

Coyne	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Phelps
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Pickett
Davis (FL)	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Davis (IL)	Klecza	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kucinich	Rahall
DeGette	LaFalce	Rangel
Delahunt	Lampson	Reyes
DeLauro	Lantos	Rivers
Deutsch	Larson	Rodriguez
Dicks	Lee	Roemer
Dingell	Levin	Rothman
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lipinski	Rush
Dooley	Lofgren	Sabo
Doyle	Lowe	Sanchez
Edwards	Lucas (KY)	Sanders
Eshoo	Luther	Sandlin
Etheridge	Maloney (CT)	Sawyer
Evans	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Farr	Markey	Scott
Fattah	Mascara	Serrano
Filner	Matsui	Sherman
Forbes	McCarthy (MO)	Shows
Ford	McCarthy (NY)	Sisisky
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Skelton
Frost	McGovern	Slaughter
Gejdenson	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gephardt	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Gonzalez	McKinney	Snyder
Gordon	McNulty	Stabenow
Green (TX)	Meehan	Stark
Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Stenholm
Hall (OH)	Meeks (NY)	Strickland
Hall (TX)	Menendez	Tanner
Hastings (FL)	Millender-	Tauscher
Hill (IN)	McDonald	Taylor (MS)
Hilliard	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Hinche	Minge	Thurman
Hinojosa	Mink	Tierney
Hoeffel	Moakley	Towns
Holden	Mollohan	Turner
Holt	Moore	Udall (CO)
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Udall (NM)
Hoyer	Murtha	Velazquez
Inlee	Nadler	Visclosky
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Waters
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Watt (NC)
(TX)	Obey	Weiner
Jefferson	Olver	Wexler
John	Ortiz	Weygand
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Woolsey
Jones (OH)	Pascarell	Wu
Kanjorski	Pastor	Wynn
Kaptur	Payne	
Kennedy	Pelosi	

## NOT VOTING—26

Blagojevich	Klink	Packard
Brady (PA)	LaTourette	Peterson (PA)
Campbell	Lazio	Spratt
Chenoweth-Hage	Lewis (CA)	Stupak
Crowley	McCollum	Talent
Danner	McIntosh	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Metcalf	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	Neal	Weldon (PA)
Hoekstra	Owens	

□ 1309

Mr. HORN changed his 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.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5178. An act to require changes in the bloodborne pathogens standard in effect under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2498. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in Federal buildings in order to improve survival rates of individuals who experience cardiac arrest in such buildings, and to establish protections from civil liability arising from the emergency use of the devices.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2335

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2335.

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

There was no objection.

## WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4942, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 653 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 653

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4942) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

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 Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 653 is a typical rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4942, the conference report for the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration, and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

The House rules provide 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority members of the House.

I want to briefly discuss the conference report that this rule makes in

order. The conference report appropriates \$445 million for the District of Columbia, and it appropriates \$37.5 billion for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Federal Judiciary, and 18 related agencies.

□ 1315

For the District of Columbia, the bill provides \$17 million for the college assistance, \$5 million to help move children from foster care to adoptive families, \$1 million for pediatric health clinics, and provides for the largest ever drug testing and treatment program. These appropriations go directly to improving the lives of the District's residents.

The bill provides a \$384 million increase for the DEA, the FBI, and the U.S. Attorneys to ensure that our Federal law enforcers have the tools that they need in the 21st century. The bill provides an additional \$548 million for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to ensure the safety of our borders and the efficiency of our immigration process.

For local and State law enforcement, the bill appropriates \$4.7 billion, a total that includes dollars for law enforcement block grants and funding for Violence Against Women Act programs.

Equally important for the safety of our people, the bill provides the State Department with \$6.9 billion. This total, more than the President requested, will ensure worldwide security improvements at our embassies to ensure the safety of U.S. personnel. The bill also provides full funding for our current year United Nations assessments.

I might add, it is the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the subcommittee, whose own interest in worldwide safety of our embassies has held sway in all of these debates and provided the funding for these embassies.

Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that I have heard that the President intends to veto this bill, he intends to stop this money for local law enforcement, money for Federal law enforcement, money for the residents of the District of Columbia, money for the safety of our embassies, and money for the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues know why he has threatened to veto this bill? Because it does not contain language to provide mass amnesty for those who have flouted U.S. law and come to this country illegally. Such language was not included in the House-passed bill. Such language was not included in any Senate version. Yet, the President today seems to be insisting that it is his way or the highway.

He seems to be saying today that he wants to provide amnesty to law breakers rather than provide funding to law enforcers. Rather than provide the funding to those who protect our borders, he wants to provide amnesty

to those who have illegally crossed them.

See, Mr. Speaker, the President is insisting on a rider on the appropriations bill, precisely the same kind of legislative rider that caused him to veto, 5 years ago, a continuing resolution and shut the government down. But if it is his rider, it is a good rider. If it is our rider, it is a bad rider.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have misunderstood the President's intentions. For all we have heard from the White House about finishing appropriations bills in a timely fashion, I simply cannot believe that he would delay funding increases for the District of Columbia, the Justice Department, the State Department, the Commerce Department and more.

I oppose the amnesty that the President seeks. But even if I supported it, I would know that it does not now nor has it ever belonged in an appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules. I urge my colleagues to support the previous question and the rule so that we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this important conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the fact that this resolution is being considered this morning, or this afternoon now, is proof positive the Republican majority has no plans to adjourn the 106th Congress any time this week, this weekend, or perhaps even next week.

This rule provides for the consideration of an appropriations conference report which has little chance of being signed by the President of the United States and, if vetoed, most likely will not be able to muster the votes to override that veto.

Mr. Speaker, it is a mystery to me why my Republican colleagues persist in prolonging this session of Congress, but prolonging it they are, and quite unnecessarily.

Mr. Speaker, the Commerce, Justice, State conference language has been attached to the conference language on the District of Columbia. It is bad enough the D.C. appropriations bill has been saddled with the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations, but what is in the Commerce, Justice, State conference language is especially egregious.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority had an opportunity to bring fairness to immigrant families and individuals who have made the United States their home but who have been living here in legal limbo for many years. Earlier this morning, my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Rules said this language makes significant progress in reforming immigration law inequities; but, frankly Mr. Speaker, it is not fair, and it does not go far enough.

Democrats in the House and the Senate, as well as the President, handed our Republican counterparts a golden opportunity to fix a problem affecting thousands of Latino families, but the Republicans have fumbled the ball.

Mr. Speaker, the immigration language in this bill is a pieced together proposal which sounds good, but will do little to help families. It perpetuates the current patchwork of contradictory and discriminatory immigration policies enacted by the Republican Congress and leaves countless immigrants in legal limbo.

This conference report does nothing to resolve injustices that affect the vast majority of Latino immigrants now in this country. Mr. Speaker, this conference report ignores the need to stabilize the immigrant status of people who have lived, worked, and paid taxes in the United States for years. This proposal is inadequate and unjust and needs to be sent back to conference rather than to the White House.

Mr. Speaker, the President has called for these injustices to be rectified and Democrats in the House and the Senate have joined together in support of the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act which would truly help to reunite immigrants who are already guaranteed permanent residency status with their families.

Democrats want to correct the inequity and legislation passed in 1997 which helped some Central American war refugees while excluding others and which specifically excluded immigrants from Haiti. The Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act corrects a mean-spirited law passed by the Republican Congress which vacated Federal lawsuits on behalf of those immigrants who were wrongfully denied legalization in the 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans had a chance to fix these injustices by including the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, but they took a pass. The Republican leadership has chosen to include an immigration proposal in this conference report which, again, picks winners and losers among immigrants.

I am particularly concerned that the so-called Hatch proposal does not fix a specific problem in the 1996 immigration bill which has affected a number of legal permanent residents who find themselves subject to deportation because they pled guilty to offenses which are not deportable offenses prior to the 1996 law.

Yet, in spite of the fact that they have paid their debt for these infractions, they have become subject to deportation. The House passed legislation correcting this problem by voice vote, yet this sensible and significant reform of the 1996 law, which would keep many families together, has not been included in this Republican bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a question of fairness and justice for Latino and other immigrant families around the

country. The Republican majority has passed up an easy chance to right a wrong. The President will be exactly right to veto this conference agreement. I can only hope whenever we see the next version of this conference report, the Republican majority will include the language of the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act which will keep families together and bring about real reform of the misguided legislation passed by earlier Republican Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other problems with this conference, and I will not take a lot of time to go into them. But there is another particularly troubling provision in the conference agreement which relates to the expansion of cable and satellite television service in rural areas.

It is my understanding that, as late as yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) have been negotiating an agreement on the language to ensure that loan guarantees for rural television were used to enhance new competition and services including satellites, wireless, and cable in rural areas, and not just to stabilize existing cable companies. Yet, when the Committee on Rules met this morning, a completely different version of the rural cable language was included in the bill.

The Democratic Members who have been working with their Republican counterparts had thought they were negotiating on a proposal which would bring competition to underserved areas around the country. What is in the bill seems to be quite different from what they had been led to believe would be included. I am sure they, along with other Members from rural areas, might have legitimate concerns about this provision.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report also contains provisions in the District of Columbia appropriations that, again, as a Republican majority has done in the past 6 years, infringe on the rights of the citizens who live here, to make decisions about how their own government is run.

The provisions in the conference agreement are significant improvements on the House-passed appropriation. It is my understanding that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) supports this language. However, Mr. Speaker, the residents of the District are, again, being held hostage by virtue of the fact that a bill that is nothing more than veto bait has been attached to it.

It is high time the taxpayers and American citizens who live in this city be treated with more respect by the Republican majority and that a clean D.C. appropriations bill be sent to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this conference report because the Republican majority has, again, failed to address the real needs of real people. It is well past time for this Congress to have finished its business. I can only hope that the President will veto this conference report quickly, that the Republican majority will substitute real immigration reform for the meaningless provisions now in this report, and that we can end this Congress knowing we have done something fair and just.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there are two issues I would like to address. One, this legislation has language in it which I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and also Senator JUDD GREGG dealing with conflict diamonds which are resulting in men and women in Sierra Leone having their arms cut off.

