as the conflict in Colombia, the deactivation of the armed participants by means of negotiation is a priority. However, in order to secure a lasting peace, guarantees for non-repetition of crimes of international law, human rights violations and serious infractions of international humanitarian law must be in place. This requires the clarification and reparation of the consequences of violence through mechanisms which prove to be adequate to establish the truth of what has happened, administer justice and provide reparation for the victims in light of the American Convention on Human Rights and the GAS Charter. The IACHR shall continue to excercise its mandate to promote and protect human rights in Colombia vis-a-vis the demobilization process and the interpretation and application of its legal framework, both through the adoption of general and special reports and the consideration and decision of individual cases.—Washington D.C., 15 July, 2005

HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH,
July 15, 2005.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing, in response to a letter dated July 12, 2005, from Luis Alberto Moreno, Colombian Ambassador to the United States, concerning the new legal framework that is to govern the demobilization of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs) in that country.

The establishment of an effective legal framework is of great importance for the prospects for both peace and justice in Colombia. It is essential that demobilizations be carried out in a manner that accomplishes the goals of dismantling these mafia-like organizations and holding accountable those responsible for serious crimes of drug trafficking, terrorism, and grave violations of human rights.

Regrettably, the Colombian ambassador's letter mischaracterizes key elements of the new law governing demobilization. To ensure

that you are fully informed about the processes established under the law, we address below some of the most serious factual inaccuracies in the letter:

1. No confession.

The ambassador's letter states that ''combatants will come forward . . . and admit to past crimes. . . . Any crime the individual intentionally does not confess to can be investigated and tried . . . with no benefits from the law . . .'' In fact, the law discourages confessions. This is because:

The law does not require a full and truthful confession of the FTO member's own involvement in crimes, his knowledge of others' crimes, or any other information of the illegal activities of the FTO, as a condition for members to receive generous sentence reductions. The law only requires that FTO members give an unsworn statement (a ''version libre''), in which there is no obligation to tell the truth.

To receive sentence reductions, a member need only ''accept''—without confessing—whatever charges are brought against him. If it is later found that a member did not tell the whole truth, under the new law he can avoid additional penalties by simply ''accepting'' any new charges levied against him. A single reduced sentence applies to the totality of accepted charges.

Only in the rare case where a court finds that the defendant intentionally omitted his involvement in a crime (something very difficult to prove, because Colombia's Constitution presumes good faith), will there be an increase in the sentence.

2. No incentives or penalties to ensure that members turn over all illegally acquired assets, release kidnapping victims, and disclose information.

The letter states that members of the demobilizing groups must ''turn in weapons, release kidnap[ping] victims, and identify and hand over illegally-gained assets'' as a condition to receive sentence reductions. But under the new law, if FTO members fail to do these things—if they are later found to have lied to authorities, or if commanders have hidden their fortunes, they will face no penalties. Once sentence reductions are granted, they are locked in.

Another problem, not addressed in the letter, is that top commanders can receive benefits even if their group continues committing terrorist acts, drug trafficking, kidnappings and atrocities. The law draws no distinction between leaders and ''members'' of FTOs—they can each receive the same benefits by demobilizing ''individually'' (i.e., not as part of a larger group) regardless of whether the troops under their command demobilize or cease their illegal activities.

3. Time limits for investigation are drastically reduced.

The letter states that the law ''does not grant amnesty for serious crimes committed, nor does it provide a statute of limitations.'' This statement obscures the fact that the law drastically reduces the terms for investigation:

A team of 20 prosecutors has only 36 hours after receiving possibly hundreds of members' statements to bring charges against these members for any crimes in which, based on their statements or other available evidence, they may ''reasonably be inferred'' to have participated.

If the defendant does not ''accept'' the charges, then within a maximum term of 60 days prosecutors must complete their investigations and bring the cases to trial. In Colombia, investigations of criminal cases routinely last many months and even years. It is virtually unheard of for any investigations—much less investigations of complex organizations involved in money laundering, drug trafficking, and extortion—to be completed in such a short time. Because of these drastic reductions, very few FTO members will likely be charged, and even fewer convicted.

4. Sentences can be as low as 2–3 years for all terrorist acts, narcotrafficking and atrocities.

The letter states that ''if they fulfill all these conditions, they become eligible for a reduced sentence of five to eight years. . . . With no possibility of further reductions in time served.'' This is not accurate. In practice, reduced sentences could be as low as two or three years for the totality of their crimes because:

The law provides that a year and a half of the time members have spent in a concentration zone (i.e., negotiating) ''shall be computed as time served;'' and

Constitutional jurisprudence in Colombia holds that all prisoners, without exception, must be allowed to receive generally available sentence reductions of up to one third for work and study—a rule that convicted drug traffickers in Colombia have consistently exploited to their benefit.

5. Extradition can be blocked.

The letter states that ''the question of extradition is not addressed in the law.'' This statement obscures the fact that the law gives FTO members tools to shield themselves from extradition through double jeopardy:

The law allows individuals to receive sentence reductions for all the crimes they committed during their membership in the FTO, including drug trafficking.

