Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—156

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Baca
Barton
Campbell
Cooksey
Kilpatrick
Roemer
Smith (WA)
Vento

□ 1253

Ms. CARSON and Messrs. FARR of California, GEJDENSON, DICKS, THOMPSON of California and MINGE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1339

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4871, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 560 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 560

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. 4871) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 62, line 17, through page 63, line 2. During the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), 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, House Resolution 560 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4871, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2001.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule also waives clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislation on an appropriations bills, with regard to the bill.

Additionally, this rule accords priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This encourages Members to take advantage of the option to facilitate consideration of amendments and to inform Members of the details of pending amendments.

The rule also provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on postponed questions to 5 minutes, provided that the votes immediately follow another recorded vote, and that the voting time on the first in a series of votes is not less than 15 minutes.

House Resolution 560 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of minority Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 560 is an open rule, similar to those considered for other appropriations bills. It will afford a fair and complete debate on the issues surrounding the underlying legislation.

H.R. 4871 continues the trend of this Congress by funding our national priorities while ensuring fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget. The bill increases funding for $678 million over last year's appropriation, placing a priority on enhancing law enforcement priorities such as school violence prevention, international child pornography trafficking, and strict enforcement of our existing gun laws.

The bill also continues our commitment to the war on drugs by maintaining spending for drug technology transfers to our allies in the fight against narcotraffickers; ensuring ongoing efforts to partner with local law enforcement and providing an additional $12.5 million to attack drug smuggling across our borders.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4871 funds 40 percent of the law enforcement activities of the Federal Government, and it successfully maximizes the impact of America's investment in those worthy initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his hard work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this fair, open rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) for a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question on the rule is defeated, would it be in order for a Member to offer an amendment to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would recognize the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question for the purposes of offering an amendment to the resolution, if the previous question were not ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, as I continue, I plan on leading the fight against the previous question. I want to inform my colleagues that I intend to oppose the previous question and encourage them to do so. If it is defeated, I intend to offer an amendment to rescind the Member COLA.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule which will allow for the consideration of H.R. 4871. As my colleague from Georgia has explained, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority Member on the Committee on Appropriations.

This allows germane amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer amendments that do not violate the rules for appropriations bills.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. It is one that funds executive branch agencies important to the ongoing activities of the Government and through the Treasury Department funds are provided to bureaus and offices that make our money, that pay our debts and collect our taxes.

I am disappointed that overall the bill provides for $2.1 billion below the administration's request. There are significant funding shortfalls in a number of important areas, including our government's counterterrorism programs and the Internal Revenue Service's restructuring efforts.

However, there are a number of significant provisions in this bill. The measure provides for $76 million to expand the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative and to assist State and local governments in tracing firearms. It provides $185 million to the National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign, which has been a proven campaign to prevent drug abuse among our Nation's young people, and it provides an increase in funds for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains an immensely important provision that I have worked on for some time with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). The Wolf amendment addresses the widespread problem of conflict diamonds in Africa.

The language prohibits the U.S. Customs Service from using any funds in the bill to allow diamonds from certain conflict regions in Africa from entering the stream of U.S. commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this provision was not protected against a point of order by the Committee on Rules due to jurisdictional concerns raised by my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means. I have received assurances, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has, too, however, that the Committee on Ways and Means will hold a hearing on this subject prior to final enactment of the treasury postal appropriations bill.

Based on these good-faith assurances and a commitment by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), I did not offer a motion to the rule last night to waive points of order against the Wolf provision. I appreciate my colleagues' cooperation in holding a hearing, and I urge them to schedule it without delay.