When one is out buying diamonds this Christmas, if one gets a good price and one does not know where the diamonds are coming from, one is probably buying diamonds from Sierra Leone and supporting people having their arms and legs cut off.

The other issue, Mr. Speaker, in addition, this conference report contains a provision that deeply troubles me. I want Members of this body to be aware that section 629 of the conference report would legalize interstate pari-mutuel gambling over the Internet. Under the current interpretation of the Interstate Horse Racing Act in 1978, this type of gambling is illegal, although the Justice Department has not taken steps to enforce it. This provision would codify legality of placing wagers over the telephone or other electronic media like the Internet.

We have been trying, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and others have been trying for months and months to pass two bipartisan pieces of legislation on gambling, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act and the Student Athletic Protection Act which would close the Las Vegas loophole on the current ban of gambling on college and high school athletes.

Both had overwhelming support. Both had several hearings on them. Both were the result of hard work. Yet, at the end of Congress, both bills die, and we bring this up to expand, to expand gambling at a time when men and women are becoming addicted to this process.

So, Mr. Speaker, as Members vote, they have to understand both of these provisions are in this bill.

I compliment the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and Senator JUDD GREGG.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following "News Stories From Around the Nation About the Negative Impact of Gambling" for the RECORD, as follows: NEWS STORIES FROM AROUND THE NATION ABOUT THE NEGATIVE IMPACT OF GAMBLING

EXAMPLES OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF GAMBLING, THE PEOPLE IT AFFECTS, AND THE REPERCUSSIONS OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF GAMBLING

#### GAMBLING CAN LEAD TO DEATH

"A gambler losing big dollars in the high-roller area of the MotorCity Casino in Detroit pulled out a gun Wednesday, shot himself in the head and died, police said. Terrified gamblers fled from the blackjack table where off-duty Oak Park Police Sgt. Solomon Bell had been consistently losing large bets, witnesses said. . . . Detroit police said Bell had been gambling earlier in the day at MGM Grand Detroit Casino and was hoping to make up for some losses there. They said he lost between \$15,000 and \$20,000 in the two casinos during the day." (Detroit Free Press, 1/27/00)

"A former employee at Trump Marina Hotel and Casino [Atlantic City] leaped to his death from the gambling hall's self-parking garage early Friday. . . . [Charles] LaVerde's death marks the fifth suicide plunge from a casino facility in less than a year." (Atlantic City Press, 5/27/00)

"A German tourist jumped to his death off a 10-story casino-parking garage Wednesday in the third such suicide in Atlantic City in eight days." On Aug. 17, a gambler who had lost \$87,000 jumped to his death off a Trump Plaza roof. On Monday, a dealer at Caesar's Atlantic City Hotel Casino committed suicide by leaping off the casino's parking garage. "It wasn't clear if the most recent victim had been gambling. He left no suicide note." (Associated Press, 8/25/99)

A Hancock County (Miss.) woman says she killed her mother and husband last year as part of a suicide pact made in despair over large gambling debts the trio had run up at Gulf Coast casinos. "Julie Winborn pleaded guilty in the death of her husband, Grady Winborn, 57, and her mother, Inez Bouis, 66. She was sentenced Thursday to two life sentences. She had testified that the three lost \$50,000 at casinos and decided to end their lives because they could not repay bank and credit union loans." (Associated Press, 9/10/00)

"A Florida man who lost \$50,000 while gambling [in Atlantic City] during the past two days died Tuesday after he jumped seven floors from a Trump Plaza Hotel and Casino roof onto Columbia Place, officials said." (Atlantic City Press, 8/18/99)

"[South Carolina 6th Circuit Solicitor John Justice said] that a man in Columbia was convicted of murder [August 30]. The fast-food restaurant employee had killed his manager at the end of the night shift. In the hours after the murder, the man had visited three video poker machines. 'When the police retrieved the \$5, \$10 and \$20 bills from the machine, the young lady's blood was still on the money,' he said." (The Herald [Rock Hill, S.C.], 9/1/99)

[York County (S.C.) Sheriff Bruce Bryant] said many [gamblers] "have the same dream: finding the six magical numbers that unlock the treasure known as the Texas Lottery. . . . Billie Bob Harrell Jr. shared those common visions of the salvation of sudden fortune. And in June 1997, he found it. . . . He and wife Barbara Jean held the only winning ticket to a Lotto Texas jackpot of \$31 million. . . . And on May 22, 1999, Harrell locked himself inside an upstairs bedroom in his fashionable Kingwood home . . . investiga-

tors say he stripped away his clothes, pressed a shotgun barrel against his chest, and fired. . . . "Shortly before his death, Harrell confided to a financial advisor, 'Winning the lottery is the worst thing that ever happened to me.'" (Dallas Observer, 2/10/00) brought on by video poker are not recorded in police reports. 'Arguing over video poker is the reason for many domestic abuse cases,' Bryant said. 'We've had murders in York County because of video poker.'" (The State [Columbia, S.C.], 7/23/99)

After a night of drinking at a Kenner (La.) casino Saturday night, a Ponchatoula man apparently short himself to death in his car outside the gambling boat, police said." ([New Orleans] Times-Picayune, 11/8/99)

#### GAMBLING CAN LEAD TO CRIME

"An insidious new kind of crime is taking hold, radiating out across southern New England from the two Indian casinos in eastern Connecticut. It is embezzlement committed by desperate gamblers, usually compulsive gamblers, who work in positions of trust. . . .

"A sampling of criminal cases over the past two years shows that the amounts of money can be staggering and that an increasing number of the gamblers are women. In all these cases, the money was used to gamble at the Foxwoods Resort Casino or the Mohegan Sun casino, authorities said.

"In May 1998, Edward Hutner of Rocky Hill was sentenced to prison for embezzling \$1 million from his employer, a CIGNA subsidiary, by creating fictitious pension plan participants and moving the money through brokerage firms. A few days later, Norwalk investor adviser Richard Scarso was sent to prison for stealing \$1.4 million from 13 families.

"In the fall of the 1998, two Massachusetts men, Thomas Aldred and Neal J. Colley, were sentenced to prison and home confinement for the theft of nearly \$2 million from the company where Aldred worked by creating fictitious shipments of supplies. Last year, April Corlies was accused of embezzling more than \$300,000 from the Cross Sound Ferry Co. in New London by manipulating records of ticket sales. She is awaiting trial.

"Early this year, Lynne M. Frank, who handled bar receipts at The Bushnell, was charged with embezzling \$91,000. A few weeks ago, James Coughlin of Waterford avoided prison in his home improvement scam by agreeing to partially repay victims, who lost more than \$200,000. . . .

"This week state police are working on an investigation expected to lead to the arrest of Yvonne Bell, who was Ledyard's tax collector until she resigned in June after money was discovered missing. An audit completed recently put the figure at more than \$300,000. Two years ago former Sprague Tax Collector Mary L. Thomas repaid \$105,000 she had stolen from her town and was sentenced to probation." (Hartford Courant, 8/23/00)

"Of all the heroes who emerged from the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics, perhaps none was more inspirational than Henry Tillman. A big, tough hometown kid, he had plunged into serious trouble when he was rescued in a California Youth Authority lockup by a boxing coach who saw a young man of uncommon heart and untapped talent. In a little more than two years, he would stand proudly atop the Olympic platform at the Sports Arena, just blocks from his boyhood home, the gold medal for heavyweight boxing dangling from his neck.

"But two years after his mediocre pro career ended, he was back behind bars. And now he stands accused of murder in a case that could put him away for life. . . .

"[G]ambling got Tillman into trouble. He was arrested in January 1994 for passing a

bad credit card at the Normandie. He pleaded no contest and got probation. In 1995, he pleaded guilty to using a fake credit card in an attempt to get \$800 at the Hollywood Park Casino in Inglewood. . . .

"I have suffered from a long history of gambling addiction, which I am very ashamed had taken over my life," Tillman wrote in a letter to the court." (Los Angeles Times, 1/26/00)

"A 56-year-old (Southern California) compulsive gambler pleaded guilty Tuesday to several bank robberies and the attempted murder of a police officer . . . (Terry Drake Ball has been battling a severe gambling addiction since at least 1971, when he received the first of his four state and federal robbery convictions, [his attorney] said. His struggle was highlighted in the past year when he won \$250,000 from a casino bet on horse races . . . and lost the entire amount within three weeks, [his attorney] said." (Los Angeles Daily News, 10/27/99)

"A former casino consultant fought back tears as he told a federal jury Thursday that he funneled hundreds of thousands of dollars in payoffs to former [Louisiana] Gov. Edwin Edwards and his son Stephen—before and after Edwards left office in 1996. Ricky Shetler's testimony was backed by Shetler's own ledgers and conversations secretly recorded by the FBI. "It was the most damaging to date in the six-week-old trial, and, perhaps, in the 40-year public life of the often scandal-plagued four-term governor who was acquitted of federal racketeering charges in 1986. Federal prosecutors say Edwin and Stephen Edwards and five other men took part in a years-long series of schemes to manipulate the licensing of riverboat casinos." (Associated Press, 2/24/00)

"The former president of the Decatur (Alabama) Board of Education will serve at least three years in prison for stealing more than \$50,000 from the Austin High School Band Boosters. William Randall Holmes, 42, was sentenced after a hearing Thursday which included testimony that Holmes used a band boosters credit card at casinos in Mississippi." (Associated Press, 6/2/00)

"A Rhode Island woman known as the 'church lady' is free on bail after pleading innocent to stealing \$3,000 from four severely mentally retarded adults at a Mansfield (Mass.) group home to play slot machines at Foxwoods Casino. . . . An organizer at St. Theresa's Church in Nasonville, R.I., [Denise] Manderville worked as a caretaker for the four adults." (Boston Herald, 3/9/00)

"On Friday, the 24-year-old former bank manager [Lonnie Lewis, Jackson, Tenn.] pleaded guilty to embezzling about \$1 million from the bank where he worked, then using the money to support a lavish lifestyle . . . Court records indicate Lewis's wife, Rita, 41, also used some of the money to gamble at casinos in Tunica. A federal lawsuit filed by the bank last year said Rita Lewis was spending about \$6,500 a month at two Mississippi casinos." ([Memphis] Commercial Appeal, 2/26/00)

"Brian Dean Gray, a former Richmond (Va.) stockbroker, pleaded guilty yesterday in U.S. District Court to all three federal fraud charges against him for stealing more than \$850,000 from clients and gambling much of it away. . . . He used more than \$350,000 to gamble on horse racing, at New Jersey casinos and in card games." (Richmond Times Dispatch, 6/3/00)

"Stevan Datz, co-owner of the former United Surgical Center, in Warwick (R.I.), has been sentenced to five years' home confinement and five years' probation for embezzling money from his company. . . . "He took a total of \$149,859 from the company, said Jim Martin, spokesman for the attorney general's office. . . . Special Assistant Atty.