To block extradition, members would only have to admit, during their statements, the crimes for which their extradition has been requested. This admission would trigger a prosecution in Colombia. They would then be able to simply accept the charges against them, and serve reduced sentences.

Once they have served sentences for those crimes in Colombia, they could assert double jeopardy and block their extradition to the United States. Two or three years on an agricultural colony in Colombia is much more attractive than life in prison in the United States.

6. Drug lords can benefit under the law.

The letter states that ''no drug traffickers can receive legal benefits under the law.'' In fact, the law does allow drug traffickers to receive benefits:

The law provides benefits to all persons ''linked to illegal armed groups'' so long as the group was not ''organized for the trafficking'' of narcotics. But the government does not consider paramilitaries or guerrillas to have been ''organized for'' the purpose of drug trafficking. Thus, they will receive benefits despite the fact that their top commanders include notorious drug traffickers, who have been requested for extradition to the United States on drug charges.

Moreover, the Colombian government deleted a provision in an earlier version of the law that would have barred individuals from receiving benefits if they had been involved in drug trafficking before joining the FTO. As a result, the law can provide benefits even to drug lords who joined, or even purchased, FTO units for the sole purpose of receiving those benefits.

The law states that benefits will only be provided for crimes committed during actual membership in the armed group. But in most cases, prosecutors will probably have little evidence of the date of entry in the group other than the drug lords' own self-serving statements.

Under the newly approved law, the government will give up all its leverage, including the threat of extradition, over these FTOs and their commanders, but it will demand virtually nothing in exchange. The law does not require individuals to do anything more than admit crimes they have been charged with. There is no requirement to disclose anything more about their own or their groups' illegal activities, structures, financing streams, or illegally acquired assets. Members can easily be replaced through new recruitment and promises of high pay. In the event they are convicted of serious crimes, commanders will be able to serve sentences little longer than two years, probably on ''agricultural colonies,'' not real prisons. When they reenter society, their records will be clean, and their wealth, power, and criminal networks will likely be intact.

As a result, this law will undermine U.S. interests in the fight against drugs and terror. It will impede accountability, and yield no genuine progress towards peace and the rule of law in Colombia.

Please let us know if we can provide you with additional information on the demobilization law or Colombia. We look forward to continued communication with your office, and thank you for your interest in this important matter.

Sincerely,

JOSÉ MIGUEL VIVANCO,
Executive Director, Americas Division.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL,
July 19, 2005.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: In the coming days you will be debating and voting on the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 2006 and 2007. Included in this bill is language authorizing U.S. assistance for ''demobilization and disarmament of former members of the foreign terrorist organizations . . .'' specifically Colombia's paramilitary forces known as the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC in Spanish). The AUC is considered a ''Foreign Terrorist Organization'' by the Department of State.

While Amnesty International would welcome efforts by the government to ensure that paramilitary groups are truly dismantled, Amnesty International believes that the current process underway in Colombia neither ensures that paramilitary groups are effectively dismantled or ensures that their members are removed from the conflict. The recently passed law governing the demobilization is wholly inadequate. It threatens to guarantee the impunity of those responsible for heinous and widespread human rights atrocities (See the attached summary of paramilitary human rights atrocities for further background), not only paramilitaries, but also those who have backed the paramilitary such as wealthy landowners, and government and military officials. The demobilization law is based on the false premise that there are no links between the security forces and paramilitary forces. The law therefore threatens to ensure that paramilitary structures can remain intact and facilitate a process that could allow paramilitarism to re-emerge under a new legal guise.

The following is a review of some of the law's key provisions and an explanation of its fatal flaws that will almost certainly guarantee impunity and undermine the rule of law in Colombia.

I. Confessions of wrongdoing: The heart of the demobilization law is the requirement that potential beneficiaries voluntarily admit to crimes they committed while part of the paramilitary or guerrilla forces. Article 17 states that an individual can provide information on offences they have committed, but there is no loss of benefits if it is revealed that he or she lied in their original statements to judicial authorities unless it can be proved the combatant ''intentionally'' failed to provide such information. In legal terms it is practically impossible to prove ''bad faith.''

Fatal flaws: Full confessions are not guaranteed.

The law is structured in such a way that it will be extremely difficult for the federal prosecutors to determine whether the confessions offered are full and complete.

1. The law does not require a full judicial process whereby confessions are submitted to cross-examination or consideration is given to statements by witnesses, victims, survivors or family members familiar with the case.

2. It is expected that thousands of combatants will come forward seeking to benefit from the law, but the government of Colombia will only have 20 prosecutors devoted to investigating these cases. Worse, the prosecutors only have 60 days to verify the confessions and determine whether they are truthful or complete. It is entirely possible that paramilitary combatants (and possibly guerrillas in the future) may provide only minimal information in their statements and receive full benefits if prosecutors are unable to prove they are lying or withholding information within 60 days. In other words the 60-day time limit and the restricted number of prosecutors make it extremely unlikely that full and impartial investigations will be carried out into the responsibility of demobilizing combatants in human rights abuses or violations. It is extremely unlikely that prosecutors will uncover evidence of other crimes committed by the combatant other than those to which he or she freely admits in his or her initial statements.

