

Shows Towns Waxman  
Talent Vento Whitfield

□ 2041

Mrs. BONO changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. REGULA and Mr. ROEMER changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent today, Monday, June 26, 2000, and as a result, missed rollcall votes 322 and 323. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 322 and "yes" on rollcall vote 323.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTLER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 23 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 201, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—196

Aderholt	Cooksey	Hill (MT)
Arney	Costello	Hilleary
Baca	Cox	Hilliard
Bachus	Cramer	Hobson
Baker	Crane	Hoekstra
Ballenger	Cubin	Holden
Barcia	Cunningham	Hostettler
Barr	Danner	Hulshof
Barrett (NE)	Deal	Hunter
Bartlett	DeLay	Hutchinson
Barton	DeMint	Istook
Bass	Dickey	Jenkins
Bateman	Doolittle	John
Berry	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Biggert	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Kanjorski
Bishop	Emerson	Kasich
Bliley	English	Kingston
Blunt	Everett	Knollenberg
Boehner	Ewing	Kolbe
Bonilla	Fletcher	LaHood
Bono	Fowler	Lampson
Boucher	Gekas	Largent
Boyd	Gibbons	Latham
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Bryant	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Burr	Goodlatte	Linder
Burton	Goodling	Lucas (KY)
Buyer	Gordon	Lucas (OK)
Callahan	Goss	Mascara
Calvert	Graham	McCreary
Camp	Granger	McIntyre
Canady	Green (TX)	McKeon
Cannon	Green (WI)	Metcalfe
Chabot	Gutknecht	Mica
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Chenoweth-Hage	Hastings (WA)	Mollohan
Clement	Hayes	Moran (KS)
Coble	Hayworth	Murtha
Coburn	Hefley	Myrick
Collins	Herger	Nethercutt
Combest	Hill (IN)	Norwood

Nussle	Sanford	Taylor (NC)
Ortiz	Scarborough	Terry
Ose	Schaffer	Thomas
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Paul	Sessions	Thune
Pease	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Peterson (MN)	Sherwood	Toomey
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Trafficant
Petri	Shuster	Turner
Phelps	Sisisky	Vitter
Pickering	Skeen	Walden
Pickett	Skelton	Wamp
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Watkins
Portman	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Radanovich	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Rahall	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Regula	Stearns	Wicker
Reynolds	Stenholm	Wilson
Rogers	Strickland	Wise
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wolf
Royce	Sununu	Young (AK)
Ryan (WI)	Tanner	Young (FL)
Salmon	Tauzin	
Sandlin	Taylor (MS)	

NOES—201

Abercrombie	Gilchrist	Neal
Ackerman	Gilman	Northrup
Allen	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Andrews	Greenwood	Obey
Baird	Hall (OH)	Olver
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Oxley
Barrett (WI)	Hoeffel	Pallone
Becerra	Holt	Pascrell
Bentsen	Hooley	Pastor
Bereuter	Horn	Payne
Berkley	Houghton	Pelosi
Berman	Hoyer	Porter
Bilbray	Hyde	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Inslee	Pryce (OH)
Boehlert	Isakson	Quinn
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Ramstad
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Capps	Johnson (CT)	Roemer
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rogan
Cardin	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson	Kennedy	Rothman
Castle	Kildee	Roukema
Clay	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	King (NY)	Sabo
Clyburn	Kleccka	Sanchez
Condit	Kucinich	Sanders
Conyers	Kuykendall	Sawyer
Coyne	LaFalce	Saxton
Crowley	Lantos	Scott
Cummings	Larson	Serrano
Davis (FL)	LaTourette	Shaw
Davis (VA)	Leach	Shays
DeFazio	Lee	Sherman
DeGette	Levin	Simpson
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Deutsch	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart	Lowe	Snyder
Dicks	Luther	Spratt
Dixon	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Dooley	Matsui	Stupak
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Sweeney
Dunn	McCarthy (NY)	Tancredo
Edwards	McDermott	Tauscher
Ehlers	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McHugh	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McInnis	Thurman
Etheridge	McKinney	Tierney
Evans	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Farr	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Meeke (FL)	Upton
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Foley	Menendez	Visclosky
Forbes	Millender-Ford	Walsh
Ford	McDonald	Waters
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Weiner
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Wexler
Frost	Moakley	Weygand
Galleghy	Moore	Woolsey
Ganske	Moran (VA)	Wu
Gejdenson	Nadler	Wynn
Gephardt	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—37

Archer	Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)
Blagojevich	Campbell	Dingell
Boswell	Cook	Gutierrez

Hansen	Martinez	Ryan (KS)
Hinchey	McCollum	Schakowsky
Jones (OH)	McIntosh	Shows
Kaptur	Morella	Talent
Kilpatrick	Ney	Towns
Klink	Pitts	Vento
Lazio	Pomeroy	Waxman
Lipinski	Rangel	Whitfield
Manzullo	Riley	
Markey	Rush	

□ 2050

Mr. PACKARD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidable detained in my Congressional District earlier today and was unable to vote on several amendments to H.R. 4690.

On the Sanford amendment, rollcall 322, I would have voted "no."

On the Olver amendment, rollcall 323, I would have voted "yes."

On the Hostettler amendment, rollcall 324, I would have voted "no."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

I would like to voice my concern over the state of Federal judicial compensation. I believe that judges' salaries are falling below the minimum levels that are needed, not only in the interests of fairness, but also to ensure the continued quality of the Federal judiciary.

Over the past 8 years, Federal judges have experienced a 13 percent decline in the real value of their salaries. At the same time, their workload has remained at high levels. Salaries of Federal judges have not just lagged behind the inflation indices.

As a result, judges' salaries no longer bear a reasonable relationship to that of the pool of lawyers from whom candidates for judgeships should be drawn. It has been widely reported that the first-year associates in law firms in metropolitan areas throughout the country are now earning \$125,000 a year. It is therefore not surprising that even second- and third-year associates at most large law firms would have to take a pay cut, a pay cut to accept an appointment to the Federal bench.

Public sector salaries may even be more relevant. The general counsel of the University of California receives a salary in excess of \$250,000 annually, which is substantially greater than the pay of the Chief Justice of the United States.

The district attorneys of Los Angeles, for example, are paid \$185,000. All of these salaries far exceed the salary of the United States Supreme Court Justices and Associate Justices, which are currently less than \$182,000 and \$174,000, respectively.

Additionally, a U.S. District Judge salary is currently only \$141,300. Increasingly, judges are choosing not to make the financial sacrifice to remain

on the Federal bench. As a result, our Federal judiciary is losing some of its most capable and dedicated men and women. Since January, 1993, 40 Article III judges, judges whose positions are delegated in Article III of the U.S. Constitution and serve lifetime appointments subject to Senate confirmation, have resigned or retired from the Federal bench. Many of these judges have retired to private practice.

The departure of experienced, seasoned judges undermines the notion of lifetime service and weakens our judicial system. If the issue of adequate judicial salaries is not soon addressed, I believe there is a real risk that the quality of the Federal judiciary, a matter of great and justified pride, will be compromised.

The President of the United States' salary goes up to \$400,000 next year. Is it not about time the Supreme Court Justices' salaries go up, too?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns. This is an issue that the Judiciary has been struggling with for a number of years. It gets worse. It is becoming more widespread. As the number of agencies that require professional expertise grows, we hear the same problem in connection with the SEC, FCC, the FBI, all agencies that hire lawyers and professional experts.

We have to compete with the private sector, but we do not have the resources to match those salaries dollar for dollar, as the gentleman has so adequately pointed out. So we will work with the gentleman on this issue as we work through the process, hoping we can find some solution.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should have asked for the gavel, because I could not believe my ears. My understanding is that the previous gentleman was inquiring about the inadequacy of the pay of Federal judges. I remember a number of years ago when the same gentleman was very active in seeing to it that this House did not provide cost-of-living increases for its own employees.

I would simply say, I admire the gentleman's solicitude for people who are already making six figures, but frankly, I would like to see the same solicitude for the legislative branch of government, and by that, I specifically am thinking of the people who work for us. I am not talking about Members, I am talking about our staffs, the people who make us look a lot better than we are.

I find it ironic that a gentleman who was very active in denying us that opportunity to compensate our own employees with a cost-of-living increase a number of years ago is now very concerned about the pay of the highest-paid judges in this country.