Gen. Danika Iacoi, who prosecuted the case, said Datz spent the money at Foxwoods casino, on travel and on other personal expenses." (Providence Journal-Bulletin, 10/29/99)

"Rodney Stout, 25, of Pine Bluff (Ark.) was sentenced Friday to 30 years in prison for abducting Stacey Polston of Jacksonville and her 18-month-old daughter at gunpoint and stealing Polston's van. . . . Stout was under financial pressure, he said. He had a 'gambling problem' that came to a head when he gambled away \$5,000 he had set aside for moving expenses." (Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, 5/9/00)

"By the time former Placerville (Calif.) police officer Jerry Olson was arrested for bank robbery last month, he had hit 'rock bottom,' his father said. Battling drug addiction and crushed under gambling debt, the 39-year-old already had lost his job. FBI agents say he may have robbed 10 banks in Northern California and Nevada." (Associated Press, 3/8/00)

"A former Monrovia (Calif.) cop who stole \$124,000 from that city's police officers association was sentenced today to 16 months in prison and ordered to repay the money, and to pay state taxes of \$11,300. . . . The former La Verne resident embezzled the MPOA money from the association between December 1994 and December 1998 to pay off gambling debts." (City News Service, 6/23/00)

"Former University of Southern California baseball player Shon Malani was sentenced Wednesday to two years in federal prison for stealing nearly \$500,000 from the federal credit union where he worked. U.S. District Judge Helen Gillmor rejected a request for leniency made by Malani's attorney, who said he stole the money to pay off gambling debts totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars." (Associated Press, 3/1/00)

"A departing Florida A&M University journalism professor and former Tallahassee Democrat columnist has been charged with stealing nearly \$8,000 in checks from the school's student newspaper, where he was an adviser, police said. . . . "I've had a problem with gambling, mainly playing the lottery, and I'm seeking counseling for it," [said Keith Thomas]." (Associated Press, 7/27/00)

"An arraignment date for William O'Hara a former administrator of Bartron Clinic in Watertown (S.D.) charged with embezzling \$670,000 from his employer to cover funds for a gambling addiction, is expected to be set this week." (Watertown [S.D.] Public Opinion, 6/13/00)

"A San Francisco financial planner pleaded guilty yesterday to laundering more than \$6 million of his clients' money in a scheme to pay off gambling debts and other personal expenses, according to the U.S. attorney's office." (San Francisco Chronicle, 6/29/00)

"A 19-year veteran of the (Massachusetts) state authority that helps low- and middle-income families buy houses is believed to have funneled as much \$130,000 from one of the agency's funds into his personal bank account to pay for gambling debts, officials said yesterday." (Boston Herald, 10/28/99)

#### GAMBLING CAN LEAD TO DEBT AND BANKRUPTCY

"One third of 120 compulsive gamblers participating in a pioneering treatment study have either filed for bankruptcy or are in the process of filing, a University of Connecticut researcher said Tuesday. . . . (Nancy) Petry said she recently gave a talk to a group of bankruptcy lawyers who estimated that as many as 20% of their clients had mentioned gambling as a reason for their problems." (Hartford Courant, 6/14/00)

"The Secret Service in investigating whether a prominent Louisville cancer doctor who went bankrupt after losing more than \$8 million gambling last year com-

mitted fraud when he borrowed millions from local banks, the doctor's lawyer says. . . ." (Stanley) Lowenbraun, an oncologist, is the former president of the Kentucky Oncology Society. . . . [I]n 1998 alone he lost \$8.2 million, bankruptcy records show. Most of that was lost playing craps at casinos in Atlantic City and Las Vegas, including \$2 million at Bally's casino, \$2 million at Caesar's Atlantic city, \$400,000 at the Hilton International Hotel and Casino, \$1.7 million at the Rio Hotel \$ Casino and \$1.42 million at the Trump Taj Mahal Casino, according to a list of debts Lowenbraun filed in bankruptcy court. The remainder was lost betting on the horses at Churchill Down and the Sports Spectrum." (Louisville Courier-Journal, 11/8/99)

"Will Torres Jr. spends part of his day listening to sad stories. As the director of the Terrebonne Parish (La.) District Attorney's Office's Bad Check Enforcement Program, Torres has heard some doozies. "I've seen people lose their homes, their retirements wiped out, their marriages. People losing everything they have," Torres said. Gambling, specifically video poker, is starting to catch up with drugs and alcohol as a precursor to local crime. . . . "Torres and the District Attorney's Office recently noticed an interesting trend while profiling bad-check writers: a large number of their suspects are video poker addicts. 'We're not talking about people who mistakenly write a check for groceries at Winn-Dixie for \$25.33,' Torres said. 'We're talking about people who are writing checks for \$25 or \$30 eight times a day at locations with video poker machines or places in close proximity of video poker machines.' "So far this year, Torres' office has collected \$320,000 for Terrebonne Parish merchants who were given 3,600 worthless checks. Torres said about 30% of those bad checks are connected to gambling. "It's eating people up," he said. "It's real sad when people don't have a dollar. No money for food because of gambling addictions. I've seen it up close, and video poker plays a large role in the problem.'" (The Courier [Houma, La.], 8/28/99)

#### GAMBLING CAN LEAD TO ADDICTION

"As many as 500,000 Michigan adults could be 'lifetime compulsive gamblers,' and the number could swell with two new Detroit casinos in operation and a third to open soon, says a new state report. The survey, released Wednesday, also found that well over half of those with gambling problems began young. 'When we asked compulsive gamblers "When did you start having a problem?" we were startled to learn that 77% of them said they were already compulsive by the time they were 18,' said Jim McBryde, special assistant for drug policy in the Michigan Department of Community Health." (Detroit News, 1/13/00)

"At Detroit's Gamblers Anonymous, a spokesman says the addiction-counseling service has seen a 200% rise in demand in this year's first three months over the same period in 1999. The number of calls to the state's toll-free compulsive gambling help line has risen almost monthly, from 1,817 last October to 5,276 in May." (Associated Press, 7/26/00)

"At Detroit's Gamblers Anonymous, a spokesman says the addiction-counseling service has seen a 200% rise in demand in this year's first three months over the same period in 1999. The number of calls to the state's toll-free compulsive gambling help line has risen almost monthly, from 1,817 last October to 5,276 in May." (Associated Press, 7/26/00)

"With the proliferation of gambling in recent years, social workers and other mental-health professionals have seen a disturbing increase in compulsive gambling, said

Salvatore Marzilli, president of the Rhode Island Council on Problem Gambling. . . .

"In 1990, Marzilli said, there was only one Gamblers Anonymous group meeting in Rhode Island each week. Today there are 10; each has at least 20 members." (Providence Journal, 4/28/00)

#### GAMBLING CAN LEAN TO PROSTITUTION

"Escort services (in Detroit) are flourishing. Agencies with names such as Queen of Hearts and Casino Babes whisper their \$100-an-hour promotions from classified ad columns and from home pages on the Internet. Two months before casinos came to town, the Wayne County Sheriff's Department began monitoring local exotic escort service Web sites; at the time, there were seven. By the end of September, two months after MGM's grand opening, that number had grown to 42." (Detroit News, 2/7/00)

"A growing federal probe accuses eight-year East Palo Alto (Calif.) Councilman R.B. Jones of treating his elected office like his personal cash cow. . . .

"Court documents hint that Jones' passion for gambling has compounded his legal problems. In 1997, a self-described former mistress gave sworn testimony that she moonlighted as a prostitute at Nevada brothels from 1983 through 1991 'when Mr. Jones needed money for his gambling.'" (San Francisco Chronicle, 7/31/00)

#### GAMBLING AFFECTS CHILDREN

"A 4-year-old girl remained in protective custody (in Fort Mill, S.C.) after her mother was charged with leaving her in a locked car while she played video poker." Tuesday in Ridgeland, a woman whose 10-day-old baby died in a sweltering car while she played video poker was given a suspended sentence and five years' probation." "York County (S.C.) Sheriff Bruce Bryant said such incidents reflect the addictive nature of video poker. 'You see the same thing with people addicted to cocaine and heroin. They lose all rational thought and will do anything to support her habit, sell the furniture right out of their house, leave their babies in locked cars during the middle of summer.'" (The State [Columbia, SC], 7/23/99)

"Children have been left unattended at Indiana's riverboat casino more than three dozen times while their parents or other guardians were gambling during the past 14 months. A Courier-Journal review of Indiana Gaming Commission records found 37 instances involving an estimated 72 abandoned children since May 1999, when the state first began compiling reports of such episodes.