This is important because rebel groups, particularly those in Sierra Leone, are killing and maiming their own people in a battle to control the diamond mines, and these groups are becoming rich overnight by trading illegally seized diamonds for arms and then brutalizing their people. In Sierra Leone, these rebels transformed themselves from a ragtag group of people of 400 to a force of 25,000 soldiers that has made hundreds of millions of dollars from these diamonds, and they have killed more than 70,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Sierra Leone last year where I personally witnessed the atrocities committed by rebels. I met with victims who had their arms and hands cut off because they supported democracy; children who were drugged and forced to kill their parents and others; girls who were routinely raped. Atrocities like these are funded through illegal diamond smuggling, and by allowing the importation of these conflict diamonds from Sierra Leone and other countries who are involved in diamond smuggling, we are turning a blind eye to a situation most law-abiding citizens would abhor.

American consumers buy diamonds as tokens of love and commitment and not as parties to atrocities. Last year my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I introduced legislation to require the disclosure of a diamond's country of origin. The measure was intended to provide American consumers, who buy 70 percent of all the diamonds in the world, the information they need and want in order to buy legitimate diamonds.

Two weeks ago the United States voted for a U.N. resolution calling for an embargo on conflict diamonds from Sierra Leone and the language in the bill before us today implements that policy by barring these black market diamonds from entering our country. It is a bold step, of course, and one that I support.

Again, I would emphasize the importance of congressional hearings on conflict diamonds by the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow jurisdictional issues in the House to supersede the fact that innocent people are losing their lives in Sierra Leone and other African countries.

Mr. Speaker, the rule was approved by voice vote in the Committee on Rules last night.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER).

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the rule on the Treasury Postal appropriations bill because it does not make in order an amendment to disallow the cost of living adjustment for Members of Congress. It is my intention to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question on this rule so that we will have an opportunity to amend the rule and make this amendment in order.

The pay raise, I believe, is inappropriate at this time and unnecessary. A 2.7 percent pay increase would increase the salaries of Members by almost $4,000. The total price tag to American taxpayers is $2.1 million.

Now where I come from, the average salary for a family in my district is about $25,000, and this $2.1 million in the pay increase that would occur here is a lot of money to the folks back in Kentucky.

Now we have come a long way in Washington over the last few years, balancing the budget, preserving Social Security and Medicare and reducing the debt; and yet I believe there is still a lot more that can be done.

With a balanced budget and surpluses as far as the eye can see, I believe we must focus on strengthening America, paying down the debt, and giving more money back to the American worker.

I've worked closely with the folks in the 6th District to accomplish a great deal these past two short years. That's because I came to Washington to fight for their needs, concerns, and issues, not for another pay raise.

I find it very disturbing when we just had a vote on eliminating the marriage penalty tax, when I see 155 Democrat

Members who voted against giving families, married couples, a $1,400 average tax reduction a year and yet those same individuals will probably vote to increase the COLA and give themselves a $4,000-a-year increase in pay. I find that very disturbing.

That is the reason I am rising, Mr. Speaker, to oppose the previous question; would ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question, and I want them to understand that a vote against the previous question is a vote to rescind the COLA and to allow an amendment to be in order.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

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

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Members' annual cost of living allowance, not to oppose it but to talk about the procedure we are using to consider it.

During my time in Congress, we have addressed this issue several times. In 1997, I opposed the increase because the Federal budget was in deficit, and we were proposing massive cuts to programs that everyday people rely upon. I was also concerned about the process the House employed in considering the COLA. I was unhappy that there was little public debate on the issue and only a procedural rather than a straight yes or no vote.

In 1999, the procedure was the same. Again, I was uncomfortable; and as I did with the 1996 COLA, I did not accept the increase and returned the net amount to the Treasury.

Now, many Members argue that COLA is not a raise per se and that the statute automatically authorizes implementation without requirement of debate or vote. Several point out that COLAs for other workers operate in just this fashion. This is true. It is absolutely correct. However, we are not like other workers. One hundred percent of our costs, both for employment and office expenses, are borne by the taxpayers. We also set our own salaries, and we have no direct employer or supervisor, except the public in the collective.