3. The law is focused primarily on individuals and does not require beneficiaries to provide information about their paramilitary organization and their illegal activities. It is entirely possible that the demobilization law will leave paramilitary organizations intact, and allow them to continue functioning. The strict time limit on investigations means that it is unlikely that criminal investigations would focus on the nature and structure of the armed group to which the combatant belonged leaving it concealed.

II. Inadequacy of penalties: The law provides for maximum penalties of 5 to 8 years even for gross human rights violations.

Fatal Flaws: De facto Amnesties.

While the law does not explicitly provide for an amnesty or pardons for heinous crimes, it does provide for leniency and some of its provisions may lead to de facto amnesty for many.

1. Sentences imposed may be reduced by the amount of time (up to 18 months) the beneficiary spent waiting in the ''concentration'' zone pending the outcome of the demobilization negotiations with the government. Human rights violators and abusers could thus receive a reduced sentence of 3.5 years.

2. It is not clear that the sentences will be served in prison. Article 31 allows the government to decide where sentences will be served. It has been suggested that sentences might be served in agricultural communities (''colonias agricolas''), potentially on lands paramilitary forces illegally confiscated from indigenous, Afro-Colombian, or peasant communities. They may therefore be able to derive profit from lands and other assets they obtained through war crimes or crimes against humanity.

3. Provisions in the law allow prosecutors to close investigations into individual combatants if there are not sufficient merits to submit charges. The danger is that with only 60 days to advance criminal investigations a decision to drop all charges could be taken on only superficial evidence. This could constitute a de facto amnesty for many human rights violators or abusers. It is clear that this law is designed to bring the minimum number of people to trial and only a small minority will be held to account and then will only be subject to the extremely limited and lenient sentences.

III. Extradition will become more difficult: The law grants political status to the paramilitaries by defining their activities as ''sedition.'' Sedition is a political offense in Colombia.

Fatal Flaw: Political offenses are not extraditable crimes under Colombia's 1991 Constitution.

1. If sedition is defined as a political offense, and the activities of paramilitaries are defined as sedition, then it will become extremely difficult for paramilitary forces to be extradited.

2. Under the 1991 Colombian Constitution those responsible for crimes related to sedition may be eligible for amnesties or pardons. Again another door is opened to protect those who have promoted or helped create paramilitary groups who may escape justice by receiving pardons or amnesties on the basis that these crimes are defined as forms of sedition.

IV. Lack of participation by victims: The law makes no provision for the participation of victims and their families in any part of the judicial process, except at the stage of reparation after the sentencing of an offender.

Fatal Flaws: Those who have suffered the most from human rights violations will have almost no role in determining the penalties.

1. Victims and their families will only be eligible for reparations for offenses for which a paramilitary is sentenced. If the perpetrator's confession is incomplete or inaccurate, there will be no way for families to dispute the sentence handed down.

2. Only the perpetrator's illicitly obtained funds will be subject to reparation, not their total wealth. Identifying such illicit funds might prove difficult since money is often laundered through apparently legal enterprises. Some paramilitaries might not even have illicitly-obtained assets from which to make reparations. Failure to ensure that demobilizing combatants are subjected to a full and impartial judicial investigation and court proceedings means it will be difficult to identify all the assets the individual or the armed group (paramilitary or guerilla) appropriated through its activities including through human rights abuses. The law could thereby result in the de facto legitimization of illicitly obtained land and enable those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity to profit from the assets they obtained through these heinous acts.

Conclusion: Amnesty International is deeply concerned that the demobilization law passed by the Colombian Congress will not rid the country of the scourge of illegal armed activity and human rights abuses against the civilian population. In fact, it may make the situation worse by:

Providing de facto amnesties for paramilitaries and guerillas responsible for serious human rights abuses and violations;

Perpetuating impunity for human rights abusers and violators thereby undermining the rule of law in Colombia;

Failing to guarantee the effective dismantling of paramilitary structures by focusing solely on individual combatants;

Failing to expose those Colombian security forces, government officials, and private citizens who have supported and benefited from the activities of the paramilitary;

Failing to establish a full and independent judicial process to oversee the demobilization process;

Failing to respect the rights of victims of human rights violations and abuses to truth, justice and reparation.

AI has urged President Uribe to refrain from ratifying the demobilization law, and we urge the United States Congress to oppose the use of U.S. assistance to fund this demobilization process.

If you have any questions about this or any other human rights matter in Colombia, please do not hesitate to contact me via *eolson@aiusa.org*.