I have nothing against adequate judicial salaries, but I also think we have

a problem when the average length of stay for a young congressional staffer on the Hill is less than 3 years, and I think there is a serious problem when the House of Representatives on average pays its top legislative staffers \$15,000 to \$25,000 less on average than the United States Senate does. I have forgotten whether it is \$15,000 or \$25,000, so I will supply the exact number for the RECORD.

□ 2100

But I just want to say that I share the gentleman's concern about adequate reimbursement for judges. I would welcome his concern about adequate salaries for the young people in this institution who work just as hard as Federal judges for about one-fifth the pay.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me. The gentleman has a very good memory. That was 10 years ago that I had that amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I remember. My motto is: "Forgive and remember."

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the gentleman remembers that like it was yesterday, because it did occur a decade ago. At that point the salaries that were provided the staff were going up quite substantially and was well above inflation. And since we have had the years go on for the last 10 years, we have provided inflationary increases for the staff.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would simply say the fact is those salaries are a whole lot less than every other branch of government. They still are. And it seems to me that one of the ways for people to judge Members of Congress is to judge them by whether or not they deal with their staffs the way they would like to be dealt with themselves.

And, certainly, it seems to me that the country would be well served if we also had a greater ability to retain congressional employees of more experience so that we are not being advised by people who on average have been here less than 3 years.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 107, after line 21, insert the following:  
TITLE VIII—LEGAL AMNESTY  
RESTORATION ACT OF 2000

SEC. 801. (a) Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1259) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "1972" and inserting "1986"; and

(2) in subsection (a), by striking "1972;" and inserting "1986;".

(b) The table of sections for such Act is amended in the item relating to section 249 by striking "1972" and inserting "1986".

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I did not have to rise to the floor on this issue, because I know if my colleagues understood this issue completely, they would immediately move to waive the point of order and allow us to proceed to vote on this and pass this amendment.

In 1986, the Immigration Reform and Control Act authorized the legalization of undocumented immigrants, in essence to grant late amnesty. This is a nation of immigrants and laws. But, unfortunately, the INS promulgated a rule that denied such legalization to the immigrants in this group who had briefly left the country to bury a loved one or take care of a child, or handle other matters.

We find that these individuals now live in our country having lived 18, 20 years, they have mortgages, car payments, and are hard-working individuals with young adult children now trying to seek an educational opportunity. But yet because of an incorrect interpretation by the INS of a regulation, the situation now exists that these individuals, hardworking, tax-paying families are not able to adjust their status and become citizens or apply for such.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment resolves this in a fair and adequate manner so much so that the AFL-CIO has offered a resolution in support of legal amnesty, and at the appropriate time I will submit their statement for inclusion in the RECORD.

I offer another amendment, Mr. Chairman, that would bring an end to a long problem. In 1986, the Immigration Reform and Control Act authorized the legalization of undocumented immigrants who could prove that they had been living in the United States since January 1, 1982.

Unfortunately, the Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS") promulgated a rule that denied legalization to the immigrants in this group who had briefly left the country. INS then refused to accept applications from people who had violated this rule.

But by the time the INS had agreed to modify the rule, the 12-month application period had ended and hundreds of thousands of people who could have established eligibility for legalization had been turned away.

This amendment would update a provision of the immigration law known as "registry" by which our government recognizes that it makes sense to allow long-time residents, deeply rooted immigrants who are contributing

to our economy to remain here permanently. This amendment would get these immigrants out of "legal limbo."

My bill H.R. 4172 "The Legal Amnesty Restoration Act of 1999" also fixes this problem, however the devastation that these families are facing because of our inability to seek legal status warrants our acting today to correct this injustice. Thank you.

#### AFL-CIO'S RESOLUTION SUPPORTING IMMIGRATION AMNESTY

The AFL-CIO proudly stands on the side of immigrant workers. Throughout the history of this country, immigrants have played an important role in building our nation and its democratic institutions. New arrivals from every continent have contributed their energy, talent, and commitment to making the United States richer and stronger. Likewise, the American union movement has been enriched by the contributions and courage of immigrant workers. Newly arriving workers continue to make indispensable contributions to the strength and growth of our unions. These efforts have created new unions and strengthened and revived others, benefitting all workers, immigrant and native-born alike. It is increasingly clear that if the United States is to have an immigration system that really works, it must be simultaneously orderly, responsible and fair. The policies of both the AFL-CIO and our country must reflect those goals.

The United States is a nation of laws. This means that the federal government has the sovereign authority and constitutional responsibility to set and enforce limits on immigration. It also means that our government has the obligation to enact and enforce laws in ways that respect due process and civil liberties, safeguard public health and safety, and protect the rights and opportunities of workers.

The AFL-CIO believes the current system of immigration enforcement in the United States is broken and needs to be fixed. Our starting points are simple.

Undocumented workers and their families make enormous contributions to their communities and workplaces and should be provided permanent legal status through a new amnesty program.

Regulated legal immigration is better than unregulated illegal immigration.

Immigrant workers should have full workplace rights in order to protect their own interests as well as the labor rights of all American workers.

Labor and business should work together to design cooperative mechanisms that allow law-abiding employers to satisfy legitimate needs for new workers in a timely manner without compromising the rights and opportunities of workers already here.

Labor and business should cooperate to undertake expanded efforts to educate and train American workers in order to upgrade their skill levels in ways that enhance our shared economic prosperity.

Criminal penalties should be established to punish employers who recruit undocumented workers from abroad for the purpose of exploiting workers for economic gain.

Current efforts to improve immigration enforcement, while failing to stop the flow of undocumented people into the United States, have resulted in a system that causes discrimination and leaves unpunished unscrupulous employers who exploit undocumented workers, thus denying labor rights for all workers.

The combination of a poorly constructed and ineffectively enforced system that results in penalties for only a few of the employers who violate immigration laws has had especially detrimental impacts on ef-

forts to organize and adequately represent workers. Unscrupulous employers have systematically used the I-9 process in their efforts to retaliate against workers who seek to join unions, improve their working conditions, and otherwise assert their rights.

Therefore, the AFL-CIO calls for replacing the current I-9 system as a tool of workplace immigration enforcement. We should substitute a system of immigration enforcement strategies that focuses on the criminalization of employer behavior, targeting those employers who recruit undocumented workers from abroad, either directly or indirectly. It should be supplemented with strong penalties against employers who abuse workers' immigration status to suppress their rights and labor protections. The federal government should aggressively investigate, and criminally prosecute, those employers who knowingly exploit a worker's undocumented status in order to prevent enforcement of workplace protection laws.

We strongly believe employer sanctions, as a nationwide policy applied to all workplaces, has failed and should be eliminated. It should be replaced with an alternative policy to reduce undocumented immigration and prevent employer abuse. Any new policy must meet the following principles: (1) it must seek to prevent employer discrimination against people who look or sound foreign; (2) it must allow workers to pursue legal remedies, including supporting a union, regardless of immigration status; and (3) it must avoid unfairly targeting immigrant workers of a particular nationality.

There is a long tradition in the United States of protecting those who risk their financial and physical well-being to come forward to report violations of laws that were enacted for the public good. Courageous undocumented workers who come forward to assert their rights should not be faced with deportation as a result of their actions. The recent situation at the Holiday Inn Express in Minneapolis highlights the perversity of the current situation. Therefore, the AFL-CIO calls for the enactment of whistleblower protections providing protected immigration status for undocumented workers who report violations of worker protection laws or cooperate with federal agencies during investigations of employment, labor and discrimination violations. Such workers should be accorded full remedies, including reinstatement and back pay. Further, undocumented workers who exercise their rights to organize and bargain collectively should also be provided protected immigration status.

Millions of hard-working people who make enormous contributions to their communities and workplace are denied basic human rights because of their undocumented status. Many of these men and women are the parents of children who are birthright U.S. citizens. The AFL-CIO supports a new amnesty program that would allow these members of local communities to adjust their status to permanent resident and become eligible for naturalization. The AFL-CIO also calls on the Immigration and Naturalization Service to address the shameful delays facing those seeking to adjust their status as a result of the Immigration Reform and Control Act.

Immediate steps should include legalization for three distinct groups of established residents: (1) Approximately half-a-million Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Hondurans, and Haitians, who fled civil war and civil strife during the 1980s and early 1990s and were unfairly denied refugee status, and have lived under various forms of temporary legal status; (2) approximately 350,000 long-resident immigrants who were unfairly denied legalization due to illegal behavior by the INS during the amnesty program enacted in the late 1980s; and (3) approximately 10,000 Libe-

rians who fled their homeland's brutal civil war and have lived in the United States for years under temporary legal status.