"In one case, an infant had to be revived with oxygen." (Louisville Courier-Journal, 7/8/00)

"A woman was arrested [in Shreveport, La.] on two felony counts of cruelty to a juvenile after she allegedly left two children in a car with the windows rolled up while she played video poker. . . . The girls in (Candice) Bradley's custody—ages 5 and 2—were in the woman's car, which was parked in the sun and its windows were shut, [a police spokesman] said. The National Weather Service reported the temperature at that time to be 89 degrees." (Associated Press, 7/26/00)

"A Rhode Island woman was arrested Saturday after police discovered that she left four children unattended for 14 hours at Foxwoods Resort & Casino." (The Day [New London, Conn.], 7/16/00)

"A Westville (Indiana) woman arrested last year for leaving her infant daughter in a car to gamble is being prosecuted again, accused of leaving her children home alone so she could play the odds. . . . [Friends] found the children, aged 15 months and 4 weeks, alone inside the residence." (South Bend [Ind.] Tribune, 7/21/00).

"A 31-year-old Virginia woman has been arrested on neglect charges for leaving six young children unattended in a sweltering vehicle while she and her mother played the slot machines at the Caesars riverboat casino." (Louisville Courier-Journal, 7/12/00).

#### GAMBLING AFFECTS FAMILIES

"There is an ugly undercurrent that's sweeping away thousands of Missourians—people whose addiction to gambling has led to debt, divorce and crime. This is a world of people like Vicky, 36, a St. Charles woman who regularly left her newborn son with baby sitters to go to the casinos and who considered suicide after losing \$100,000. 'And Kathy, a homemaker and mother of two from Brentwood, who would drop her kids at school and spend the entire day at a casino playing blackjack. She used a secret credit card that her husband didn't know about to rack up more than \$30,000 in debt. . . ." (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 2/6/00)

"The battle against domestic violence is gaining ground, and work by University of Nebraska Medical Center researcher Dr. Robert Muelleman is helping. . . . Muelleman worked on a . . . study at the UNMC hospital this summer. The study has not been published yet, so the results are not entirely concluded, he said, but some preliminary inferences can be drawn. 'It looks as if problem gambling in the partner is going to be as much a risk factor as problem alcohol, and that's really new information,' he said." (Daily Nebraskan, 1/13/00)

#### GAMBLING AFFECTS THE UNDERAGE

A study released Tuesday suggests young people age 18 to 20 apparently have little problem playing video poker or buying lottery tickets [in Louisiana]—even though they are legally too young to do so. . . . The study is based on a series of stings conducted by Louisiana State Police early last year with the help of underage informants. . . . Under the direction of State Police, underage informants visited 501 lottery retailers in early 1999. They were successful buying lottery tickets 64% of the time. The underage informants also made 501 attempts to play video poker and were successful 59% of the time." ([Baton Rouge, La.] Advocate, 5/10/00)

#### GAMBLING AFFECTS SENIORS

"[A survey] conducted by a [Las Vegas] problem gambling center and UNLV professor Fred Preston, found that nearly 60% of Clark County residents older than 55 gamble, while 30% do so at least once a week. . . .

"Just under 3% of seniors had problems with gambling at some point in their lives, while another 2.4% had signs of pathological gambling in the past. . . . The UNLV researchers also found that 20% of those seniors who gambled said they knew at least one person with a gambling problem." (Las Vegas Sun, 7/31/00)

#### GAMBLING AFFECTS COLLEGE STUDENTS

"As allies of the National Collegiate Athletic Association push legislation that would ban wagering on college sports, a new study found that one out of every four male student-athletes may be engaging in illegal sports betting—and that one in 20 places bets directly through illegal bookies. And though prevalent among student-athletes, the study found that sports wagering activity is higher among ordinary students—39% among male nonstudent athletes. . . .

"The study surveyed 648 student-athletes and 1,035 students, both male and female, at three midwestern universities. . . . The study also found that 12% of male student-athletes—roughly the same portion as non-athletes—showed signs of problem gambling. About 5% of the overall athlete sample demonstrated signs of pathological gambling disorders." (Las Vegas Sun, 7/6/00)

#### CASINOS

"Tethered to his post by a curly plastic cord that stretched from his belt loop to a frequent-player card inserted in a Black Widow slot machine, James Lint pondered. What happens to the little guy when casinos come to town?

"I see a lot of people leave with tears in their eyes,' said the Georgia businessman, taking a short break from the machine in Biloxi's Beau Rivage casino. 'They come here too much, and they spend too much money.'

"Lint, who flies his private plane to Biloxi three times a year to kick back at the casinos, doesn't count himself among the ranks of those who gamble away what they cannot afford. But some people do lose their grocery money to slot machines, and no one—not casino operators, not gung-ho promoters of the industry—denies it.

"It would be hard to: The Mississippi Coast has been at the center of several high-profile compulsive gambling incidents, including one involving two famous writers, brothers who squandered an inheritance worth more than \$250,000 at blackjack and slots.

"It is a hard-edged reality that happens—at casinos, at racetracks, at church bingo, at state lottery outlets. The Mississippi Coast has seen a 26-fold increase in the number of Gamblers Anonymous meeting—to 13 a week—since the first casino opened in 1992." (Lexington [Ky.] Herald-Leader, 9/12/99)

"Detroit's casinos, the city and state are raking in more profits and tax money than even they expected, but legalized gambling is not yet making a ripple in the lives of most Metro Detroiters.

"How come all those promises and nothing has been developed?" asked George Reo, who lives on Auburn on Detroit's northwest side. 'A lot of improvements were supposed to happen and, in my mind, they should have happened by now. I don't see any improvement in city services. Taxes aren't lower.'

"As Detroit prepares to mark the first anniversary of casino gambling on July 29, not all the hopes and expectations that surrounded the heady, early days have come true:

About 7,500 new jobs have been created. But the 10 million people who'll gamble here this year aren't boosting most others businesses.

"There's been little economic spin-off for stores, bars, clubs, sports teams or cultural institutions.

The \$50 million in casino taxes collected by the city in the just-completed fiscal year disappeared into its general fund. So far, that's not translated into additional police officers, recreation centers, widespread neighborhood improvements or lower taxes." (Detroit News, 7/23/00)

"Seven months before the (Illinois) General Assembly voted last year to approve a new casino for Rosemont, a small group of rich and influential figures in Illinois gambling met in a Northern Michigan Avenue high-rise to plot to divvy up the jackpot. Their agenda: appease a big potential opponent to the plan, Arlington International Racecourse owner Dick Duchossois.

"In the end, according to sworn testimony given by Duchossois and aides in a federal lawsuit, the racetrack owner and major political contributor was promised a 20% stake in the new Rosemont boat if he used his considerable influence in Springfield to help get it approved. "Depositions in that lawsuit, obtained by the Tribune, provide the first detailed glimpse into the intricate plotting, horse-trading and double-dealing that went on behind the scenes to win state approval for a new riverboat sure to make it owners reap tens of millions of dollars a year in profits." (Chicago Tribune, 4/2/00)

"Senate President John Hainkel, R-New Orleans, has accused the riverboat casino industry of trying to use the Louisiana Association of Retarded Citizens to pressure senators for a limited gambling tax increase." (New Orleans) Times-Picayune, 6/11/00)

"More than half the state's adult population has visited a casino, either in Michigan or elsewhere, a statewide poll shows. . . . People at the top and bottom of the income scale are the biggest spenders at the casinos. Those making less than \$15,000 a year spend \$172 per visit, and those earning more than \$100,000 per year spend \$161 per visit. People in the \$30,000-\$45,000 income bracket spend the least, reporting an average of \$87.40 per visit. "Pollster Ed Sarpolus noted that the age groups most likely to visit casinos are between 18 and 24, and between 50 and 54." (Detroit Free Press, 11/17/00)

"California Indian tribes that operate gambling casinos have spent something in excess of \$100 million, and perhaps as much as \$150 million, in the past decade on contributions to politicians, video ad campaigns for two ballot measures, lobbying fees and other forms of 'political action.' And in doing so, the tribes have arisen from virtual invisibility to become the single most powerful political force in the Capitol. . . . The goal of that years-long political effort was simple: A monopoly on full-scale casino gambling in California. And by any measure, it's been a stunning success. . . .

"Tribal casino operators already have announced plans for lavish new facilities throughout the state, some costing more than \$100 million to construct. Nevada gambling corporations, which originally fought the Indians, are now joining them by forging management contracts with the tribes. . . . Bill Eadington, a University of Nevada, Reno, specialist in gambling economics, has concluded that by the end of the decade Indian casinos will be pulling in \$5.1 billion to \$10.3 billion a year in gambling revenues." (Sacramento Bee, 7/2/00)

#### STATE LOTTERIES

State officials are admitting a small core of heavy gamblers, many of them poor, are the mainstay of the California Lottery. The voter-approved lottery that benefits public education has maintained for 15 years that lottery players simply reflect the population of California. After an ANG Newspapers report in December and subsequent grilling by legislators, the Lottery began compiling figures that show a fifth of its players account for 90% of the multibillion-dollar sales. . . . "Of the 2 million heavy gamblers, more than half are from households earning less than \$35,000 a year. People from households earning less than \$25,000 annually make up 41% of the lottery's heavy gamblers while they are less than a third of California's adult population. The heavy, poor gamblers spend an average of more than \$830 a year on the games." (Las Vegas Sun, 2/24/00)

"State lotteries hurt the poor and have lousier payouts than other types of legal wagering, the former head of a federal panel on gambling said Tuesday. Calling lotteries 'a regressive tax' on the poor with particular impact on minorities, Kay James said states don't regulate their gambling as well as government regulates gambling by business. . . . She spoke Tuesday at a Minneapolis program sponsored by the Center of the American Experiment which wants Minnesota to ban most lottery ads, raise the age for buying tickets from 18 to 21 and prohibit new gambling." ([Minneapolis] Star Tribune, 10/27/00)

"Hoping to boost sagging sales, the Ohio Lottery has doubled the daily drawings of games played most heavily in black neighborhoods, some of them the poorest in Cleve-

land. . . . In areas of Cuyahoga County where more than half of the residents are black, sales per capita—\$234—are three times higher than in areas where a majority of residents are white. Sales are heavier in lower-income neighborhoods of Cuyahoga County. Where the household income is below the county median of \$35,381, per-capita betting is twice as high as areas above the medium." (Cleveland Plain Dealer, 10/10/00)

"A three-month investigation by the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review found Pennsylvania Lottery sales come disproportionately from the poor and working class. In Allegheny County, the most recent lottery records available show stores in neighborhoods with per capita incomes lower than \$20,000 sold more than twice as many tickets per resident as those in neighborhoods where the average incomes exceeded \$30,000. . . . "The lottery's 1997 study found 39 percent of 'heavy' players—those who bet at least once a week—report household incomes below \$25,000 a year." (Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, 8/22/00)

"The state [of Florida] is preying on poor people by selling Lottery tickets at check-cashing stores that offer short-term, high-interest loans against a future paycheck. According to sales from the 1988-99 budget year, Florida Lottery tickets are sold by 161 check-cashing stores, payday loan stores and pawnshops, many located in low-income neighborhoods." (Miami Herald, 11/25/00)

#### INTERNET GAMBLING

"More than 850 Internet gambling sites worldwide had revenues in 1999 of \$1.67 billion, up more than 80% from 1998, according to Christiansen Capital Advisors, who track the industry. Revenues are expected to top \$3 billion by 2002." (Reuters, 5/31/00)

#### LOBBYING FOR GAMBLING

"Lobbyists [in West Virginia] have spent more than \$1 million in the past five years to get the attention of state officials, and gambling interests are the biggest spenders. . . . Lobbyists for gambling interests have spent more than \$220,000 since 1996, compared to about \$3,333 spent by gambling opponents." (Las Vegas Sun, 6/5/00)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me the time.