Sincerely,

ERIC L. OLSON,
Advocacy Director for the Americas.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the remarks that have been given so far by the gentleman from Florida as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts. Saying there were 70 amendments proposed happens to be rounding up the number, but of those that were not allowed in the process, six were withdrawn by their sponsors. The majority of the others were either duplicative or not germane. And may I remind this body that why we are talking in a structured rule is because the bulk of the issues should have been done in the hearing and in the committee level. The committee who did hear these issues did pass this bill, I remind you once again, unanimously from both sides of the body. The issues that have been addressed so far will have a chance because there is also another amendment that deals with Colombia, so the gentleman from Massachusetts will have a chance once again to give some dramatic rhetoric one more time on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Let me thank the gentleman very, very much for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the rule. I was somewhat disappointed, as expressed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), on the lack of a couple of amendments that we were attempting to insert in the bill dealing with Haiti. Haiti is a tragedy. There is no other way to describe it. They are kind, wonderful, hardworking people who are desperate for a solution to their ever-growing controversy. No matter whose side you believe in, no matter what you thought of past presidents or future presidents, the one thing that is abundantly clear to most of us is that Haiti is drowning in despair. The people have been ravaged not only by political unrest and upheaval, natural disasters, hurricanes and other things and what I was trying to do in the amendment was to provide a new concept much like a Peace Corps, taking Haitian citizens who are now here in the United States who are learning a free economy, learning to be teachers, police officers, pharmacists, to create a structure in the State Department, in cooperation with NGOs, to use those talents and capabilities to help bring some stability to Haiti.

□ 1215

I know we have tried and the White House both past and present have injected significant amounts of resources to try to help the island. For whatever

reason, one side pits the other, the lack of any clear-cut direction, and I believe to some degree the Haitian people lack trust in some of our motives and motivations, which is why I thought of this concept of bringing people who now had learned about the free market concepts of America to send them back to Haiti for a limited time so that they too could use that talent that they have learned here in the United States to help their brothers and sisters in Haiti try to build an economy, build an education system, build a health care dynamic, and try to create a pathway for their future.

We have seen billions, honestly, squandered in Haiti from one regime to the next. None seems to be better than the last. And at the same time, the people in Haiti are starved, some are imprisoned. An election is contemplated, and I do not know how in the world we will structure an election based on the current chaos that is evidenced in Haiti. However, many of us, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), many people in the room, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), I am just naming a couple people. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) I know has had a unique and particular interest in this area. We may come from different political parties, but I think our motives are pure at least on the point of view that it is about the people of Haiti, not about whoever is running the country.

So I commend the bill and of course will support the very important endeavors of our Committee on International Relations as they work across the globe to try to bring unity of purpose to a very complicated and convoluted and dangerous world. But for this Member from Florida, my heart really does truly go out to the Haitian people. I pray that in the days ahead we come up with some significant ways in order to look at the concerns some members of the Congressional Black Caucus have relative to our intervention or activities in Haiti and try to put aside some of our animus towards recognizing that unless we get our act together the people of Haiti will still be starving, they will still be dying of disease, they will still be cleaning up after hurricane debris, and they will still be wondering what is their future to be like.

So I want to thank all who have participated in the debate. I want to thank Members, both Republicans and Democrats, who have submitted amendments yesterday that were not included in the rule. But I can assure my colleagues that we will continue to endeavor to see that our points of view are brought forward either in this vehicle or future vehicles as we move down the road.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would be remiss not to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) for his sincere and measured remarks.

But I am here today, Mr. Speaker, to speak of Uzbekistan. President Bush stated that the United States ''will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation: The moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom, which is eternally right. America will not pretend . . . that any human being aspires to live at the mercy of bullies. We will encourage reform in other governments by making clear that success in our relations will require the decent treatment of their own people.'' Certainly noble words.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) and I offered an amendment that would have provided real meaning to those noble words, but the Committee on Rules did not make our amendment in order, thereby failing the democratic aspirations of the people of a nation in Central Asia called Uzbekistan.

One of our partners in the Coalition of the Willing is a bully. His name is Islam Karimov, and he is the thug who rules Uzbekistan. According to our own State Department, Karimov runs a regime that does not allow freedom of speech or religion, that makes a mockery of elections, that holds thousands of political prisoners where security forces customarily utilize torture. Some of their victims have literally been boiled alive, and 2 months ago his security forces massacred hundreds of civilians who were simply asking for liberty and justice. Yet we have given this thug some $350 million in aid. Our amendment would have use that leverage to push Karimov to democratize, to respect human rights, and to accept an independent investigation into that massacre. As Bill Kristol said in the Weekly Standard just recently, ''It would be unfortunate if the spring of 2005 went down in the history books as a turning point, in favor of dictators.''

The choice is simple and we have made the wrong choice today. We are standing with a thug rather than standing for democracy, and I urge defeat of the rule.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the subcommittee chairmen, one who has spent a great deal of time working on this significant piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This legislation that we bring to the floor is a comprehensive bill, 332 pages long. It will probably grow significantly during the course of the day because there are a number of amendments that will be offered and I believe accepted.

As chairman of the Africa, Global Human Rights, and International Operations Subcommittee and as author of H.R. 2601, I am very proud of the way we worked in a bipartisan way on crafting this legislation. I point out to my colleagues that this legislation has been crafted over the course of several months. I chaired eight hearings at which we looked at various component parts of this bill and policies related to this bill, and the full committee met twice to consider the State Department request and the other associated requests that are contained within this legislation. I would point out to my colleagues that I know I have had amendments in the past that were not made in order over my last 25 years as a Member of Congress. It is always disappointing. But there were 10 amendments considered by our subcommittee. And then when we moved to full committee, there were 52 additional amendments considered. Today we have another 38 that will be considered as well. So this bill will be subjected to an enormous number of amendments, and I think that is good and healthy and very important.