Guestworker programs too often are used to discriminate against U.S. workers, depress wages and distort labor markets. For these reasons, the AFL-CIO has long been troubled by the operation of such programs. The proliferation of guestworker programs has resulted in the creation of a class of easily exploited workers, who find themselves in a situation very similar to that faced by undocumented workers. The AFL-CIO renews our call for the halt to the expansion of guestworker programs. Moreover, these programs should be reformed to include more rigorous labor market tests and the involvement of labor unions in the labor certification process. All temporary guestworkers should be afforded the same workplace protections available to all workers.

The rights and dignity of all workers can best be ensured when immigrant and non-immigrant workers are fully informed about the contributions of immigrants to our society and our unions, and about the rights of immigrants under current labor, discrimination, naturalization, and other laws. Labor unions have led the way in developing model programs that should be widely emulated. The AFL-CIO therefore supports the creation of education programs and centers to educate workers about immigration issues and to assist workers in exercising their rights.

Far too many workers lack access to training programs. Like all other workers, new immigrants want to improve their lives and those of their families by participating in job training. The AFL-CIO supports the expansion of job training programs to better serve immigrant populations. These programs are essential to the ability of immigrants to seize opportunities to compete in the new economy.

Immigrant workers make enormous contributions to our economy and society, and deserve the basic safety net protections that all other workers enjoy. The AFL-CIO continues to support the full restoration of benefits that were unfairly taken away through Federal legislation in 1996, causing tremendous harm to immigrant families.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and continue to reserve my point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 3½ minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for raising this very important point, and we in the Committee on the Judiciary have worked hard to correct it. I cannot understand why it has only 5 minutes on each side. But we are trying to make an improvement on the registry by which the government recognizes that it makes sense to allow a long-time resident, deeply rooted immigrant who is here contributing to our economy to remain here permanently.

So we have this correction for people that have come to the country, made

well, raised families, have created no problem, are otherwise good citizens and we are modifying a rule that INS is not able to do without this legislation. I think this is an excellent amendment, and I hope that all the members in the Committee will agree to it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member very much, and I thank him also for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) who has been a long-standing fighter on this issue.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me this time. This is an extremely important issue which we have fought from the early times of the 1990s up to now. It just does not make good sense from an economic standpoint or political standpoint or a moral standpoint for the United States not to recognize that these Salvadorans, Haitians, Guatemalans all of them are here now, they have lived good lives and paid taxes. There is no reason for us now not to approve the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

It is an important amendment. If we allow these people who have been here a long time, paying their taxes, not breaking our rules, this will get them out of legal limbo.

Mr. Chairman, some of us come from areas where there are inordinate amounts of people in this category. They are living in this country doing well, pay taxes; and this amendment will get them out of the legal quagmire which we put them in. It is not their fault that they were put in this situation. This was a mistake or misconception by INS.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that this is about fairness. It is that simple. And it is time.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this in the committee before. It is time to address it. I think each and every Member in this body has dealt with a family that finds itself in limbo waiting for a loved one to come back.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from Texas for bringing it forward, and I would hope that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) would recede on the point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, that is all I need just to rise in strong support of this amendment. I think it speaks to an extremely important issue; one that we have to continue to work on. I support the gentlewoman wholeheartedly.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of

my time. I will also offer to speak on the point of order, subsequent to the distinguished gentleman continuing to raise it.

Mr. Chairman, I note even on page 37 that this bill legislated on an appropriations bill. But I think this is a human factor here. We are talking about families who have been separated from each other. We are talking about families who remain divided because they, for very important family reasons, had to leave the country to go and take care of family matters.

But we are also talking about contributing individuals who have contributed to the economy of this country. All they want, Mr. Chairman, is the ability to adjust their status to legal status. The same right allowed to other immigrants in their same category. However because the INS misinterpreted the rule, and the courts have affirmed that the INS misinterpreted the rule, we have this injustice.

I hope that this amendment can be passed and I thank the Chairman for the time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) insist on his point of order?

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, yes. Again, I will restate, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) clearly is aware of the fact that despite any merits, this amendment does not belong on this bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in the pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if it directly amends existing law.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) wish to be heard on the point of order offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM)?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me refer the Chairman to page 37 of this bill which, in fact, under section 112 there is the implementation of a genealogy fee, which as far as I am concerned is legislating on an appropriations bill.

This is such a crucial bill, if there is precedent that we have legislated on an appropriations bill, then I would ask that the point of order be waived and that this amendment be allowed to go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that the amendment proposes a direct amendment to existing law. As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI. The point of

order is sustained, and the Chair would advise Members that other provisions in the bill that may be legislation were subject to waivers of points of order.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 75 offered by Mr. SOUDER: Page 107, after line 21, insert the following:

#### TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for payment of expenses of any United States delegation or special envoy at a United Nations-sponsored meeting at which the delegation or envoy votes for or otherwise advocates the adoption of any provision under the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime that legalizes, legitimizes, or decriminalizes prostitution in any form or under any circumstances, or otherwise limits international efforts to combat sex trafficking whether or not the individual being trafficked consents to engage in prostitution.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this limitation of funds amendment is simple, direct and necessary. It prohibits taxpayer funds from being used to pay expenses for any United States delegation or special envoy at a United Nations-sponsored meeting at which the delegation or envoy votes for or otherwise advocates the adoption of any provision that legalizes, legitimizes, or decriminalizes prostitution in any form, or under any circumstance, or otherwise limits international efforts to combat sex trafficking, whether or not the individual being trafficked consents to engage in prostitution.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues would not think that such a resolution would be necessary. But here are the sad facts. At Beijing +5, there was a document released condemning the sexual exploitation of women around the world. It eloquently condemned domestic violence, sexual abuse, sexual slavery and sexual harassment. But on the issue of prostitution, it clarified, quote, "forced prostitution."

Why "forced" prostitution? All prostitution is the sexual exploitation of women. How, exactly, does one distinguish between women who are sometimes forcibly taken and sold into prostitution, those who are involuntarily forced to sign "consent" or voluntary participation forms, those whose families push them into such agreements, those in dire poverty where circumstances drive them into sexual exploitation, and those who knows what

other societal pressures would pressure them into selling their bodies for sex to those who choose to exploit them?

Apparently, our U.S. delegation at the two most recent conferences, one in Vienna and one in Beijing +5 Conference, felt it could do so. According to reports, the Philippine delegation moved to strike the word "forced" prostitution. According to numerous eyewitness reports, the U.S. State Department official assisting the U.S. delegation jumped up and moved to strike the entire reference.

Mr. Chairman, what is going on here? Is it the Clinton administration's position that prostitution is okay?

Feminist leaders apparently thought so. Equality Now had already sent a letter on behalf of a coalition of women's rights groups to the President after the conference in Vienna which states, among other things, "To our chagrin, the United States strongly supports the use of the term 'forced prostitution' rather than 'prostitution' in the definition of 'sexual exploitation.' We believe that the administration's current position on the definition of trafficking is extremely detrimental to women."

It was even more difficult for these feminist leaders to condemn the administration's position since Mrs. Clinton is the Honorary Chair of the President's Interagency Council on Women, formed after the initial Beijing Women's Conference. Mrs. Clinton spoke to the conference and delivered several other messages of support.

After the United States Government effort to protect some types of prostitution, that somehow it viewed as nonexploitative of women became public, clarifications and denials of sorts were made.

Mrs. Clinton's Chief of Staff carefully qualified their position, taking the position that the document did not require the U.S. to change our laws, a somewhat accurate response to a completely different question. The document only condemned some types of prostitution. The United States representatives clearly wanted some types not to be condemned, and the First Lady's Chief of Staff did not deny that point.

□ 2115

The President's response was somewhat more clear in a fuzzy sort of way. Agreeing with this resolution, my resolution, he clearly states his "opposition to prostitution in all its forms." Then he subtly changes the point to, "We would not become a party to any treaty that weaken laws against prostitution," and then further attempted to change away his Beijing +5 actions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SERRANO. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), who has

worked with this amendment and has been a leader on this issue.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

As a Member of Congress, I like to dream about the future of our country and imagine an educated America, a healthy America, a prosperous America, and a secure America. I think of children in this great Nation and the bright future that they represent. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, for many throughout this world their tomorrow is not as bright. They do not have their health, education, and security.

In fact, they live in utter misery under the cruel control of their oppressors. They are women and children who are sold, coerced, or otherwise find themselves being exploited by sex traffickers. This is the life of approximately 2 million people worldwide.