Few workers in this country enjoy such circumstances. We have the luxury through our own action, or in this case inaction, to alter the amount of money we earn. Given that, I believe a substantive vote on the COLA is the appropriate way to handle the annual increases. Nevertheless, it does not appear that my views are likely to prevail on this issue, although I will continue to promote a direct vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the COLA itself. I believe that Members can justify a 2.7 percent increase in their wages, but I also believe that the taxpayers who pay our salaries have a right to ask for that justification. In order to do so, however, they must be able to understand the House's action relative to its compensation.

I am not here to criticize or demean the hard work of the good people with whom I serve in this body. Nor do I wish to disparage the views of those who disagree with me. I have a personal sense of propriety that we should be doing this publicly. I am making it clear to my constituents that we are indeed voting to raise our salary.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with others to protest the process that we are using here with regard to the issue of the pay raise, so I intend to vote no on the previous question. I also intend to vote no on the rule.

I oppose the rule because it is in the process of making the rule that we were denied the opportunity of whether or not we would be able to vote on this pay raise or not. Those who are opposed to the pay raise would probably then want to vote no on the previous question, which I intend to do as well. This really is not a debate about whether we should get a pay raise or not. In fact, I think one could make a case for why we ought to have a pay raise.

This has been a very, very productive Congress, particularly this year. We have balanced the budget I think the third year in a row. We have reformed welfare. We have extended the life of Social Security and Medicare. We passed a prescription drug benefit, several tax reduction bills. We passed the appropriation bills in record time and the budget as well, but the real issue here is whether or not we ought to vote every year on whether we get this pay raise or we do not.

I think the point here is that there are very few Americans who get an automatic pay raise, and there are even fewer Americans who get to decide whether or not their pay is going to go up or it is going to go down. The rule did not make in order an opportunity for us to vote on this.

Now, when I was an employee, I never went to my employer and said, I did not do a good job but I want a pay raise. No, I went to them and said, I think I have been doing a good job. I think I have earned it, and I think I deserve a pay raise.

I never, as an employer, had an employee come to me and say, I want a pay raise but I do not think I earned it. If they did, I do not think I would have granted them a pay raise.

No, we have an obligation to convince the person who controls our pay that we deserve it, and we ought to do that with our constituents. We ought to go back to our constituents and say, look, I think I have earned a pay raise, and justify it to the people who hired us, the people who elect us to be here. So I think it is wrong for us to avoid the opportunity to vote on whether or not we ought to have a pay raise or not, and so I intend to vote against the previous question.

I also intend to vote against the rule.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to urge Members to support both the previous question and the rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 173, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Foley
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Ganske
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy
King (NY)
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lowey
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal

Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rodriguez
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stenholm
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—173

Aderholt
Allen
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Buyer
Capps
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeMint
Deutsch
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Evans
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Goode
Gordon
Green (WI)
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Inslee
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Lazio
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
Metcalf
Mica
Minge
Moore
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Northup
Ose
Pascrell
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wu

NOT VOTING—12

Baca
Barton
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Cooksey
Ehrlich
Kilpatrick
Mollohan
Roemer
Smith (WA)
Vento

□ 1420

Mrs. NORTHUP, Ms. DANNER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Messrs. DEUTSCH, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, BAKER, KINGSTON, SHERMAN, THUNE, DEAL of Georgia, and HORN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Messrs. FARR of California, CAMP, CONYERS, and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 419, I was away from the floor and neither the bell system nor my beeper notified me of the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 141, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—282

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Foley
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy
King (NY)
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—141

Aderholt
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bono
Boswell
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Capps
Carson
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Cook
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutsch
Duncan
Edwards
English
Evans
Everett
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (TX)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Largent
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
McGovern
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Metcalf
Minge
Moore
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Petri
Phelps
Pomeroy
Ramstad
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Slaughter
Snyder
Stabenow
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wu

NOT VOTING—11

Baca
Barton
Campbell
Clay
Cooksey
Ehrlich
Kilpatrick
Roemer
Smith (WA)
Vento
Woolsey

□ 1439

Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. BROWN of Ohio changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. DELAURO changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 420, I was away from the floor and neither the bell system nor my beeper notified me of the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONGRATULATIONS TO TIM AND SALLY ROEMER ON THE BIRTH OF GRACE ELIZABETH

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise just to announce to my colleagues that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), our good friend, and his wife, Sally, had a baby this morning, a little girl.