I would point out to my colleagues that the bill passed the committee 42 to zero. People on the left and on the right, conservatives, moderates, and liberals, came together realizing that we had crafted a truly bipartisan piece of legislation for our Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

We often debate money on the floor, and having the monetary resources necessary to carry out our foreign policy tasks are indeed critical. But equally if not more important, it is how we spend the money. This authorization measure contains important new foreign policy directives and reflects a consensus on both sides of the aisle. Together we have produced a very strong piece of legislation that protects our national interests abroad, robustly funds our public diplomacy efforts, and promotes those values that we hold dear such as the protection of human rights, support for democracy, and assistance to those in crisis or in need.

H.R. 2601 fully funds the operations of the Department of State, especially its diplomatic operations abroad, and meets the President's budget request. It authorizes $22.3 billion over 2 years plus for the Department of State, international broadcasting activities, international assistance programs, and related agencies.

Again, I hope my colleagues will support the rule and the bill when it comes to the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), who is the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, my good friend and classmate.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that the Committee on Rules did not make my

amendment in order. Our amendment on global climate change, which passed both the House and the Senate in a previous version, simply says that the United States must lead the world in the fight against global warming.

In this Chamber of democratic ideals, the House of Representatives is supposed to be the place where we take a stand on the issues. If one disagrees, for example, with my amendments, fine. Then stand up and vote against them.

The fact is that global warming exists and is fully acknowledged by the scientific community. The fact is that a report which President Bush himself commissioned from the National Academy of Sciences says that human activity causes global warming. The truth is that the United States should lead on climate change, not avoid it.

Let me be clear. I was not advocating for the Kyoto Protocol. Other countries took the lead when we backed out, and it entered into force earlier this year. But just because we rejected Kyoto does not absolve us from working with other countries on climate change. Actually, it means that we have to take the lead, be creative and find a solution. The G–8 statement on climate change is a start, by acknowledging that climate change is a serious challenge that human activities are contributing to. Unfortunately, the administration reportedly exerted a considerable amount of pressure to water down the G–8 statement and the document falls far short of making a call for strong and immediate action.

The truth is that the world's future depends on our actions today. Global warming could devastate our environment and our economy. President Bush's administration, in a report to the United Nations, said that global climate change could mean greater storm surges on the coasts, reduced snowpack and water supplies in the West, declining water levels in the Great Lakes, stronger hurricanes, more extreme weather events, and greater risk of both flooding and drought. If that is not an incentive for the administration to act, nothing will be.

Finally, I am also concerned that the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. MCGOVERN) amendment on the demobilization process in Colombia was not made in order. The current Colombian demobilization framework, as discussed in the bill, does not provide minimal guarantees on at least three basic points. First, terrorist leaders who are under standing indictments in our country for serious crimes can escape extradition to the United States. Second, the bill does not require that these terrorists provide complete information on their networks so they could be dismantled. And, lastly, the law does not build in adequate monitoring mechanisms to ensure that those who have forsworn violence do not return to their terrorist activities.

We must address these issues before we authorize assistance to a process that could cost the U.S. taxpayer an estimated $80 million over 3 years. The Colombia and global climate change amendments should have been made in order so that Members would have had the opportunity to debate and vote on these important issues.

I urge my colleagues, therefore, to vote ''no'' on the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, today we are failing the people of Darfur in the Sudan.

In July of 2004, this Congress called what is happening in Sudan a genocide. In September of 2004, President Bush said it was a genocide. There is no place else on the face of the Earth today that carries such a distinction. But both the President and the Congress have said there is genocide going on.

The words we have spoken have not stopped the government in Khartoum. Four hundred thousand people have died. Three and a half million people are at risk.

Again, everything we have done so far is words, very little action. We have supported the African Union Mission, assisting in the transport of troops and providing funds, and we have helped some of that. But it has been over a year since the African Union began their mission in Darfur, and nothing has changed. There are currently only 2,600 troops in a region the size of France with a plan for another 7,000 odd to be there later on this year. Plus the mission does not even have a mandate that includes the protection of civilians. We need troops there now. We need the American Government to step up now.

The U.S. has been generous in its contributions in support of the AU and humanitarian aid, but it is not enough. The regime that runs Sudan is genocidal, as stated by this Congress and our President.

□ 1230

We send incredibly mixed messages to both the people of Sudan and the people around the world when we say there is genocide going on, we say it is terrible, the people of Sudan are inflicting tremendous actions on their own people; yet our own government, the CIA, sends an executive jet to pick up the head of the Khartoum intelligence service who is seen by many to be the architect of the genocide in Darfur, and we fly him to Washington for secret talks. What message does that send?

We are failing the people of Darfur, who continue to die. We need to stand up. The amendments that were offered yesterday should have been allowed so that this Congress can make the decision whether to stand up or whether to sit idly by while millions more die.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my classmate and good friend.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this restrictive rule because it ignores, actually blocks, the important issues and amendments that we should be talking about here and now, including my amendment ensuring that the United States lives up to its international commitment to reduce and eventually disarm its nuclear weapons stockpiles and my amendment expressing the need for a sensible, multilateral American response to terrorism, otherwise known as SMART security. But most important of all, this bill fails to include any Democratic amendments that address the war in Iraq.