Many women find themselves victims of sexual trafficking by being drugged and kidnapped and lured with false promises of jobs far away. They are beaten and raped until they consent to prostitute themselves to customers. Is this voluntary prostitution? Prostitution is an exploitation of women and a violation of their dignity and basic human rights.

To my great dismay, while the Clinton administration may pay lip service to this same idea, their actions do not show it. Despite the horrors of the sex trafficking industry throughout the world, this administration has promoted the position that voluntary prostitution is okay and sex traffickers, who are somehow able to obtain the consent of their victims, should be immune from prosecution. This is unconscionable and unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment because I do not believe the State Department ought to be able to use the taxpayers' dollars to send representatives of the United States to the U.N. conference where they take the stance that voluntary prostitution is okay and a legitimate form of labor.

Mr. Chairman, prostitution in any form or under any circumstances is an intolerable exploitation of women.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order against the gentleman from Indiana's amendment.

The amendment changes existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. SOUDER. First off, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree with the

interpretation that I fear is coming. From our discussions, I understand that this is anticipating a future action, potentially, and therefore could be construed as legislating on an appropriations bill.

However, since the last two conferences in a row, with our last funding process that we went through in this House, in fact the administration agents, through the State Department, took this position. I would argue that this is a limitation of funds because there is no reason to believe that they will not take the position a third time.

I understand that this is now at the mercy of the Chair, and I hope he strongly considers that position.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on this point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York raises a point of order that the amendment changes existing law in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The amendment in pertinent part seeks to restrict funds for United States delegates who "otherwise advocate" the adoption of a described convention.

The fact that similar representations have been advocated in the past by delegates to the United Nations does not immunize the amendment from the point of order, which applies to the use of funds in the next fiscal year.

Requiring the relevant Federal official to determine whether a delegate has "advocated" the adoption of a convention under any circumstance imposes a new duty.

Accordingly, the amendment is not in order and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, for the opportunity to briefly discuss the funding level for International Broadcasting.

I want to thank the gentleman for providing an increase in funding for International Broadcasting Operations and Broadcasting Capital Improvements above last year's level, and specifically for the increase for Radio Free Asia. This additional funding will enable these broadcasting services to meet some of the overwhelming demand for uncensored news and information in oppressed areas of the world.

However, there is still a great unmet need, especially in Asia. In H.R. 4444, which granted permanent normal trade relations to China, was legislation authorizing increased funds for international broadcasting services in China and neighboring countries. If this package should be signed into law before

the conference on this appropriations bill, and additional funds are made available, I ask that the gentleman from Kentucky work with me to ensure that international broadcast funding be increased.

H.R. 4444 provided for an additional authorization of \$65 million for Broadcasting Capital Improvements and \$34 million for International Broadcasting Operations. I realize there is a large amount of money in today's tight budgetary constraints. However, international broadcasting is in desperate need of new and stronger transmitters to counteract the increase of jamming practices by oppressive regimes of Asia. Expansion of Internet capability is also greatly needed as the Internet continues to become accessible to more people.

Any increase in funding allowing for the expansion of these services would make a significant difference for the Broadcasting Board of Governors and be a beacon of light to billions of Asians living under repressive regimes.

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement and his long-standing efforts on behalf of International Broadcasting.

Should H.R. 4444 become law, and additional funding be provided in our allocation, we will endeavor to fund Radio Free Asia, Voice of America, and Broadcasting Capital Improvements at a level which reflects the increasing needs in Asia.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the chairman for his acknowledgment of my request and his support for International Broadcasting.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and as a Member of Congress who has two Weed and Seed sites in his district in Michigan, one in Benton Harbor and one in Kalamazoo, I know very well how valuable the Weed and Seed is to the people who live there.

I commend the chairman for recognizing the value of the Weed and Seed program and recognizing that the best solutions to crime problems are customized to neighborhood needs, which is at the very core of the Weed and Seed program.

The bill before us tonight provides \$33.5 million for Weed and Seed, which is the amount that was appropriated in the fiscal year 2000 bill. However, in previous years, the Department of Justice was permitted to reprogram other funds to the Weed and Seed program, increasing the level of funds available to the program. For instance, in fiscal year 2000, the program received \$40 million.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the gentleman from Kentucky might

be able to give me an assurance that he will work to assure that the Weed and Seed program will receive at least as much funding in 2001 as we received in fiscal year 2000.

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his work on this issue.

I will work to assure the program is funded in fiscal 2001 at least at the level of funds available in the current year.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I have concerns regarding the level of funding provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology's scientific and technical research and services account, including the Global Standards Program.

As the chairman knows, the Global Standards Program is intended to provide guidance to industries and to facilitate global harmonization of standards where possible. An issue has come to my attention that involves standards for anchor bolts that are post-installed in concrete.

The Transatlantic Business Dialogue has recommended that NIST facilitate a transparent standards harmonization process for these products, which are sold in Europe and the United States. Is it the gentleman's opinion that this bill provides adequate funding for this effort?

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would advise the gentlewoman that, yes, I do believe this is a function that would be adequately covered by the funding provided in the bill for NIST. It is my understanding that NIST has begun a technical analysis on this very issue.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for clarifying this issue for me.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 53 offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (page 107, after line 21) the following new title:

**TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to seek the revocation or revision of the laws or regulations of another country that relate to intellectual property rights with respect to pharmaceuticals or other medical technologies and comply with the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment such that it explicitly applies only when the United States Trade Representative is engaged in a Special 301 process established under the 1974 Trade Act and that it applies only to developing countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 53 offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be:

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the United States Trade Representative to seek the revocation or revision of the laws or regulations of a developing country under the Special 301 process established under the Trade Act of 1974 as amended that relate to intellectual property rights with respect to pharmaceuticals or other medical technologies and comply with the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN)?

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for an explanation of his modification.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, malaria killed 1.1 million people last year; 2.2 million people, mostly children, died of diarrheal infections; 2.3 million died of AIDS; 1.5 million of tuberculosis. Mr. Chairman, we know how to treat each of these diseases. We could have saved the lives of many of these people.

Countries around the world are attempting to expand access to desperately needed prescription drugs by pursuing competitive strategies explicitly permitted under international trade agreements. The USTR, on behalf of the global prescription drug industry, has made a practice of pressuring these nations to forsake legitimate strategies that can achieve lower prices; strategies like parallel importing and compulsory licensing.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation and object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Both of these practices, parallel importing and compulsory licensing, are explicitly permitted under a world trade agreement commonly referred to as TRIPS. The WTO TRIPS accord sets

global norms for patents, for trademarks, for copyrights, and for other types of intellectual property.

It is a tough set of requirements. For example, it requires all WTO member countries, including the United States, to adopt 20-year patents on medicines, even though under our patent law our patent length was 17 years.

The WTO TRIPS agreement requires many poor countries to adopt rules that actually raise the price of their medicines. The USTR, on behalf of the prescription drug industry, is pushing countries to abandon fully sanctioned actions, like parallel importing and compulsory licensing.

It is difficult to believe the U.S. is participating in efforts to prevent developing countries from fighting back when drug companies ignore the dire consequences of their actions and abuse their monopoly power, for example, when they impose higher prices in developing countries than in industrialized nations, as in the case with AIDS drug Fluconazole.

□ 2130

U.S. trade officials have pressured South Africa, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, and many other poor nations, threatening sanctions unless they forsake rights they have under the TRIPS agreement.

In many of these countries, the average income is less than \$1 a day.

In December last year, President Clinton told the WTO it was time to change U.S. trade policy, to consider the issue of access to medicines.

In May, the President issued an executive order prohibiting the USTR from pressuring sub-Saharan African nations into giving up legitimate competitive strategies aimed at expanding access to HIV/AIDS drugs.

In justifying his decision to reign in the USTR, the President asserted "it is in the interest of the United States to take all reasonable steps to prevent further spread of infectious disease, particularly HIV/AIDS. The TRIPS agreement recognizes the importance of promoting effective and adequate protection of intellectual property rights and the right of countries to adopt measures necessary to protect public health."

Our amendment is grounded in that same logic.

The United States should enforce the TRIPS agreement to ensure the proper protection of property rights to be sure, but it should not undercut the balance TRIPS strikes between protecting intellectual property and promoting the public health.

The President's executive order applies only to AIDS drugs and only to sub-Saharan Africa. Our amendment says the United States should not interfere in legitimate efforts to expand access to essential medicines in developing countries in health crises.

This amendment does not undercut in any way intellectual property pro-

tections. It permits the U.S. to insist on tough provisions of the WTO TRIPS agreement, but it prevents the U.S. Government from seeking to impose so-called "TRIPS Plus" protections on countries when these more onerous protections would have a negative impact on access to medicine.