I want to also stand up, like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has just done, my friend, and talk about conflict diamonds. There is a section in the bill that deals with the issue, section 406. It is an amendment that is supposed to eliminate the problem. I do not think that it will, although I support it. I regret that an alternative that I negotiated and all sides agreed would be preferable, but it was not included in the conference report.

Conflict diamonds or blood diamonds are diamonds that are sold in the United States. They are sold in great numbers. The problem with it is that these conflict diamonds come from countries like Sierra Leone, the Congo, Burkina Faso, Liberia, and Angola.

What they do is they arm the rebels. They make the civil war go. What has happened over the years is that they have killed people. They have maimed all kinds of children. We have actually had hearings here in the Congress.

They go to disrupt society. Sierra Leone is still disrupted as a result of these conflict diamonds.

Today the industry is trying to play catchup, and they are acting like they are trying to play catchup. They have come up with a solution to this problem. For years, it has ignored the rebels' role in overthrowing the democratic government; but over the same period, the diamond industry has raked in phenomenal profits. Last year alone, the industry leader posted an 89 percent increase in profits.

Until now, Congress has demonstrated little leadership on this issue; and we really failed on this particular issue. There have been some shining exceptions: the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), people that supported the CARAT Act, Holly Burkhalter, who is a human rights advocate with Physicians for Human Rights, and Amnesty International. They have been tremendous on this issue.

I want to thank Senator GREGG in the Senate. He has been great on this. He stood alone on this. However, his amendment, the reports are that the administration is saying it will not enforce this provision. That is deeply troubling to me because of the industry's attempt to renege on its compromise with the coalition because of assurances it has received from U.S. officials that they have no intention of enforcing Senator GREGG's amendment.

□ 1330

And so if this is the case, we are back to square one.

The problem with it is that I think probably we need to take the gloves off. We need to go to the American consumers and tell them that they are contributing to killing; that they are contributing to the fact that people are being raped, children are having their arms cut off, and the reason why that is happening is because they are buying the diamonds. We need to inform the consumers in America that when they go into a store that they should ask the question, where do these diamonds come from; what is the history of these diamonds. And if that question cannot be answered, they should not buy the diamonds.

Americans buy 65 percent of all the diamonds in the world. We can make a difference in Africa; we can take the profit out of war. It is time we take the gloves off. We have the chance to really do something. Oftentimes, as we look at Africa, we do not have leverage. We can do something because we buy the diamonds in the world. We can stop these blood diamonds. We can make a difference.

The industry has had a chance. They have let the clock run out. The administration has had their chance; they have let the clock run out. The majority party had their chance, and they have let the clock run out. This is what

makes us look bad, when we can do something that makes a difference for people and stop the killing.

Hopefully, we are not finished here. If this bill is vetoed, we might have a chance for another shot at doing something right.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. The American people need to pay close attention, however, to the maneuverings that are going on in these last closing days of Congress. During this time, Members of Congress are, of course, anxious to go home and campaign, so the American people should pay close attention to what the Clinton-Gore administration is threatening those of us in Congress to do unless we do what they want.

In fact, there is a veto threat to this Congress over the D.C., Commerce-Justice-State conference report. And what is that veto threat that the Clinton-Gore administration is making to Congress? Unless we include a general amnesty for all illegal aliens, a general amnesty meaning millions of illegal aliens to be permitted to stay in this country, the President is threatening, the Clinton-Gore administration is threatening to veto this bill and keep Congress in session. Millions.

It has been described as family reunification. No, the Republicans are suggesting a compromise. Let us put people together who fell through the cracks 10 years ago and have some family reunification. What Clinton-Gore is demanding is a mass, a mass, amnesty for millions of illegal aliens, bypassing all of the legal restrictions making sure that all those people all over the world who are waiting in line to come here legally will be made fools of; making sure that millions of illegal aliens, people who are now illegally in this country and have violated our laws are eligible for education and health benefits because they are now legally in our country.

Is this what we want to do with our surplus? Is this what Clinton-Gore wants to do with the surplus? We cannot give it back in some sort of modest tax relief; but we can, instead, grant millions of people who have come here illegally the right to consume benefits and cost the government billions of dollars.

The last time we granted such an amnesty was in the mid-1980s. I come from California. I saw what that did to our country. We are talking about a huge increase in illegal immigration right after that amnesty. Because every time we give an amnesty to illegal immigration, it is like putting out a welcome mat: come on in from all over the world. Because if they can get here they know they will eventually be able to outwait these people and they will be able to get government benefits just like everybody else.

I know how painful this is for some people on the other side, Mr. Speaker,

who just tried to describe this as family reunification. That is not the demand of the Clinton-Gore administration. Again, it is a betrayal of the American people, the people who are here legally, who have come here as immigrants legally through the process. Those people, they love this country enough to obey our laws. Should we then reward people who have just thumbed their nose at the legal system and come here illegally and put them on an equal par to those legal immigrants, those people who make our country and have such a beneficial effect on our country?

There is a lot of politics being played in this country right next to this election. There are some people who are calculating that Americans of Hispanic descent, especially Americans of Mexican descent, in some way like illegal immigration. That is an insult to those American citizens. This bill is an insult to them; and it is an insult, as I say, to the legal immigrants who have gone through the system and done what they were supposed to do and are making fine U.S. citizens.

But, no, what we have now is a threat from this administration, and I believe it is for political reasons, to make sure that millions of people who have come to this country are made legal in an amnesty program, and a general amnesty. Again, let me say that those of us on the Republican side are willing to compromise. We think it is a fine compromise to bring family reunification, and a much lower level of people would be involved in this, and it is a humane thing to do. But a general amnesty is a betrayal of our country and our people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if Members want to know why they ought to vote against this bill they have more choices than a New York delicatessen.

I do not understand what is happening here, because up until 2 days ago we were proceeding on a bipartisan track, and we were going to pass this bill by a good margin. Now that has fallen apart.

There are a number of problems with this proposition. First of all, the problem is the lack of fairness in terms of the way it deals with immigration issues. I will not get into that now, but later in the debate there will be people on this floor who will bring this issue to my colleagues in human terms so that they can understand the unfairness and the human pain that is being brought to individual human beings by what this Congress is trying to do.

Second, we have the problem of the threat to privacy of every American posed by abuse of the Internet; the ability, for instance, to use Social Security numbers to unlock all of the secrets of the lives of individual Americans.

There is a provision included in this bill which will make matters worse than they are today. It is called the

Amy Boyer law. She is a young woman who was tracked down by a stalker and murdered, because he was able to get her Social Security number and then find out her place of work, and wound up being killed because of it. This provision in this bill is named for her, but her father is so outraged by the way this has been handled that he is asking that her name not be associated with it in any way.

Third, this bill appropriates enormous amounts of money for coastal areas to protect fragile environments. The money in this bill for that provision is 50 percent higher than the compromise amount agreed to in the interior appropriation bill just a month ago. But much of that money will not be used for protection of our coastal areas. It will, instead, be used for the degradation of those coastal areas.

After weeks of negotiations, the Senate flatly rejected a request on our part to add one sentence to this bill, which simply said that any funds used for construction in coastal areas be used for environmentally-sound projects. That was rejected. As a result, the prevailing position in this bill is that the majority of money will be used for environmentally-unsound projects. That alone is reason enough to veto this bill.

There was also an earlier effort to reach an agreement to provide about \$40 million for the most serious remaining water pollution problem we have, nonpoint source pollution. Instead, this bill cuts that \$40 million to \$10 million and uses every dollar of that \$30 million for pork projects in coastal States. I did not know that Kentucky was a coastal State, but it is going to get some money.

There are other problems associated with this bill. No money for tobacco litigation. That is going to cost the Treasury millions of dollars. There are five reasons why this bill ought to be rejected, and we will hear more as the debate progresses.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I regret that some would use fear, would use the darkest shadows that might exist within our society, would use false statements to try to describe something that is basic justice. I guess Governor Bush's compassion does not extend to his party here in the majority in Congress.

What we seek in this legislation, that is not here, is three simple common sense justifiable public policy immigration issues. They are: one, during the 1980s, the INS wrongfully denied, under U.S. law, thousands of persons who could have legalized their status to do so. And that is universally recognized. That injustice of the government should not be on the backs of those families but should be on the back of a

government that unjustifiably, illegally denied them their opportunity to adjust their status. So we look to right that wrong.