This critical issue should not be neglected by a bill of this magnitude, a bill that addresses and authorizes our Nation's international programs over the next two fiscal years.

This authorization will not discuss an amendment that I would have offered calling on the President to develop a plan for the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Iraq and to bring that plan to the Congress. It also covers our responsibility to assist Iraq, not through our military, but through international humanitarian efforts, to rebuild their war torn economic and physical infrastructure.

Would the Republican leadership believe that we can wait two more years to debate our role in Iraq, to debate when we will bring our troops home? We need to declare for the record that we plan to leave Iraq. Unfortunately, the rule before us today prevents us from having this very important debate. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote against this unfair and restrictive rule and to support every effort to plan to bring our troops home.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the introduction of this particular rule, this bill covers a wide range of issues. As you can see from the discussion we have had so far, there are a wide range of issues that are covered in this particular bill. That is why it is also remarkable, one more time, that this particular bill came through its committee in a uniquely bipartisan way, in which there were hearings and then a markup, over 62 amendments presented, bipartisan, discussed, and once again with a bipartisan result were submitted to us.

The committee process that we have in the House is of a unique and supreme importance. Without trying to make any kind of value statement on what is done on the other side of this particular Capitol, former Senator McCarthy of Minnesota once said that the Senate has rules, but it does not

matter because no one over there follows them.

We on the House side though, have an orderly process in which to discuss issues and bring them in a timely and consistent manner, and the specifics of those are the importance that we put on the committee, and especially the hearing process in the committee. It is the committee process in which issues of specifics as well as long-range importance should be debated and discussed and allow that hearing process to go forward, so that what is brought to the floor becomes a significantly refined model, and that therefore on the floor we can narrow our process and narrow our discussion into those particular areas and into certain particular areas.

This bill is still a significant issue. It is a significant bill. It is a 2-year authorization, and within that authorization is a blueprint for the reform of the State Department. It is significant that that move forward, because we are talking about how we fully authorize and fully purport to have a well-balanced and strong core of diplomatic personnel representing us in every institution.

Within this bill are specific and important issues that fully authorize the safety and security of that personnel. Those are significant issues, and though we may differ with specifics of what is happening today, we must also look to the fact that this bill deals with long-term results, long-term goals, long-term aspirations of our State Department and our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is this bill has had significant debate on a wide variety of issues within the committee process, and that is the way the House tries to function, by also authorizing 38, which is a majority of the resolutions. Once again, the majority of the amendments not offered were taken away either from withdrawal or from redundancy or from germaneness issues.

But by authorizing 38 and providing a process for that discussion means that, once again, we are going to take these issues in a wide range and a wide variety and move forward with those with that type of discussion on the floor. My only hope at this stage is that as a floor, we can be as wise as the Committee on International Relations was when they came up with a bipartisan product and a 44–0 vote and presented it here for our further considerations.

Hopefully we will maintain the same kind of collegiality and standards that particular committee did, because I think it sets a standard and a goal for us to try and emulate as we go through with the floor discussion.

I am proud of the underlying bill and I am proud of the rule because it provides the fair representation for this bill as a continuation of the committee process, but does not supplant the committee process, which is what we do here on the House floor for an orderly discussion of those particular issues.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very tempted by my friend on the Committee on Rules that I serve with when he says we follow these rules, this rule says waives all points of order against consideration of the bill in item 3; five, says waives all points of order; eight, it says waives all points of order. There is a notwithstanding clause.

I want to know what part does the gentleman see as following the rules. The simple fact of the matter is we are not going to be discussing Darfur, we are not going to be discussing Colombia, we are not going to be discussing Haiti, and somewhere along the line we could have done that under the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this restrictive rule. It prevents the House from discussing our policy toward the Andean region and Colombia in particular in a serious way. Two important amendments on these subjects were offered by Democrats in the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules, in refusing to make them in order for debate, has denied Members the opportunity to address these critical issues that were raised in the amendments.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) offered an amendment that would have required at least 40 percent of Andean Counterdrug Initiative funds to be dedicated for alternative economic and social development in rural areas, encouraging human rights and protecting democratic institutions.

I guess the majority thinks this is not a worthwhile discussion to have. Clearly they are not interested in results or wise investment of our funds in Colombia. As we know, despite billions invested in the Andean region over the last several years in a largely supply side and military drug eradication program, drug cultivation has gone up in the Andean region and the availability of cocaine in the United States has gone virtually unchecked, with prices low and products more potent than ever.

The Republican leadership must know this bill is more of the same, instead of a balanced policy that would provide some real results on the ground.

The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. MCGOVERN) amendment sought to place serious conditions on any funding that goes from the United States to the Colombian paramilitary demobilization process, just as the Senate did, so that paramilitary and drug trafficking organizations are fully dismantled and the worst criminals, murderers and terrorists face real and tough prison sentences.

By denying Members a chance to debate the McGovern amendment, the Republican leadership has made it clear they are not serious about ensuring those terrorists are brought to justice. Without the McGovern amendment, this bill is toothless. It does nothing to prevent U.S. dollars from helping to set Colombia's worst criminals free. Colombia's deceptively named ''peace and justice law'' fails to fully dismantle paramilitary organizations and threatens to let criminals off the hook, and without more stringent conditions, U.S. taxpayers should not support what amounts to an allowance for individuals implicated in drug trafficking and murder.