Not only is this policy appropriate from a public health point of view, it is also consistent with the WTO TRIPS agreement itself. Article I of the TRIPS agreement says "Members may, but shall not be obliged to, implement in their law more extensive protection than is required by this Agreement." The key phrase is "not obliged to."

The United States should honor, in fact we should applaud, policies in other countries that place the health and well-being of people ahead of the profit goals of the prescription drug industry.

Hindering efforts to combat debilitating and fatal diseases on behalf of the global prescription drug industry is an unjustifiable and counterproductive use of our Nation's power and influence. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, helps us to put a stop to it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not belong on this bill. It is a subject for the Committee on Ways and Means. It is within their jurisdiction. And they are objecting. In addition, the administration is strongly opposing the amendment. It will bog down this bill.

So, for all of the foregoing reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Brown amendment. The Brown amendment compromises USTR's ability to protect U.S. intellectual property rights around the world for U.S. pharmaceutical companies and medical device manufacturers.

Section 315 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act clearly states that it is U.S. policy to seek enactment and implementation of foreign intellectual property laws that strengthen and supplement TRIPS. The Brown amendment directly contradicts this provision, conflicting with U.S. law.

The pharmaceutical and medical technologies industry depend on consistent and fair trade rules, including those that protect intellectual property rights. Without such practices, companies and those who invest in them will be discouraged from providing the necessary capital to pursue the development of new medicines.

A consistent theme in U.S. trade policy is encouraging an environment

based on rule of law around the world that U.S. firms need to be able to compete. The Brown amendment sends countries conflicting messages that we would like them to provide the highest degree of intellectual property protection in every category except pharmaceuticals and medical technology.

Ironically, the Brown amendment, which is intended to help poor countries, will actually hurt them by reducing their ability to attract foreign investment. Developing countries need the transfer of technology and know-how for their economic growth and stronger, not weaker, intellectual protection is the way to get it.

In short, the Brown amendment is the wrong solution to increasing the access of developing countries to pharmaceuticals and medical technologies. Instead of stripping U.S. firms of their legal rights, we should seek to encourage partnerships between U.S. pharmaceutical firms and developing countries.

For example, several U.S. firms are already involved in pilot programs to increase access to AIDS drugs in African countries. Encouraging growing economies, as we are doing in the recently enacted African Growth and Opportunity Act, also enables developing countries to have the resources to purchase drugs without discouraging further innovation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Brown amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a hard-working member of our committee.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have a system of patents for a reason, to protect intellectual property rights of the people who create new inventions and products, as well as protect the efficacy of the actual product. And the efficacy of drug products and medicines are important. It is all about safeguarding patients, patients around the world.

Our U.S. Trade Representative, Charlene Barshefsky, has been pursuing the enforcement of U.S. patent laws in virtually every international market and she has done so effectively. As the U.S. representative for the fair treatment of U.S. products anywhere and everywhere in the world, this is her charge.

This amendment basically tells that representative to stop doing her job. That is not only wrong, it is dangerous.

I know that the intent of the gentleman is to help those suffering from horrendous diseases, such as AIDS and other diseases in Africa and other places, by guaranteeing access to prescription medicine at the cheapest cost. But, with all due respect to the

gentleman, this is not the way to achieve his goal and he will not likely achieve his goal.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns about this amendment. A year ago, on the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill, we debated the Sanders amendment dealing very specifically with Asian and African countries applying specifically to pharmaceuticals.

The amendment now that we have before us seems to me to apply far beyond pharmaceuticals to any medical technology. It could cover laser equipment used in cosmetic surgery, prohibit the executive branch from encouraging nations to provide TRIPS Plus protection to patents which cover such laser technologies.

It also seems like the Sanders amendment last year was designed to make pharmaceuticals more affordable. It specifically was approaching trade representative activities which enforced patent laws that would make drugs more expensive. This does not have that kind of limitation.

The Brown amendment would prohibit the executive branch from seeking to appeal a TRIPS compliant law covering IPR and pharmaceuticals that is intended to discriminate against U.S. pharmaceuticals.

So a Western European law that has nothing to do with getting drugs to Africa, which has nothing to do with dealing with the crisis in Africa, but which is designed to discriminate against U.S.-made pharmaceuticals or medical technologies, the USTR would be prohibited from focusing on it if it did not violate TRIPS.

I think that it may overreach in that regard, and that is why I have some concerns about this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. VITTER

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 76 offered by Mr. VITTER: Page 107, after line 21, insert the following:

**TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 801. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for participation by United States delegates to the Standing Consultative Commission in any activity of the Commission to implement the Memorandum of Under-

standing Relating to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems of May 26, 1972, entered into in New York on September 26, 1997, by the United States, Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, and Ukraine.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would block the implementation of unratified limitation on missile defense. Precisely the same amendment, word for word, passed the House last year by voice vote and the previous year before that by a significant margin. And so, this amendment would merely continue that status quo in the law and not change present law.

Mr. Chairman, on September 26, 1997, the Clinton administration entered into a Memorandum of Understanding and related treaties with Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, and the Ukraine. If ratified, these treaties would strengthen the 1972 ABM Treaty with the former Soviet Union and impose new and severe restrictions on America's ability to develop and deploy missile defense systems.

But these agreements have not been submitted to the Senate and they have not been ratified. And that is why this amendment should pass, so that they are not implemented unless and until the U.S. Senate considers and ratifies those agreements.

Mr. Chairman, these agreements, the MOU and related documents, essentially do two things. First of all, they change the parties to the 1972 ABM Treaty, substituting for the USSR: Kazakhstan, Belarus, Russia, and the Ukraine. Secondly, and more importantly, they really expand the Treaty and expand the scope to disallow more theatre and missile defense systems.

The original 1972 Treaty places no limitations on theatre missile defense. These new demarcation agreements would prohibit the U.S. from being able to fully develop our theatre missile defense systems. And that is, of course, why these agreements are so important.

Now, the Clinton administration has frankly admitted there is no debate, and this House has voted many times that this is a new treaty and, therefore, must be put before the United States Senate and ratified by the United States Senate. This has never happened. And that is why we should pass this amendment to prevent implementation unless and until the Senate takes up and ratifies these new treaties.

As I said, this passed last year by a voice vote. It passed the year before that by a substantial margin. I would certainly implore the House to pass it again this year.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I seek the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because this issue has come up in previous years. The State Department has opposed it.

In the past, the State Department, during conference, has been able to get language added, making it subject to a presidential certification. And that language is not in the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) today.

This amendment is unnecessary because the administration has already said that it will not implement the September 1997 Memorandum of Understanding on secession to the ABM Treaty prior to its ratification by the Senate.

In a letter and report provided to the chairman of the Senate and House Committee on Appropriations dated February 9, 1999, the President certified and affirmed that the United States Government is not implementing the Memorandum of Understanding. The way it is currently worded, without the President's certification language, the State Department would be prevented from sending representatives to meetings because it would prohibit money for any participation. The State Department wants to be able to participate in meetings even though it is not implementing the agreement. If the prohibition is on implementation but the State Department is not implementing, they can attend meetings with the presidential certification.

In our view, Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to obstruct the arms control dialogue. It is unnecessary and it is unjustified.

What we are saying is simply that the way this amendment is worded at this particular time will hamper ongoing discussions about arms control unnecessarily.

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

□ 2145

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, with regard to the issue of the certification, if the certification language were in this amendment, it would then be subject to a point of order. So for that very simple parliamentary reason, that certification language cannot be put in this amendment on the House floor. Should the process, as in previous years, yield that certification language, I would not object; and I would suggest we should move the process along by passing this amendment as it has evolved in previous years.

Also, if, as the gentleman on the other side said in opposition, this amendment is not necessary, then neither he nor the administration should

object to it. In fact, I believe the standing consultative commission does offer this administration the opportunity to implement and to push forward unratified new treaties. That is clearly inappropriate. The way to push forward these treaties, if they are in the best interest of the country, is to submit them to the United States Senate and have the Senate decide the issue. That is their constitutional duty; and, in fact, it is beyond debate.