I think it is important, when we have spent some time talking about marriage today, that we talk about a product of a very great marriage, and that is TIM and Sally ROEMER, who, this morning, at 3:30, had their fourth child, a girl, Grace Elizabeth, who is 7 pounds 11 ounces. I just want to announce this to my colleagues, and we all join them in wishing them the best.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on consideration of H.R. 4871 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 560 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4871.

□ 1440

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4871) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased today to present H.R. 4871, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001. As reported to the floor, this bill contains $14.4 billion in discretionary budget authority for the Department of Treasury, the Executive Office of the President, the Postal Service, and other independent agencies. This represents an increase of $678 million above the current year levels. That is about 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in a few moments, I suspect we will hear from some of our colleagues that this bill fails to meet its critical responsibilities for agencies under this subcommittee's jurisdiction. I do not disagree with that. I disagree, however, that we are not meeting our priorities, because we do meet the priorities in this bill.

We do not fund everything, but we meet the priorities. Do we fund everything that was requested by the President? No. But being below the President's request by $2.1 billion does not make this bill or this subcommittee irresponsible. It means we have somewhat different priorities.

Do we provide $225 million to hire an additional 2,835 IRS employees? No. Do we fund seven new courthouses for a cost of $488 million? No, we do not.

The bottom line is this, in putting together this bill, choices had to be made.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have called this bill half empty. I, on the other hand, believe the bill presented here today is more than half full.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today provides $4.9 billion for Federal law enforcement, and that supports 30 percent of all Federal law enforcement. This includes funds for the U.S. Customs Service to protect our borders from drugs and other contraband as well as to protect our burgeoning trade; funds for the Secret Service to protect, not only our Nation's dignitaries, but also our currency and our children through their school violence program; and funds for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to enforce our gun laws.

As my colleagues are aware, one of the greatest challenges with this bill is keeping it free of controversial legislative riders. We seem to have a great talent for attracting controversy for a whole host of reasons.

It is unfortunate that so much time gets spent debating not appropriations matters on this bill. From my perspective, it is even more unfortunate the passage of this measure has nothing to do with the programs and activities that are funded here but rather with legislative items that either are attached or perhaps not attached.

□ 1445

And what gets lost in the debate is the good things that are accomplished by this bill.

For those who may in the end decide to vote against this measure, let me tell them what they are opposing. They would be opposed to $185 million for ONDCP, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, for that youth media campaign that keeps kids off drugs and helps parents learn how to teach children just to say no.

They would be opposed to $30 million for Drug Free Community Grants, partnerships between community coalitions and the Federal Government for the purpose of reducing drug use.

They would be opposed to $192 million for High Intensity Drug Trafficking Programs, providing assistance to State and local law enforcement in areas most adversely affected by drug trafficking.

They would be opposed to $13 million to keep children out of gangs through the GREAT program that is administered through the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

They would be opposed to $76 million for the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative, called YCGII, to take guns out of the hands of our Nation's youth.

They would be opposed to $3.6 million for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, reuniting children with their families and supporting the child exploitation unit.

They would be opposed to $1.7 million for a new program for the Secret Service's National Threat Assessment Center, a project designed to prevent targeted violence from occurring in schools by helping schoolteachers and administrators identify problems in advance.

And, yes, $4 million for the Customs Cybersmuggling Center to target international child pornography trafficking and child exploitation via the Internet.

The list I have just shared with my colleagues is a small sampling of what is included in this bill. I could continue. I could tell my colleagues about the $233 million that is in here for Customs Automation, including $105 million for the much-awaited and even more needed Customs information technology modernization program that is known as ACE, and I know that many of my colleagues have a strong interest in this program.

I could also stand here and inform Members about the reporting requirements that we have included regarding the First Lady's use of government aircraft for the Senate campaign, and funding for the National Archives to