We hear a lot about family values. Well, that is what 245(i), which was the law of the land, stripped away by the Republicans in their last immigration bill, seeks to accomplish. We simply seek to restore that which was the law of the land and say that U.S. citizens and permanent residents who have family members here in the United States and who, under existing immigration law, have the right to adjust their status, should not be ripped apart and sent back while they are waiting to legalize a status that they have every right to accomplish. We should preserve families, and that is a family value.

And lastly, during the Reagan-Bush era, we conducted wars in Central America in promotion of democracy. And we told those people that they would have a place here while those wars raged. Now we seek to turn our backs on them instead of giving them the same right that this Congress gave to Nicaraguans and Cubans. They deserve the same rights.

This is not about a blanket amnesty. This is about fairness and justice in helping taxpaying law-abiding individuals who have made their families here in the United States. And the Latino community is watching as to what this Congress does on these votes.

□ 1345

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about real Latino and immigrant fairness, whom are we talking about? We are talking about legislation crucial to immigrants from all backgrounds, from all countries, to every American who understands that our country was built by people from around the world, that it once offered sanctuary to those fleeing the dangers around the world.

I am gratified that many of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring legislation to rectify this crisis, to protect people who have fled political violence in Central America and the Caribbean, to provide relief to immigrants who have resided in the U.S. since 1986 and some decades before, including many of those who were wrongly turned away admittedly by the INS and Immigration officials when they sought their permanent adjustment, and to reinstate a family-based visa program 245(i) program.

Instead, we are left with so-called "LIFE" bill, a bill that was hatched by Republicans in the last 24 hours. Let me tell my colleagues, this LIFE bill is rife with errors, most notably, the error of omission.

An immigration bill that does not address the issue of parity for all Central Americans is not worth the paper it is printed on. It is unworthy of serious

discussion other than sharp criticism. It is a relic of Cold War politics.

Because immigrants and Latinos, among them millions of voters, will not be deceived by this ploy, will not be dissuaded from our goal nor divided from each other.

This current proposal is the legislative equivalent of offering a single cup of water to an entire band of people who have been exiled, left to wander for years through the desert; and then its sponsors have the audacity to expect those tired and thirsty people to be grateful for a few elusive drops of water of relief.

Mr. Speaker, do not send Members home until we allow immigrants to continue to call America their home. Do not allow this Congress to end until we have brought an end to the injustice and insecurity that has plagued the immigrant community.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle, remember the principles at stake. Forget about politics. Forget about partisanship. Instead, focus on the principles of fairness, freedom, and families.

Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty bill of 1986. Let all those be in America that Ronald Reagan signed a bill for.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Southern California (Mr. BILBRAY).

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was in the House and listened to the discussion, and I guess the discussion of talking about a drop of water is maybe very appropriate.

Some Members here may not know this, but I am probably the only Member of Congress that has rescued illegal immigrants as they were drowning. I am probably also the only Member of Congress that, sadly, has had to recover their bodies when they were not rescued.

Now, I would just ask, as we talk about this in political terms, that we remember there is a human factor here. And the human factor is not just in the neighborhoods way up north. The human factor is also in our neighborhoods along the frontier.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that over 260 people die every year trying to come into this country illegally and that is more or equal to those who were killed in the Oklahoma explosion.

I wish this institution would be as outraged at the carnage along our frontiers as they are with the terrorism within our borders. But they admit it is not the fault of the Immigration Service that we have these problems. It is the fault of those fuzzy thinking people around this country who think that breaking the law and rewarding people for breaking the law somehow will come out to be a good thing.

The concept of breaking the basic tenants that, playing by the rules, peo-

ple should be rewarded, breaking the law and breaking the rules, they should not be, that is a basic concept we try to especially teach our children.

But will this institution learn that?

I am just asking my colleagues to consider that every one of us that offers a job or offers a benefit or offers amnesty to somebody who is illegally in this country is doing the bait-and-switch on those people that are out of the country right now watching, that they are going to say, let us come to America illegally because the Congress of America will reward us for doing that; and then when they are drowning, when they are dying in the desert, when they are dropping off the cliffs in the Southwest, we will be responsible for it.

I am asking us to get back to common sense and fairness, playing by the rules here in Congress and in our immigration policy.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against this rule and against the conference report because of what it does not contain as well as what it does contain.

The conference agreement does not contain language that would embody the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act. I heard the last gentleman that spoke just say they are breaking the law. There is a time for fairness, which indeed is above the law.

This bill does not contain language that would allow those persons who have lived in the United States since 1986 to have access, simply to have access, to legalize their status while they are indeed making a contribution to the society and paying taxes.

Most of these immigrants are doing essential work in our communities that no one else will do. We take advantage of them but give them no benefits. We indeed should be ashamed of ourselves. It may be they are breaking the law, but it is immoral what we are doing to them.

The bill does not contain language that will allow persons who wish to remain in America to pay a fee so they can stay here with their families. We say we are about family values, but we are breaking families up.

This bill does not contain language that would give equal treatment to all Central American immigrants, including Haitians, to live and to work here and to participate in the citizenry. And while the bill does not include language that would treat these immigrants fairly, guess what it does do? This bill does include language that will allow the Federal Government to invade the privacy of citizens and obtain information from census data that every citizen believes they gave in confidence to their Government. In fact, we said to them that no one would indeed know about that information.

The census, Mr. Speaker, is very important. But our word is even more important. We should indeed be ashamed of what is not in this bill as well as what is in this bill.

I urge defeat of both the rule and this bill.

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

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill because of an important omission in the bill, Section 245(i) of the Immigration law. It sounds like a technicality, but it is not.

I would like to tell my colleagues about Vicky Lynn Gonzalez of Beaverton, Oregon. She married a man named Luis Gonzalez. Together they have a son, Alex, who is now 2 years old.

Vicky Lynn goes to college at night, works full time. But because section 245(i) was removed and is not in this bill, Luis is waiting in Mexico and Alex is growing up alone.

This is unfair. This is unjust. This is not friendly to families. I know because I had to grow up without my father because that was a sacrifice that we had to make to get to this country.

I do not want any other American child to have to grow up without their parent because of some omission that we can fix in this bill today.

I ask for a no vote from all Members who care about families, who care about children, who care about children growing up with care from both parents. Vote no on this bill.

Remember Vicky. Remember Luis. And remember Alex. I ask for a no vote on the rule and on the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman who just spoke that that is not an omission. This is not a technical omission. That provision that he desires to be in the bill was not in the House bill and was not in any Senate version and has not had a hearing. It is the desire of this President and the rest of them to add a rider to an appropriations bill that would satisfy them. But it is not an omission.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. The underlying bill has some good news in it, and that is there are more programs and more money for coastal impacted areas, for oceans and Great Lakes and wildlife. But that is only on the surface. The bad news is that those monies are sucked away for

pork for earmarks, for projects that have fingerprints all over them for special interests in particular districts in this country.

So they are taking generic money that is supposed to be used for non-point-source pollution, which should affect every one of the 50 States, and putting more money into it and then sucking it away, so that there is only \$10 million left for the entire country. And where does that money go? It goes to specific projects in specific States that are partisan and very biased.

Most of it, I have to say, is not from this House. It is from the other body. The other side is grabbing money that we in the House of Representatives ought to be applying to all the people of the United States so that they can have some special interests. That is wrong, and it is so wrong that people should vote no on this rule.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my friend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) about omissions, about some things that are not in the House or not in the Senate bills.

I would say to my friend, there are commissions and omissions, and we believe there is an omission. There is an opportunity to do the right thing. There is an opportunity to right a wrong. There is an opportunity to correct a mistake made by the Congress of the United States. To not do so when one has the opportunity to do it is, I suggest to my friend from Georgia, an omission and, in addition to that, a grievous omission.

This provision has been talked about for months now. It is called Latino fairness. But as the gentleman from Oregon so correctly observed, it is for fairness for everybody.

I want to tell my colleagues why I rise on this floor and feel so strongly about this provision. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is on the floor. I am glad he is on the floor. He and I, during the 1980's, were members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki Commission. And we are still members of that. And one of the things that we fought shoulder to shoulder to do in the 1980's was to ensure that families would be together, that families would be unified.

The issue there was whether or not the Soviet Union was going to allow individuals out of the Soviet Union to unite with their families. The issue here is whether the United States is going to force people out of the United States to become disunited from their families and whether or not we will provide for greater unification of families from throughout Central and South America in a fair way.

□ 1400

There ought to be a resounding "yes" to that question. There ought to be a resounding "no" as the gentleman from Oregon says to this rule so that we cannot commit the omission which has been so grievously perpetrated in this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the attempt to gut privacy provisions in the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill.

Earlier this year, the House passed strong privacy legislation that would protect against misuse of Social Security numbers. Now we are being asked to weaken a good piece of legislation.

Amy Boyer was the first known victim of an Internet stalker. Her killer purchased information, including her Social Security number, from an online information broker for \$50. He then used her Social Security number to track down Ms. Boyer.

Ms. Boyer's family has said that they do not want this language included in this bill and have gone so far as to say that they want their daughter's name removed from the bill because it does not stop people from obtaining private information from information brokers.

Yesterday, the Washington Post called this language a Trojan horse. Mr. Speaker, this will not stop future stalkers from obtaining Social Security numbers. This language would roll back the progress made by this body. We must not ignore the privacy rights of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, if you take a look at the back of your Social Security card, you will see the statement: improper use of this card and/or number by the numberholder or by any other person is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.

Now, the premise of the Amy Boyer bill was supposed to be that we would ensure that we protected against a felon purchasing any one of our family's Social Security numbers and then using it in a way, as did the stalker of Amy Boyer, to kill her, or to do anything even less severe than that that just interfered with the privacy of the families of our country.

What has happened, however, is that the bill has now been amended by the Senate and sent back to us, although we never agreed with this, and here is what the back of the card is going to say from now on: improper use of this card and/or number by the numberholder or by any other person is not punishable by fine, by punishment, by imprisonment, or by anything. You can do whatever you want with America's Social Security numbers.