The administration has agreed that if it is a new treaty, it must be submitted to the Senate. So this amendment is merely a very wise, precautionary measure and may, in fact, yield the certification language as this appropriation bill moves through the process.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we simply disagree on this issue. Without the language concerning a presidential certification, we continue to object.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would simply close by saying that, in fact, we are talking about brand new agreements, treaties, which have never been submitted to the Senate, never been debated or ratified by the Senate. So clearly this is an appropriate, a wise, a conservative and cautionary amendment. It has been adopted the last 2 years. I would not object to the certification language if it is included as it moves through the process. So in that vein, I urge the House to adopt this amendment as it has the previous two years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to make note of a particular issue. On October 25, 1980, The Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction established reciprocal rights and duty to expedite the return of children to their state of habitual residence, as well as ensure that rights of custody and of access under the laws of one contracting State are respected in other contracting States.

Subsequent to this convention, over 50 countries have become signatory members. Yet, egregious cases abound. A critical step to protecting our American children is making sure that U.S. Federal and State courts are aware of international parental abduction issues and The Hague Convention. Current

law requires that the State Department prepare an annual report on the status of this Hague Convention. Unfortunately, the State Department has been reluctant to distribute their report to our courts. By providing State and Federal courts access to this document, judges will be better equipped to render decisions in custody cases that are in the best interest of the child.

Mr. Chairman, on May 23 of this year, every single Member of this distinguished body who was present voted to support passage of a resolution, the purpose of which was to highlight our interest in making sure that American children and parents remain in this country. Every single Member of this House voted for H. Con. Res. 293 to urge the Secretary of State, in part, to disseminate to all Federal and State courts the Department of State's annual report to Congress on Hague Convention compliance.

As the chairman takes this bill to conference, I ask him to keep this issue in mind and endeavor to ensure that the State Department complies with the guidance in H. Con. Res. 293.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman bringing this issue to our attention. I would be happy to work with the gentleman as the bill proceeds to conference to see if we can address the gentleman's concerns and congratulate him on the work that he has done on the issue.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. ALLEN:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 624. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading "Administration of Foreign Affairs — Diplomatic and Consular Programs", \$200,000 shall be available only for bilateral and multilateral diplomatic activities designed to promote the termination of the North Korean ballistic missile program.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering designates a small amount, \$200,000, of the State Department's diplomatic account for bilateral and multilateral activities designed to promote the termination of the North Korean ballistic missile program. Everyone agrees we must address the potential threat of a ballistic missile attack by Korea. The question is, what is the most effective and economical way to

deal with the threat? Some argue the best way, the only way, to deal with North Korea is to build a defensive shield and then hope that it can shoot down a missile after it is launched.

This approach assumes, of course, that a national missile defense would work as advertised, which has not been proven and could not be fooled by decoy technology, which we may never be sure of.

We must continue to research and test national missile defense more rigorously than we are now, but given the technological uncertainties, NMD remains a risky and expensive option to deal with the North Korean threat. It is safer and cheaper to deal with a missile that has never been built than to gamble that it can be hit after its launch.

Last year, the administration conducted a comprehensive North Korea policy review led by former Defense Secretary William Perry. It concluded that the urgent focus of U.S. policy toward North Korea must be to end its nuclear weapons and long range missile-related activities for which the U.S. should be prepared to establish more normal diplomatic relations with North Korea and join in South Korea's policy of engagement and peaceful co-existence.

We have already seen progress. Last year North Korea pledged to suspend tests of its long range missile in exchange for easing of U.S. sanctions. North Korea reaffirmed the pledge last week. Skeptics say trust their deeds, not their words, and I agree; but the fact is North Korea has not tested its Taepo Dong 1 missile in the 2 years since the first provocative test. Some may scoff at the notion of negotiating with a Stalinist state, but it is worth exploring.

In the June edition of Arms Control Today, Leon Sigal, an expert on North Korea and security issues, presents a cogent case that based on past experience cooperation with Pyongyang can work. He finds that the best strategy for ending North Korea's nuclear and missile programs and ensuring peace in northeast Asia is cooperative threat reduction.

The historic North-South Korea summit offers the chance to foster improved security conditions in the region. The Perry review found that South Korea and Japan and even China share our interests in reducing the North Korean threat. We should take advantage of the opportunity.

This amendment sends a congressional signal of support for continued diplomatic efforts to reduce the North Korean missile threat. This not only makes security sense; it makes fiscal sense. Diplomatic efforts to end the threat can be done at pennies on the national missile defense dollar, which is a \$60 billion program. The funding in this amendment is one-hundredth of 1 percent of the amount we will spend next year, \$2 billion on national missile defense. There is more than one way to

reduce the North Korean threat, and some ways are cheaper than others.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to micromanage and tie the State Department's hands, so I will, at an appropriate time, withdraw the amendment; but I think it is important to indicate Congress' support for diplomatic avenues to end the North Korean missile threat.

Subject to any comments on the other side, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. VITTER

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 77 offered by Mr. VITTER: Page 107, after line 21, insert the following:

**TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 801. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be available to the Department of State to approve the purchase of property in Arlington, Virginia by the Xinhua News Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to this bill that will send a strong signal to the State Department that this body insists that they enforce the law. This amendment lets State know that we want them to require the Chinese Communist Government to request approval for their purchase of an apartment building overlooking the Pentagon, and that this body wants State to deny that approval.

At issue is the purchase of an Arlington apartment building by the Xinhua News Agency. The Chinese Government owns Xinhua and the Foreign Missions Act of 1985 requires foreign embassies to obtain prior authorization from our State Department for the purchase of U.S. property, and it explicitly covers operations like Xinhua.

Furthermore, the authoritative Chinese intelligence operations, published by the Naval Institute Press, reports that in a number of publicized spy scandals intelligence officers used Xinhua to provide operations cover. The Foreign Missions Act clearly is applicable to the purchase of this building by Xinhua. The name of the complex, Pentagon Ridge Apartments, vividly describes its strategic location. Occupancy of this building will allow Chinese intelligence operatives to gather information using a variety of

means. These include direct observation via telescope of documents being viewed in outside offices, the collection of electronic impulses emanated by computer screens in the building and the use of laser microphones to eavesdrop on conversations.

In short, this building is an ideally suited spy tower designed to capture our military secrets.

If this were a unique occurrence, there would be no need perhaps for this body to act, but unfortunately this is just one more in a sorry series of security breakdowns that have taken place on the Clinton administration's watch. Missile secrets to China, laughable security at Los Alamos, Russian microphones and missing laptops at the State Department, the list just goes on and on, and unfortunately this is just one more item on the list.

In this case, our security agencies did not even know the Chinese Government interest in procuring this building, a strategically important building.

Now, a few weeks ago, Energy Secretary Richardson blamed the University of California for the missile computer hard drives at Los Alamos. What will Secretary of State Albright do, blame the Arlington Board of Realtors for this fiasco?

I recognize that this amendment covers spending for the next fiscal year and would not prevent State Department approval this year, but I hope that a very strong show of support for the amendment will encourage the State Department to do the right thing and block Xinhua's acquisition of this strategically located building.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I will not oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment. I do not think it is necessary. I appreciate the gentleman bringing the issue to the attention of the Congress and the country, particularly in light of the recent bugging of the State Department headquarters building itself. The State Department tells us that this sale to the Chinese Government news agency does require their approval, so they agree with us. State will consult with the intelligence community, and it is my expectation that they will not approve the sale.

Furthermore, I am told State would likely take action on this matter before the end of this fiscal year. So I hope this provision will prove unnecessary, but I do support the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the subcommittee chairman for his kind words. I too hope that the State Department does the right thing, whatever action or lack of action this House

would take. I simply do not have full confidence in that; and I think it is reasonable for me, for all of us, to lack that confidence given the past recent history of security breaches under this administration, and that is really the very important context in which I bring this amendment. I do realize that this amendment only covers the next fiscal year, but I hope that a significant vote by this body will be a very strong and telling message to the State Department that they must act decisively to block the Communist Chinese Government from obtaining this literal spy tower on the Pentagon.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

□ 2200

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 529, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CAPUANO

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, I believe it is Amendment No. 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the amendment addresses a paragraph already passed in the reading.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts ask unanimous consent for its present consideration?

Mr. CAPUANO. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, which amendment is this, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection, but I do reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. CAPUANO:

Page 107, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 624. (a) Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Common Carrier Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission shall conduct a study on the area code crisis in the United States. Such study shall examine the causes and potential solutions to the growing number of area codes in the United States, including the following:

(1) Shortening the lengthy timeline for implementation of the Federal Communications Commission's recent order mandating 1,000 number block pooling.

(2) Repealing the wireless carrier exemption from the Federal Communications Commission's 1,000 number block pooling order.

(3) The issue of rate center consolidation and possible steps the Commission can take

to encourage or require States or telecommunications companies, or both, to undertake plans to deal with this issue.