The McGovern amendment would replace the House's language, which authorizes funds for the demobilization of Colombia's paramilitary organizations, with the provisions adopted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Unlike the Senate provision, the House bill carries with it no accountability to the U.S. Congress or U.S. taxpayers for how our money is spent.

We are talking about members of paramilitary death squads that have massacred Colombian civilians and have trafficked drugs to our country. I do not oppose Colombia's efforts to negotiate with armed groups to foster peace for its people. I want peace and stability for Colombia. However, I do object to U.S. dollars being used with no strings attached in a process that may lead to known killers and narcoterrorists going free without adequate punishment.

So I suggest that our colleagues make the following calculation: Do you want U.S. taxpayer dollars to fund drug traffickers and murderers? If not, oppose the rule and demand a new one that allows debate on these important issues.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, last night in the Committee on Rules I attempted to strike an amendment that was put into this bill that I believe does not belong there. I believe it was inflammatory and totally unnecessary. It implied that those Americans who are concerned about the conduct of the war and talk about withdrawal are unpatriotic. Despite 60 percent of the American people being concerned about the war, the majority refused to remove this amendment from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans support the troops in Iraq. They are our sons and they are our daughters. We appreciate their commitment, we honor

their service and we do not need another resolution to demonstrate that appreciation. What we should do is live up to our commitment to the troops.

Mr. Speaker, it is the Democrats that have fought to raise the Veterans Administration budget the $2 billion it needs this year just to take care of the wounded from Iraq. Think about that for a moment. For what we spend on the war a week, $2 billion, we could take care of our wounded veterans for a year. We care very much about that, and that is how we honor our troops.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats in this House have pushed that debate, and again unsuccessfully, that our troops are not well equipped, that we have not given them the armored vehicles and things they need to save their lives. Now this leadership is going to use rhetoric to try to further divide the Nation. They would rather do that than take care of the troops.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this rule and particularly, as I mentioned, the Ros-Lehtinen amendment is fear politics at its worst. The underlying message the Republican leadership is sending could not be clearer. It is this: If you disagree with the policies of this administration, you are un-American. If you dare to question them, you will hurt our troops in the field. If you ask the tough questions, you are helping the terrorists.

I feel compelled to advise my colleagues that this is a democracy. What we need to do is defeat the previous question and consider the Ros-Lehtinen amendment separately as a freestanding bill. The way it is written now, there is no possibility even to amend it. It is either up or down, shut up or put up.

This is not the way we do things here, and we are leaving out half the population of this country who wants us to debate the war. Once again, we are attempting to cut out the voice of the people here, and we will try on the previous question to remove the Ros-Lehtinen amendment from the bill and immediately consider it later as a freestanding bill, giving Members the opportunity to amend it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the debate that we have heard so far. It has been very riveting rhetoric that has gone on. Sometimes I am a little bit surprised at it, as we are told we cannot debate the things we are debating.

In specific, if I could mention something about the Colombia policy, which, once again, it was said we are not going to be able to talk about, even though we have, I think the United States has a great record in what it has been doing so far down there. We are making progress. There is much to do, but we are making progress.

□ 1245

There is already a 17 percent reduction in South American purity of heroin that is coming from Colombia. Hospital overdoses from that same issue are down by one-third.

It is significant that that issue, that issue that was brought up before was debated in the Committee on International Relations. They debated demobilization of terrorists. They adopted two resolutions. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) presented a resolution on this same issue that was adopted that dealt with section 944 on the issue, and it was about the demobilization of Colombia, and it was passed with bipartisan support in that particular committee.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) also had an issue that dealt with Colombian tax policy. What I am trying to emphasize is, once again, we have had opportunity to discuss these issues in the committee process, which is the appropriate process. There will also be other opportunities to discuss this issue, not only here but, again, in other areas.

I appreciate what the gentlewoman from New York just said. On the issue of Iraq, we have had a defense authorization bill as well as defense appropriations for 3 days. We have had the opportunity to debate these particular issues on the floor. There will also be one other time to bring those positions up. Whether the amendment is passed, either for or against, that opportunity will still be here.

These issues are before us; but, once again, what we are trying to do with this rule is what we are trying to do with the House process, that is, to do things in an orderly fashion so that the bulk of these issues can be heard in the committee and could go forward in the committee where the true interaction takes place in a much, much more specific way by those people who become experts in this particular area.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the gentleman that when the Committee on International Relations marked up the provisions on the Colombia issues, this new law in Colombia had not been passed yet. This is since the markup in the committee. So we are dealing with a new law that may very well let go terrorists, killers, paramilitary leaders who have done harm not only to Colombian citizens, but to our citizens. So we need a debate on Colombia.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will be asking members to vote ''no'' on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to allow the House to consider the Ros-Lehtinen amendment on Iraq as a separate, freestanding bill with an open amendment process instead of just another amendment to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this House have very strong opinions on the war in Iraq. We also have many different viewpoints on our Nation's continued role in that country. But regardless of our individual positions on this conflict, we all support the courageous men and women who put their lives on the line every day.