So something that was originally intended to protect people like Amy Boyer, a 21-year-old young woman, and everyone else in our country like her has now been transmogrified by the direct mail industry, by every other institution in America that wants to turn each one of our family members into a product marketed as though we have no privacy rights, no ability to protect our own information, and use the Social Security number, the government-provided Social Security number, as the clue to every single person's privacy in our country.

We should reject this Senate provision. On the House side, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), we all agree on what should be the protection. There really is not a debate on the House side. But just because it is the last minute of the session, we should not accept something that turns privacy in our country on its head.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could give my appreciation to those who brought this bill to the floor of the House. But clearly this is a true example of compassionate conservatism, when so many of us are left out of the circle of inclusion in this legislation.

First, let me say what a poor example of procedural prowess to attach to the District of Columbia bill disparate legislation that has nothing to do with the fine people of Washington, D.C., attaching this bill dealing with Commerce and State and Justice. Then might I say that after all the begging, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, working with so many of the leaders of this Democratic Caucus, of the Hispanic Caucus, of Senator REID, and not having the Latino Fairness Act that deals with restoring the rights to those who deserve to be counted in this country, taxpayers, families to be reunited, individuals who are strong and who demand and should receive the right to access legalization, our friends and our neighbors.

And then this country, under this Republican leadership, refused to stand up and acknowledge that most Americans support hate crimes legislation. It is not divisive; it is inclusive. It is to say that all of us are under the same umbrella and that in fact we are against the attack on the Jewish day care center in California or the citizens going to church in Illinois who were shot by a hateful person who believed

that we should divide and not overcome division.

I would ask that we send this bill back and do the right thing for our good friends of this Nation and restore their rights as immigrants to make them citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed in what the Republican leadership brought to floor in the form and guise of the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations. As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, I am mostly concerned about the Latino Immigration Fairness Act. (LIFA) The phrase "compassionate conservatism", has very hollow meaning, if you just talk the talk and not walk the walk. This LIFA proposal is the modern day civil rights issue of our time, and just 12 days to election day, the Republicans are thumbing their noses at immigrants who have contributed to our society and are trying to play by the rules. I say no deal to this proposal, and I urged a "no" vote.

This involves amnesty for immigrants who have paid their dues and have been in this country since 1986, parity for Liberians, Guatemalans, Haitians, and Hondurans, and restoring Section 245(i), which allows immigrants to adjust their illegal status, pay a fee, and remain in this country with their spouses and children. These are reasonable proposals, and the Republican leadership has a blind eye for fairness—for justice—and for equity.

The Republican proposal to provide relief to only 400,000 immigrants who were unable to take advantage of the 1986 law for those entering the country before 1982 is unacceptable. It is unacceptable because it leaves and locks to many people out. This is a proposal that is thinly veiled as an open door, but it really is a feeble attempt to play up to the Hispanic vote during the political season.

The Republican legislation is a piecemeal correction of the flawed implementation of the 1986 legalization program. Basically, those individuals who sought the counsel of a specific lawyer and filed suit with him are protected, while countless others are left out. Of those people who are covered in the flawed proposal, less than 40 percent are expected to prevail. If the GOP acknowledges that the 1986 law was not implemented correctly, they should try to right the wrong entirely, not pick some winners and losers based on what law firm they signed up to represent them.

Also, it is important to understand that this "amnesty program" in fact is just a long overdue update in the registry provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The registry provision gives immigrants who have been here without proper documents an opportunity to adjust to permanent status if they have been here for a long enough time and have nothing in their background that would disqualify them from immigrant status. The legislation would just update the cutoff date for registry which is now set at 1972.

Then there is Juan Gonzalez who has been working for a construction company in Houston, Texas for more than 13 years. Recently he lost his job because he was not able to present his employer a renewed Employment Authorization. Since then his family is living a nightmare. Juan and his wife Luisa are having problems and close to a divorce. They lost their home and rented a 2-bedroom apartment. Unfortunately, their children are paying the consequences.

We also need to remain every vigilant on NACARA parity. This would address an injustice in the provisions of the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act of 1997 ("NACARA"). NACARA currently provides qualified Cubans and Nicaraguans an opportunity to become lawful permanent residents of the United States. The proposed legislation would extend the same benefits to eligible nationals of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti. The Bill that the Republicans have brought to the floor has completely left NACARA parity out. I say no deal, and a "no" vote.

Like Nicaraguans and Cubans, many Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Hondurans, and Haitians fled human rights abuses or unstable political and economic conditions in the 1980s and 1990s. The United States has a strong foreign policy interest in providing the same treatment to these similarly situated people. In addition, returning migrants to these countries would place significant demands on their fragile economic and political systems.

Like Senator JACK REED, I have worked very hard to ensure that the 10,000 Liberian nationals who have been living in the United States since the mid-1980's and have significantly contributed to the American economy are not deported. This legislation should also include these Liberian nationals.

If the Latino Immigrant Fairness Act is not enacted, hundreds of thousands of people will be forced to abandon their homes, will have to separate from their families, move out of their communities, be removed from their jobs, and return to countries where they no longer have ties.

The inclusion of the Latino Immigrant Fairness provisions would evidence our commitment to fair and even-handed treatment of nationals from these countries and to the strengthening of democracy and economic stability among important neighbors.

The Republican proposal creates a "V" visa for people waiting in the family backlogs, but not all, including U.S. citizens. This counterproposal treats the family members of some legal permanent residents better than U.S. citizens. The GOP proposal leaves out U.S. citizens applying for their children over the age of 21. Ironically, the GOP fails to help even United States citizens seeking to reunite with their spouses and children if the spouse or the child fell out of status for six months or more. In contrast, the Latino Immigrant Fairness Act 245(i) proposal would cover all people in the pipeline to becoming legal equally. I say no deal and a "no" vote.

The Republicans are failing to correct their flawed legislation of 1997 and 1998. It was the Republicans who passed piecemeal programs in 1997 and 1998 for some refugees. These flaws failed to correct years of uneven treatment to legitimate refugees from Central America, Haiti, and does nothing for Liberian nationals. It is baffling why today the Republicans are now turning their backs on the LIFA proposal for long time refugees, that have been in the United States for years, worked hard and paid their taxes when a few short years ago they advanced these same proposals.

There is no compassion here, Mr. Speaker. Congress should stop trying to trade some deserving immigrant groups for others, and move to help all deserving immigrants willing to play by the rules, pay taxes, and work hard in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am also outraged that this House has brought forth the important Commerce-Justice-State Conference Report to be voted on; yet the Republican leadership has not felt the need or importance to include language to address the dreadful acts of hate crimes.

This move by the Republican leadership is a slap in the face to the many people here in the United States who have historically been subjected to hateful acts resulting in death, bodily harm, as well as mental and physical anguish, only due to a person's race, ethnicity, gender, age or sexual orientation.

How can we as elected representatives for the American people ignore our duty to ensure that all people are treated equally? How can we ignore our moral oath to protect people from hateful acts that arise because of a person's race, ethnicity, gender, age or sexual orientation? How can we allow hateful skeletons of this country's past to be revived and allowed to infect our society today. Mr. Speaker, this chamber's silence on the need for hate crimes legislation would do just that, and the absence of hate crimes language in the CJS Conference Report sends the message that this country's stance on crimes of hate is not a top priority.

This issue is very dear to me and I am ashamed that after two years from the date of James Byrd Junior's vicious murder on a paved road in my home state of Texas, that a Bipartisan Hate Crimes Prevention Act has not become law.

Time and time again, I have come to the floor and asked the Republican leadership to support meaningful hate crimes legislation. I have introduced my own hate crimes legislation and have supported legislation and resolutions introduced by my colleagues in both the House and the Senate. Yet, I find myself coming before the American people once again to compel the Republican leadership to include hate crimes language in the CJS Conference Report in order to increase penalties on perpetrators of hate crimes before the 106th Congress comes to a close.

Mr. Speaker, the same tactics that have been used in the Texas State Legislature to run out the time in the legislative session to defeat the passage of hate crimes legislation have been used here in the United States Congress as well. When the James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Act was introduced in my home state of Texas in January of 1999, it was hastily defeated in the state Senate. And when state Democrats attempted to negotiate with Republicans in the state Senate and the Governor's administration to get a bipartisan hate crimes bill passed, political games were played to extend the process until the end of the state legislative session.

As I have stated, this political ploy was not only used in my home state of Texas, but it has been used here in both chambers of the United States Congress as well. We have attempted to negotiate with members of the Republican party to get hate crimes legislation passed within the 106th Congress, however, political games and wizardry have been used to delay the process until the congressional session comes to an end.

I therefore, call on the Republican leadership, with the American People as my witnesses, to once again ask for the passage of hate crimes legislation to address senseless killings and crimes of hate and to make a

statement that the United States will no longer tolerate these Acts.

Since James Byrd Junior's death our nation has experienced an alarming increase in hate violence directed at men, women, and even children of all races, creeds and colors.

Ronald Taylor traveled to the eastside of Pittsburgh, in what has been characterized, as an act of hate violence to kill three and wound two in a fast food restaurant. Eight weeks later, in Pittsburgh Richard Baumhammers, armed with a .357-caliber pistol, traveled 20 miles across the West Side of Pittsburgh where he killed five people. His shooting victims included a Jewish woman, an Indian, "Vietnamese," Chinese and several black men.

The decade of the 1990's saw an unprecedented rise in the number of hate groups preaching violence and intolerance, with more than 50,000 hate crimes reported during the years 1991 through 1997. The summer of 1999 was dubbed "the summer of hate" as each month brought forth another appalling incident, commencing with a three-day shooting spree aimed at minorities in the Midwest and culminating with an attack on mere children in California. From 1995 through 1999, there has been 206 different arson or bomb attacks on churches and synagogues throughout the United States—an average of one house of worship attacked every week.