(4) The feasibility of technology-specific area codes reserved for wireless or paging services or data phone lines.

(5) Strengthening the sanctions against telecommunications companies that do not address number use issues.

(6) The possibility of single number block pooling as a potential solution to the area code crisis.

(7) The costs and technological issues surrounding adding an additional digit to existing phone numbers and potential ways to minimize the impact on consumers.

(b) Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall submit to the Congress a report on the results of the study required by subsection (a).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for allowing me the unanimous consent request.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with probably one of the few issues that will affect every single American, has affected most Americans already and will do so within the next 5 years, every single American; namely: the issue of area codes.

In 1947, the North American Numbers Plan was enacted to establish the current numbering of all of our telephones, seven numbers with three digit area codes. As of 1994, we had 151 area codes. In the last 5 years, that number has doubled, and as of 1999, the people that administer this, the Lockheed Martin, estimates that by the year 2007, we will be completely out of telephone numbers based on the current explosion of telecommunications.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is simply ask the FCC to have a study and issue a report to this Congress as to what they intend to do about this situation. Mr. Chairman, there are many things that we could do that we could suggest to the FCC, but at the same time, I think it is incumbent upon them to tell us if they have a plan that they intend to implement in the manner that will save lots of Americans lots of money.

Many of us have been through situations where area codes have been added, or others have been through situations where area codes have been overlaid so that many Americans today have to dial 10 digits simply to call across the street. Many people certainly have to dial 10 digits to get to the town next door because so many area codes have been added in this country; that situation is going to get horrendously worse each and every day.

Just last year, the FCC cited 25 additional area codes as those, quote, in jeopardy. That happened since just last June. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a simple amendment. It does not propose that we know the answers, it simply asks the FCC to provide us with their proposals as to what the answers will be.

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

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI, because the amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAPUANO. Only momentarily, Mr. Chairman, I understand and respect the point of order, and I would say that the next time I come here on this issue, I will actually be proposing suggestions for the FCC to do, because if I am going to get ruled out of order, I may as well get ruled out of order on something substantive as opposed to simply a request for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment proposes to change existing law, to wit: mandating a study by the Federal Communications Commission. As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

#### Amendment No. 52 offered by Mr. BLUNT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (page 107, after line 21) the following new title:

#### TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the United States-European Union Consultative Group on Biotechnology, unless the United States Trade Representative certifies that the European Union has a timely, transparent, science-based regulatory process for the approval of agricultural biotechnology products.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and rise to say that I

am proposing this amendment because of my sincere concerns for the US-EU Consultative Group on Biotechnology.

This amendment would guarantee that none of the funds appropriated under the Act may be used to participate in or support activities of the consulting group unless the U.S. Trade Representative certifies that the European Union is operating in a timely and science-based process of approvals for new plant varieties, including those developed using biotechnology.

What we have seen too often is the European Union used this as an excuse not to let our products into this market. There are already 31 groups that have been designated to focus on this subject, I think that is about 30 too many, and the subject of delays brings me to a second reason to offer this amendment.

For the past 2 years, the European Union has failed to complete the procedures necessary for marketing biotech food products in member States. In so doing, they are in violation of rules established by the World Trade Organization that require a science-based process for the decision or lack thereof they made regarding agricultural biotechnology. Instead, the establishment of yet another group to study biotechnology is simply a transparent attempt to string their inactivity along.

Our friends and farmers in the agricultural community need help today. As the Government, it is imperative that we make the necessary commitment to look at real solutions to these European trade issues and not to continue to let these studies go on in a way that keeps our products out of the market.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I find it ironic that today as world scientists are heralding the breakthrough and mapping human genetics that the European Union remains in the dark ages regarding advancements in plant science.

The European Union has demonstrated extreme reluctance in implementing an approval process for genetically enhanced foods. I think that this inaction will be prolonged by the recently announced consultative forum.

As my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) has talked about America's farmers who have been struggling now for the 3rd consecutive year of depressed prices, but they are not the only ones that are going to be affected by the European Union's inaction.

Around the world, 170 million preschool kids are undernourished. In Third World countries, ag biotechnology can help develop new varieties that will survive the harshest climates. These countries will not be able

to undertake effective biotech research without the support, but, more importantly, without the consensus of developed countries.

Besides fighting famine and besides caring for the world's growing population, genetic crop enhancement can also help environmental causes such as reduction of pesticide use, groundwater pollution and topsoil erosion.

In short, as I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) that we would prefer the provision of the amendment be included in this year's appropriations bill. We also respect the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I do urge the administration to insist the U.S. participation and the forum be contingent on agreement by the European Union to restart its approval process. Mr. Chairman, let us fight hunger not biotechnology.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) reserve his time?

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, while I am not in opposition to this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that I can control the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to inform Members of the House that just this week we sent a letter from 25 of our Members to the President asking him to recognize that EU inaction and insist that our trading partners in Europe agree to mend the regulatory process in order to allow for a science-based approval process of new plant varieties, including varieties developed through the use of modern biotechnology.

It seems that today science has taken a back seat to political considerations and as a result, our farmers are caught in an untenable situation. The situation was recently complicated further when our government agreed to enter into a consultative process with the EU. The U.S.-EU consultative forum has been formed to negotiate issues related to biotechnology. Discussion is always a healthy exercise, and under different circumstances, I and others who signed a letter to the President would unreservedly welcome the opportunity to sit down with EU representatives. In fact, we have welcomed the opportunity with open arms in the form of 30 other such groups that are currently discussing related biotech issues. However, we must now stand behind America's farmers who are losing critical markets.

Corn farmers are losing an estimated \$200 million annually, and hundreds of millions in other agriculture exports

are being lost. We must send a message to the EU that while we welcome dialogue, we insist that the meeting of this particular forum be contingent upon agreement by EU nations to restart its approval process for biotechnology products.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important message that we are sending here tonight, and I urge thorough consideration by this body.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me further say that America's farmers and food processors deserve action, not just continued talk as my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) have already pointed out, there are many studies going on.

We are losing an estimated \$200 million a year in corn sales and as many millions in other ag exports. How can we justify spending taxpayers' money, including the tax money that our farmers pay on a process that promises to keep them out of the market or more likely promises to keep them twisting in the wind.

Mr. Chairman, the safety of agricultural biotechnology has been firmly established. Our own Agriculture Secretary, Dan Glickman, has stated that, quote, our best science is to search for risk. Without exception the biotech products on our shelves have proven safe, and millions of people worldwide have consumed biotech foods without a single adverse incident.

Furthermore, respected scientific and policy-oriented organizations, along with renowned scientists and humanitarians have lined up in favor of agricultural biotechnology. They advocate for a process that is increasing crop yields, creating nutritious crops that promise to improve the health and welfare of millions.

These crops are raised in an environmentally safe and friendly way. It means better production on fewer acres with less fertilizer, less chemicals, less pesticides. This is exactly the direction that the environment should be headed, biotechnology is part of that solution. It has now reached a point where reasonable people must ask really the question, is this really about biotechnology or is it about something else?

It is an easy conclusion. The European Union nations are clearly trying to protect their farmers from superior products that we can send into that market. Regardless of its motives, the EU has an obligation under the rules of the WTO to act responsibly and establish a science-based system for conducting a risks assessment of biotech products.

Added conversation in consulting forums is not going to get this done. Only the resolve of the EU members, a resolve to, at a minimum, incorporate an approval process, will see that this goal and see that it is met.

We must move forward. We must open these markets. We must insist that the rules of the free trade, the rules of the marketplace are fairly applied to Missouri farmers and to American farmers, to California farmers, to all of those who can participate in this new and significantly enhanced way.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Blunt amendment.

At first glance, the United States-European Union Consultative Forum on Biotechnology appears to be a step toward opening Europe's doors to our ag biotech products. When you look again, you start to wonder what the purpose of this group may actually be. The U.S. Trade Representative has no press release on the formation of the Consultative Forum; I've only seen news clippings. My staff has contacted the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for information, but received no call back. If the Consultative Forum is so significant, you would think that information on it would be made readily available. I see no reason why such an organization should be funded by the U.S. Congress if we neither know the purpose nor the possible outcome of negotiations.

Currently, there are over 30 organizations looking into the different issues surrounding biotechnology. Will this "Forum" be anything different than the others? I don't think so. The U.S. Government must have some agreement by the E.U. to restart its approval process before we move forward with another "Forum" on this issue. It cannot be yet another excuse to avoid action.

