

bill and that he would approve of the Committee on Rules going ahead, in effect. He would still oppose the bill, still does oppose the bill and always will oppose the bill as he has done because he has been very consistent on this issue.

But there was also a statement made as though we were, "we" being the Republican leadership as well as outside groups, trying to intimidate these poor western Members in the United States who were afraid of ads.

First, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH), the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), people in tough races, actually believe in gun rights. That is why they are on the bill. It is demeaning to have their colleagues undermine them on the House floor and imply that the only reason they got in the bill was for political purposes. That is things like people from our side would say about people from their side. Their own side should not be saying that. Furthermore, the last I saw, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) are not in tough races and they are not intimidated by outside groups.

This bill has 45 Democratic cosponsors in addition to the majority of the Republican Party. When we talk about bipartisan legislation, this is bipartisan legislation. The D.C. handgun ban has failed. It has failed miserably. This bill is demanded by the people of the United States. They wrote into their Members. Members from both parties got on this bill. This is a good rule, and I hope Members will support and pass this rule and pass the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I am here today to fight a closed rule on what will be one of the more tragic pieces of legislation that we try to pass through the House of Representatives. We have very important interests that are being ignored by this closed rule.

Guns are disproportionately killing our children in our cities and this law has no basis to be here in front of us today. DC has its own rules regulating purchasing and owning a gun, and we do not need to create legislation to usurp their power and go against their interest.

We are drowned in rhetoric saying that a Member of Congress who does not think handguns should be floating freely on our streets is someone who is anti-gun and wants to take our hunting rifles away. That is not this bill before us. You can keep your hunting rifles, you can keep your loaded guns in your business, but you do need some semblance of order on the street, where a small, innocent mistake encounter can turn into a massive bloodbath once guns are used instead of words.

Right now, DC's local laws do not prevent law abiding citizens from owning a firearm. Since 1976, District residents have registered over 100,000 firearms (mostly rifles and shotguns) with the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD).

Study after study is showing that guns protect very few at home and result in thousands of Americans killed in family and acquaintance quarrels, domestic violence and suicides. Guns obtained legally end up as weapons in domestic or neighborhood quarrels. Is this what we want in our neighborhoods? What is wrong with the mentality that it takes guns to solve problems and make people feel safe?

As a member of the House Select Committee on Homeland Security, we need to be doing everything we can to keep the men and women who protect the nation's capital out of harm's way. The nation's capital is under an orange alert.

Placing more unregulated guns in the streets of DC undermines homeland security measures. Why must we compromise our own homeland security efforts by bringing more handguns to the streets? Where are our priorities?

I have been collaborating with my colleague and good friend from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. She can echo that DC's current firearm laws are working. 97% of all guns used in crimes in DC originate outside of DC and 59% of traceable guns were first purchased in Maryland and Virginia. In addition, 8% of traceable guns were bought in North Carolina, Florida, Georgia and South Carolina. It is a travesty that her concerns are being ignored, both by the House Rules committee and by the larger body.

As legislators, we must take our role in as decision makers very seriously. This includes knowing when we have overstepped our bounds. Please, listen to the people of DC to hear if they want guns on their streets.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF MEMBER AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Pursuant to clause 11 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's removal of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of December 8, 2003, appointed the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4520, AMERICAN JOBS CREATION ACT OF 2004

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4520) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove impediments in such Code and make our manufacturing, service, and high-technology businesses and workers more competitive and pro-

ductive both at home and abroad, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. NEAL OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal of Massachusetts moves that the managers on the part of the House, on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4520, be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report an effective rate reduction for income from production activities in the United States, and such an effective rate reduction—

A) shall be provided in the form of a deduction as in the Senate amendment, and shall not be provided in the form of a corporate rate reduction, as in the House bill,

B) shall be available to all businesses (including farmers, farm co-operatives, subchapter S corporations, and other unincorporated businesses) engaged in U.S. production activity as in the Senate amendment,

C) shall include the provisions of the Senate amendment that adjust the size of the effective rate reduction based on the respective portions of the taxpayer's business in the United States and overseas in order to provide the largest effective rate reduction for businesses that have not moved operations offshore, and

D) shall include the provisions of the Senate amendment (not included in the House bill) that ensure that the rate reduction will not be available for income attributable to cost savings resulting from purchasing imported parts or outsourcing labor overseas.

2. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to not include any increase in tax benefits for the overseas operations of multinationals.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to develop a conference report that will not increase the federal deficit in either the short or long term. In doing so, the House conferees also shall be instructed:

A. To include in the conference report the provisions of the Senate amendment that eliminate tax benefits for companies that reincorporate overseas, and the provisions of the Senate amendment that restrict corporate tax avoidance transactions, including codification of the economic substance doctrine and the provisions directly targeted at transactions utilized by the Enron corporation, and

B. Shall drop the provision of the House bill that provides for private collection of Federal tax liabilities.

4. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees, and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction at a time permitting passage before the adjournment before the election.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to instruct be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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