the U.S. Attorney's office requires officers to meet with prosecutors personally before they determine whether to charge an arrestee with a felony or misdemeanor. GAO found that during 1999, the equivalent of 23 full time officers were devoted to these appearances, reducing the number of officers on patrol.

GAO cautioned that although the CJCC had been funded by the D.C. control board, the board did not include funding for the CJCC in the District's Fiscal Year 2001 budget. The last remaining staff person, working almost exclusively on technology issues, was funded by a grant. GAO recommended that ''Congress . . . consider funding CJCC—with its own director and staff—to help coordinate the D.C. criminal justice system, and to require CJCC to report annually to Congress, the Attorney General, and the D.C. Mayor.''

In addition, GAO found that as of November 2000, the CJCC and other agencies reported ''93 initiatives for improving the operation of the [D.C. criminal justice] system.'' Although GAO stipulated that many of these coordination projects are ongoing and therefore cannot yet be fully evaluated, it found that of the 93 current projects there were 62 instances where participating agencies did not agree on the initiative's goals (11 instances), status (10 instances), starting date (1 instance), participating agencies (22 instances), or results to date (18 instances).

Several of the CJCC members disputed these findings, explaining that GAO did not examine closely enough the actual work performed on these projects and merely relied on summaries provided by the participants that may have appeared inconsistent. However, GAO found that ''this lack of agreement underscores a lack of coordination among the participating agencies that could reduce the effectiveness of these initiatives.'' GAO therefore recommended that Congress require all D.C. criminal justices agencies to report multi-agency activities to the CJCC, which would serve as a ''clearinghouse'' for these initiatives.

Although members of the CJCC agree that coordination among the various agencies that have responsibility for the District's criminal justice system needs to be improved, several members disagreed with GAO's recommendation for a congressionally created and funded entity to oversee coordination and reform initiatives.

For example, Deputy Mayor Margaret Nedelkoff Kellems, formerly the Executive Director of the CJCC, wrote in response to the GAO report, ''It has been my experience [however] that to the extent that reforms have taken root in the District through the CJCC, it has been not only because of coordination resources, but equally because the member agencies have felt ownership over the body. As reporting to the new entity you describe becomes a requirement, criminal justice agencies might perceive it to be threatening and respond on a perfunctory basis. Nevertheless, I concur in your basic premise that there must be a coordinating organization and it must have dedicated resources.''

Similarly, Superior Court Chief Judge Rufus King wrote, ''it is important that any successor [to the CJCC] not become a ''superagency'' which dictates to the different criminal justice agencies what the agenda should be or how problems which involve more than one agency should be approached . . . The most important thing to preserve in any newly constituted council is that it remain a council of independent agencies who are able to recognize their responsibilities to different funding authorities.''

Finally, former U.S. Attorney Wilma Lewis offered the following criticism of GAO's recommendation: ''I have some concern about your proposal that Congress 'consider requiring that all D.C. criminal justice initiatives that could potentially involve more than one agency be coordinated through the new independent entity' . . . I question whether such review is necessary for all initiatives that could potentially involve more than one agency. Given the interrelatedness of agencies in our system, it is difficult to think of any initiative—no matter how limited in scope or application—that would not fit that definition and require review by that entity. As such, I am concerned that such a requirement would be counterproductive, as it would hamstring each agency's ability to implement policies and practices within its appropriate sphere of activity.''

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council Restructuring Act meets these concerns of District actors while at the same time ensuring that supremacy clause and federalism notions are respected. Specifically, the bill recognizes the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) as the appropriate entity set up by District legislation (the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for the District of Columbia Establishment Act of 2001) to coordinate criminal justice activities in the District. In addition, the bill requires that federal agencies with a role in criminal justice matters in the District, including Court Services and Offender Supervision (CSOSA), Pretrial Services Agency, Office of the U.S. Attorney, the Bureau of Prisons, and the United States Parole Commission, serve on the CJCC, to participate in its activities and take such action as may be necessary to fulfill their duties on the CJCC. However, no District official can compel a federal official to take any action. The bill also authorizes federal funds to carry out the duties of the CJCC.

This measure will strengthen and enhance the CJCC as a vital coordination entity for the District's multi-jurisdictional criminal justice system. I once again thank Chairwoman MORELLA for her leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. I urge its passage.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for joining with me in this important act, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for being a floor manager and for being so supportive of this legislation. I urge this body to endorse this bill by its vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2305, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize certain Federal officials with responsibility for the administration of the criminal justice system of the District of Columbia to serve on and participate in the activities of the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on three motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today. The remaining questions postponed earlier today will be taken tomorrow.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3323, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3391, by the yeas and nays;

S. 494, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

ADMINISTRATIVE SIMPLIFICATION COMPLIANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3323, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3323, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Boehlert	Chabot
Ackerman	Boehner	Chambliss
Aderholt	Bonilla	Clay
Akin	Bonior	Clayton
Allen	Bono	Clement
Andrews	Boozman	Clyburn
Armey	Borski	Coble
Baca	Boswell	Collins
Bachus	Boucher	Combest
Baird	Boyd	Condit
Baker	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Baldacci	Brown (OH)	Cooksey
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Costello
Ballenger	Bryant	Cox
Barcia	Burr	Coyne
Barrett	Burton	Cramer
Bartlett	Buyer	Crane
Barton	Callahan	Crenshaw
Bass	Calvert	Crowley
Becerra	Camp	Culberson
Bentsen	Cannon	Cummings
Bereuter	Cantor	Cunningham
Berkley	Capito	Davis (CA)
Berry	Capps	Davis (FL)
Biggert	Capuano	Davis (IL)
Bilirakis	Cardin	Davis, Jo Ann
Bishop	Carson (IN)	Davis, Tom
Blumenauer	Carson (OK)	Deal
Blunt	Castle	DeGette