Like the rest of the nation, some in Congress have been tempted to dismiss these atrocities as the anomalous acts of lunatics, but news accounts of this homicidal fringe are merely the tip of the iceberg. The beliefs they act on are held by a far larger, though less visible, segment of our society. These atrocities illustrate the need for continued vigilance and the passage of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

It is long past the time for Congress to pass a comprehensive law banning such atrocities. It is a federal crime to hijack an automobile or to possess cocaine, and it ought to be a federal crime to drag a man to death because of his race or to hang a person because of his or her sexual orientation. These are crimes that shock and shame our national conscience and they should be subject to federal law enforcement assistance and prosecution.

Therefore, I would urge my fellow members of the United States House, Congress and the American people to be counted among those who will stand for justice in this country for all Americans and nothing else.

We must address the problem of hate crimes before the 106th Congress convenes its legislation. I say no deal and no vote to this Conference Report until these issues are addressed.

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

I urge my colleagues to support the previous question and the rule and let us get on with the debate on these important bills. It is getting late in the year. The appropriators have worked long and hard into the evening. We have an opportunity to close up one more of them this afternoon, and I urge us to do so.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. FROST. 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 vote on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 194, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Gilman	Pickering
Archer	Goode	Pitts
Armey	Goodlatte	Pombo
Bachus	Goodling	Porter
Baker	Goss	Portman
Ballenger	Graham	Pryce (OH)
Barr	Granger	Quinn
Barrett (NE)	Green (WI)	Radanovich
Bartlett	Greenwood	Ramstad
Barton	Gutknecht	Regula
Bass	Hansen	Reynolds
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Riley
Biggert	Hayes	Rogan
Bilbray	Hayworth	Rogers
Bilirakis	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Heger	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Roukema
Boehlert	Hilleary	Royce
Boehner	Hobson	Ryan (WI)
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Ryun (KS)
Bono	Horn	Salmon
Boucher	Hostettler	Sanford
Brady (TX)	Houghton	Saxton
Bryant	Hulshof	Scarborough
Burr	Hunter	Schaffer
Burton	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Hyde	Sessions
Callahan	Isakson	Shadegg
Calvert	Istook	Shaw
Camp	Jenkins	Shays
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Sherwood
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Castle	Jones (NC)	Shuster
Chabot	Kasich	Simpson
Chambliss	Kelly	Skeen
Coble	King (NY)	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Collins	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Combest	Kolbe	Souder
Cook	Kuykendall	Spence
Cooksey	LaHood	Stearns
Cox	Largent	Stump
Crane	Latham	Sununu
Cubin	LaTourette	Sweeney
Cunningham	Leach	Talent
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Tancredo
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
DeLay	Linder	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	LoBiondo	Terry
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Dickey	Manzullo	Thornberry
Doolittle	Martinez	Thune
Dreier	McCreery	Tiahrt
Duncan	McHugh	Toomey
Dunn	McInnis	Traficant
Ehlers	McKeon	Upton
Ehrlich	Mica	Vitter
Emerson	Miller (FL)	Walden
English	Miller, Gary	Walsh
Everett	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Ewing	Morella	Watkins
Fletcher	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Foley	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Fossella	Ney	Weller
Fowler	Northup	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Wicker
Gallegly	Nussle	Wilson
Ganske	Ose	Wolf
Gekas	Oxley	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Paul	Young (FL)
Gilchrest	Pease	
Gillmor	Petri	

NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Green (TX)	Nadler
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Allen	Hall (OH)	Neal
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Oberstar
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baird	Hill (IN)	Olver
Baldacci	Hilliard	Ortiz
Baldwin	Hinchey	Pascarell
Barcia	Hinojosa	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hoeffl	Payne
Becerra	Holden	Pelosi
Bentsen	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hooley	Phelps
Berman	Hoyer	Pickett
Berry	Inslee	Pomeroy
Bishop	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Bonior	(TX)	Rangel
Borski	Jefferson	Reyes
Boswell	John	Rivers
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rothman
Capps	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kildee	Rush
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Carson	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Clay	Klecza	Sanders
Clayton	Kucinich	Sandlin
Clement	LaFalce	Sawyer
Clyburn	Lampson	Schakowsky
Condit	Lantos	Scott
Conyers	Larson	Serrano
Costello	Lee	Sherman
Coyne	Levin	Shows
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Cummings	Lipinski	Skelton
Davis (FL)	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
DeGette	Luther	Stark
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Stenholm
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
Deutsch	Markey	Tanner
Dicks	Mascara	Tauscher
Dingell	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Dooley	McDermott	Tierney
Doyle	McGovern	Towns
Edwards	McIntyre	Turner
Engel	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Meehan	Velazquez
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Farr	Menendez	Waters
Fattah	Millender-	Watt (NC)
Filner	McDonald	Weiner
Forbes	Miller, George	Wexler
Ford	Minge	Weygand
Frank (MA)	Mink	Wise
Frost	Moakley	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Wu
Gephardt	Moore	Wynn
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	
Gordon	Murtha	

NOT VOTING—24

Blagojevich	Klink	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Lazio	Peterson (PA)
Campbell	McCollum	Spratt
Chenoweth-Hage	McIntosh	Stabenow
Crowley	Meek (FL)	Stupak
Danner	Metcalf	Thompson (MS)
Franks (NJ)	Owens	Waxman
Jones (OH)	Packard	Weldon (PA)

□ 1426

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). 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. FROST. 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 212, noes 192, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

AYES—212

Aderholt	Gilman	Pitts
Archer	Goode	Pombo
Army	Goodlatte	Porter
Bachus	Goodling	Portman
Baker	Goss	Pryce (OH)
Ballenger	Graham	Quinn
Barr	Granger	Radanovich
Barrett (NE)	Green (WI)	Ramstad
Bartlett	Greenwood	Regula
Barton	Gutknecht	Reynolds
Bass	Hansen	Riley
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Rogan
Biggart	Hayes	Rogers
Bilbray	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Bliraakis	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Bliley	Herger	Roukema
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Royce
Boehler	Hilleary	Ryan (WI)
Boehner	Hobson	Ryun (KS)
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Salmon
Bono	Hostettler	Sanford
Boucher	Houghton	Saxton
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Scarborough
Bryant	Hunter	Schaffer
Burr	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Burton	Hyde	Sessions
Buyer	Isakson	Shadegg
Callahan	Istook	Shaw
Calvert	Jenkins	Shays
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Sherwood
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Shows
Castle	Kasich	Shuster
Chabot	Kelly	Simpson
Chambliss	King (NY)	Skeen
Coble	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Collins	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Combest	Kuykendall	Souder
Cook	LaHood	Spence
Cox	Largent	Stearns
Crane	Latham	Stump
Cubin	LaTourette	Sununu
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Talent
Deal	Linder	Tancredo
DeLay	LoBiondo	Tauzin
DeMint	Lucas (OK)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Terry
Dickey	Martinez	Thomas
Doolittle	McCrery	Thornberry
Dreier	McHugh	Thune
Duncan	McInnis	Tiahrt
Dunn	McKeon	Toomey
Ehlers	Mica	Traficant
Ehrlich	Miller (FL)	Upton
Emerson	Miller, Gary	Vitter
English	Moran (KS)	Walden
Everett	Morella	Walsh
Ewing	Myrick	Wamp
Fletcher	Nethercutt	Watkins
Foley	Ney	Watts (OK)
Fossella	Northup	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Norwood	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Nussle	Whitfield
Gallegly	Ose	Wicker
Ganske	Oxley	Wilson
Paul	Gekas	Wolf
Pease	Paul	Young (AK)
Petri	Pease	Young (FL)
Pickering	Petri	

NOES—192

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	DeGette
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	Delahunt
Allen	Capps	DeLauro
Andrews	Capuano	Deutsch
Baca	Cardin	Dicks
Baird	Carson	Dingell
Baldacci	Clay	Dixon
Baldwin	Clayton	Doggett
Barcia	Clement	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Doyle
Becerra	Condit	Edwards
Bentsen	Conyers	Engel
Berkley	Costello	Eshoo
Berman	Coyne	Etheridge
Berry	Cramer	Farr
Blumenauer	Cummings	Fattah
Bonior	Davis (FL)	Filner
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Forbes
Boyd	DeFazio	Ford

Frank (MA)	Luther	Rivers
Frost	Maloney (CT)	Rodriguez
Gejdenson	Maloney (NY)	Roemer
Gephardt	Markey	Rothman
Gonzalez	Mascara	Roybal-Allard
Gordon	Matsui	Rush
Green (TX)	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez
Hall (OH)	McDermott	Sanders
Hall (TX)	McGovern	Sandlin
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sawyer
Hill (IN)	McKinney	Schakowsky
Hilliard	McNulty	Scott
Hinchey	Meehan	Serrano
Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Hoeffl	Menendez	Sisisky
Holden	Millender-	Skelton
Holt	McDonald	Slaughter
Hooley	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Minge	Snyder
Inslee	Mink	Stabenow
Jackson (IL)	Moakley	Stark
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Stenholm
(TX)	Moore	Strickland
Jefferson	Moran (VA)	Tanner
John	Murtha	Tauscher
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Jones (OH)	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Kanjorski	Neal	Thurman
Kaptur	Oberstar	Tierney
Kennedy	Obey	Towns
Kildee	Olver	Turner
Kilpatrick	Ortiz	Udall (CO)
Kind (WI)	Pallone	Udall (NM)
Klecza	Pascarell	Velazquez
Kucinich	Pastor	Visclosky
LaFalce	Payne	Waters
Lampson	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Lee	Phelps	Wexler
Levin	Pickett	Weygand
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Wise
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Lofgren	Rahall	Wu
Lowey	Rangel	Wynn
Lucas (KY)	Reyes	

NOT VOTING—28

Bishop	Franks (NJ)	Owens
Blagojevich	Horn	Packard
Borski	Klink	Peterson (PA)
Brady (PA)	Larson	Spratt
Campbell	Lazio	Stupak
Chenoweth-Hage	Leach	Thompson (MS)
Cooksey	McCollum	Waxman
Crowley	McIntosh	Weldon (PA)
Danner	Meek (FL)	
Evans	Metcalf	

□ 1434

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 651 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 651

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, October 26, 2000, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures:

(1) the bill (H.R. 2498) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in