Any vote on Iraq significantly impacts these brave Americans and should not be taken irresponsibly, and it should not be taken for blatantly political purposes. The Ros-Lehtinen amendment, which came to light only yesterday when it was submitted to the Committee on Rules, is a good example of exploiting the current situation in Iraq purely for partisan gain. The original version of this amendment submitted to the Committee on Rules accused opponents of the President's plan, whatever that is, of supporting a ''cut-and-run'' Iraq policy that is a ''craven surrender to terrorism.'' This inflammatory language has now been removed, but it still appears that the sole intention of this amendment is to polarize Members of this House on a crucial question of national security.

Under this rule, Members can only vote up or down, take it or leave it, with no opportunity for amendment or any position except that of the amendment's author.

If we are going to discuss and vote on the U.S. presence in Iraq, it deserves a thorough and respectful debate. We owe our brave young men and women more than a divisive and meaningless sense of Congress resolution.

Members should be aware that a ''no'' vote will not prevent consideration of the Foreign Relations Authorization bill, and it will not affect any of the other amendments that are in order under this rule.

I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, (a) the amendments by Representative Dreier of California, Representative Crowley of New York, Representative King of Iowa, and Representative Rohrabacher of California at the desk at the time of adoption of this resolution and numbered 3A, 18A, 21A, and 37A, shall be in order in lieu of the amendments in part B of House Report 109–175 and numbered 3, 18, 21, and 37, respectively, and (b) the amendment numbered 2 in part B of House Report 109–175 shall be debatable for 20 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as we continue on after the passage of this rule, I am looking forward to an hour of general debate, which will be as riveting as what we have had discussing this particular rule.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering today commits a small but significant act of principle over convenience: In addition to providing for the consideration of the Foreign Relations bill, it firmly establishes the precedent that this House will not consider legislation on the floor if it exceeds the levels established by the budget resolution. This choice will not make us heroes; it will not win us accolades in The Washington Post. But it does show that we will stick to our budget disciplines, and I rise to commend Chairman DREIER and the Rules Committee for this very important decision.

By way of explanation: As originally reported by the Committee on International Affairs, the bill increases mandatory spending by $103 million over 5 years. Specifically, the bill as reported would allow the State Department to automatically spend leftover funds on other purposes without further legislative action. Traditionally these transfers are subject to appropriations. But the reported bill eliminated that requirement. As a result, the bill converted discretionary spending to mandatory at a time when we are trying to restrain mandatory spending.

This increase in mandatory spending breaches the spending limit, or ''allocation,'' established for the IR Committee in the budget resolution. In technical terms, this violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which precludes the House from considering a bill that exceeds the 302(a) allocation of the committee that reported the bill.

Now, the Rules Committee could have let this slide: The rule could simply have waived the Budget Act restriction, and let the authorizing committee fix the problem through a floor amendment. After all, many will say it wasn't really a large amount of money to worry about—and hardly anyone would have noticed anyway.

While that step might have fixed the problem with this particular bill, it would have done it the wrong way. The principle underlying the congressional budget process is that we should not consider bills on this floor until they comply with spending limits established in the budget resolution. In other words, the burden is on the committee reporting the bill to comply with the budget before the measure reaches the floor. If compliance were left to a floor amendment or a subsequent point of order, it would cost budgetary commitment to the winds of the moment—which is no commitment at all. Chairman DREIER and the Rules Committee have shown the appropriate kind of leadership: They have upheld this important principle of fiscal discipline.

Once again, I commend Chairman DREIER and the Rules Committee for enforcing the budget resolution and upholding the integrity of the budget process. We may not win any medals for this; we won't get to brag about it to Chris Matthews on Hardball. But this is the right thing to do, and that should be all the reason we need. This is an excellent rule and merits all of our support.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of this resolution, amendment numbered 38 in House Report 109–175 shall not be in order.

SEC. 3. That immediately upon disposition of H.R. 2601 the Speaker shall declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of a bill proposing to add a new section 1111 as contemplated in amendment numbered 38 in House Report 109–175. the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do need to have an explanation. I am not familiar with this process, and I do not know whether there has been an agreement reached, and I am trying to learn the answer to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has moved the previous question, both on the amendment and on the resolution.

The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the amendment and the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 196, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Becerra
Brown (SC)
Frelinghuysen
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Istook
Jones (OH)
Payne
Pearce
Reyes
Sweeney

□ 1314

Messrs. SALAZAR, McDERMOTT, STUPAK, TAYLOR of Mississippi and KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. EVERETT and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra
Brown (SC)
Dicks
Eshoo
Frelinghuysen
Hinojosa
Istook
Jones (OH)
McIntyre
Meehan
Payne
Pearce
Reyes
Sweeney
Waters

□ 1322

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 19, 2005, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall Nos. 383 and 384. The votes I missed included ordering the previous question on the amendment and on agreeing to H. Res. 365, providing for consideration of H.R. 2601 to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on both rollcall votes 383 and 384.

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 H.R. 2601.

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

There was no objection.