This amendment should be adopted to ensure the adequate and effective protection of our U.S. agricultural goods produced through biotechnology. American farmers are waiting for the Clinton administration to take leadership on this delicate trade issue, and so far, USTR seems to be stuck in a holding pattern. It's time for our biotech trading policy to be taken off autopilot and moved forward to assist our struggling American farmers.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment from my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri. This amendment would prohibit funding of the United States-European Union Consultative Group on Biotechnology until such time as the U.S. trade representative certifies that the E.U. has a transparent, science-based, and fair regulatory process for approving agricultural biotechnology products.

Mr. Chairman, on April 13, I released a report, Seeds of Opportunity, that reviewed the benefits, risks, and oversight of agricultural biotechnology. What I found is that biotechnology is safe and has incredible potential to enhance nutrition, feed a growing world population, open up new markets for farmers, and reduce the environmental impact of farming. Its potential benefits are limited only by the imagination and resourcefulness of our scientists.

However, despite an unblemished record of safety, this technology has come under attack from well-financed activist groups who have created an atmosphere of fear in Europe. Europe's political leaders have capitalized on these concerns to promote protectionist regulatory policies that have shut out American farm products from European markets. In a free-trade environment, trade decisions should be science-based, as World Trade Organization rules stipulate.

I think it is worth noting that no new agricultural biotechnology product has been approved in Europe for over 18 months. American researchers and farmers need to know that they will have a market for their products. The U.S. trade office should ensure that access to existing markets for agricultural products is maintained and that international agreements are neutral with respect to the products of agricultural biotechnology.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see the point in moving ahead with the U.S.-E.U. Consultative Group while the E.U. continues to persist with protectionist policies that violate the spirit, if not the letter, of WTO rules. This amendment sends a strong message to the E.U. that the United States will not tolerate E.U. foot-dragging that hurts U.S. farmers and an emerging biotechnology industry. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent request. Mr. Chairman, I understand that with the extent of this bill and with the fact that we do go beyond just eliminating the funding that this amendment may very well go beyond the scope of our rule on this bill. I hereby withdraw my amendment and hope to have the merits of the legislation considered by this House, by the President and the administration and, most importantly, by the European Union in a truly timely manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) knows, illegal immigration into the ninth district of Georgia has skyrocketed in recent years. North Georgia has quickly become a destination for people entering this country illegally. Word has spread throughout the communities that jobs are plentiful in our labor-intensive industries.

What once might have been called a trickle of illegal aliens into North Georgia has turned into an outright flood. A recent study completed by Georgia State University concludes that in Hall County, Georgia, where I live, there could be an illegal immigration population of over 65,000.

This is especially alarming because of the overall population of the country is only 120,000. The schools, health care, delivery system, and judicial system have all seen a dramatic influx of residents who do not have legal status in our country. This has had a drastic and debilitating impact on the social services that our community is able to provide.

□ 2215

But despite the growing problem of illegal immigration in my district, I am happy to report renewed optimism. The Quick Response Teams, or QRTs which the gentleman and his subcommittee have developed, have proved to be a tremendous success where fully implemented. The city of Dalton, Georgia, which is one of the cities most affected by illegal immigration in my district, has benefited greatly from the presence of a QRT team.

These teams of INS agents work with State and local law enforcement to identify, apprehend, and remove criminal and illegal aliens. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the interior enforcement of our immigration laws. Too few Members have had the courage to substantively address this issue. It is my hope that we can expand these successful QRTs to other communities that are dealing with this problem such as Hall County, Georgia. I would simply ask for the gentleman's commitment and for his continued support of interior enforcement of our immigration laws and especially the Quick Response Teams.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for reminding us of this enormous problem in his district. I know of few districts that are impacted as significantly as the gentleman's district in Georgia. In fact, we included an additional \$11 million in the bill which was not requested by the administration to expand this QRT program around the country. In fact, I want to tell the gentleman that he is the inspiration for the QRT program, and I appreciate the problem he is facing in his home area, as well as other areas of the country; and I assure the gentleman that we will be happy to work with him as we proceed to address the problem.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to congratulate the subcommittee for increasing the funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. It is a very cost-effective Federal-State, public-private partnership that helps small and midsized American manufacturers modernize to compete in the global marketplace. As one of my small manufacturers said to me, it is fine if you vote for China trade. Please, just keep these critical dollars in place so we can keep up with the pace of change in technology and manufacturing organizations, stay competitive, and win.

Another of my manufacturers said to me, CONN/STEP, which is this MEP

program in Connecticut, is the only program helping us assure the survivability, the viability, and the profitability of our small shops. He and others have stressed how they rely on CONN/STEP for its remarkable, broad network of top professionals. No individual small manufacturer could develop such a network. He or she has neither the amount of work nor the time it takes to develop such a sophisticated network of interested engineering and technical experts. Yet, these top people are at the beck and call of the small manufacturers in my district because of the CONN/STEP program, one of the more than 70 MEP manufacturing centers throughout America. They are, indeed, in every State and in Puerto Rico.

My small manufacturers have depended on CONN/STEP to help them achieve 9000 certification, design new products, recruit new high-skilled employees, understand and adapt lean manufacturing techniques and, in general, keep pace with the truly incredible rate of change in manufacturing techniques and processes to improve precision and productivity and stay competitive. MEP funds are critical to the future of small manufacturing, and without strong small manufacturers, our global manufacturers cannot survive.

So I thank the chairman and his subcommittee for their foresightedness in increasing those funds.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks. The bill does provide \$104.8 million for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, and the gentlewoman has been one of the biggest supporters we have had, and we appreciate that.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on tomorrow, the House will consider the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. As was done for prior appropriations bills, we will be trying to develop a unanimous consent request that identifies the complete universe of amendments with time agreements on them. Previously, we had not attempted this until we were halfway through the consideration of the bill. There was proper criticism that debate on early amendments was unconstrained, but that debate on later amendments was constrained.

In order to treat everyone the same, we are seeing if we can make an agreement at the beginning of consideration of this bill tomorrow. To do this will mean that we will need to know the universe of amendments on the Energy and Water Development bill prior to tomorrow. Therefore, I am asking all Members who may have an amendment to this bill to please file it at the desk and have it printed in the RECORD by the end of today.

Also, if all Members who have amendments could contact the staff on

the energy and water development subcommittee with a suggested time for debate on their amendments, we would be able to develop a unanimous consent with the necessary input. I would appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this regard. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are at the end of the process here, or close to it; but I do want to take a moment before we do get to the end of the bill to thank the Members for their courtesies and for being as brief as we could be under the circumstances. We have had a great number of amendments, as all Members know, and the Members have been cooperative, and I appreciate that very, very much.

Also, I want to thank my ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), for being the gentleman that he is, my partner, if you will, on this bill. The teamwork with him has been heart-warming and, I think, fruitful.

Lastly, I want to again say to our staff on both sides of the aisle how dependent we are upon them and how much we appreciate their hard work, trying to keep our tempers under control all the while supplying us with the information necessary to help with the amendments and the bill itself. We cannot say enough for the work of our staff on the committee and on our personal staffs, both minority and majority staff members. We appreciate them very much. We would not be here without them.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. RUSH:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL  
APPROPRIATIONS  
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
PROGRAM FOR INVESTMENT IN  
MICROENTREPRENEURS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the PRIME Act (as added by section 725 of the Gramm-Leach Bliley Act (Pub. L. 106-102)), to be derived by transfer from the aggregate amount provided in this Act under the heading "National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration—Operations, Research, and Facilities" (and the amount specified under such heading for the National Weather Service), \$15,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, June 23, 2000, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am introducing this amendment to the Commerce, Justice,

State and the Judiciary appropriations bill to authorize \$15 million for the PRIME Act. The PRIME Act was signed into law as part of the Financial Services Act in November of 1999, but yet has not received any funding. Funding for the PRIME Act will provide the SBA the opportunity to establish a microenterprise technical assistance and capacity-building grant program.

Mr. Chairman, in our communities all across this country, there are small entrepreneurs with great ideas and aspirations toward furthering the business objectives to strengthen our commerce, but there are more than a few problems which they face. These entrepreneurs are usually unable to secure adequate funding, cannot market themselves to potential clients, are not educated with the business venture, and need the ability to lead their own lives.

The PRIME Act will provide assistance in the form of grants to qualified organizations. Qualified organizations are microenterprises that are very small businesses, that typically have fewer than 10 employees, and generally lack access to conventional loans, equity or other banking services. A qualified organization will be able to use these grants to provide training and technical assistance to disadvantaged entrepreneurs, provide training and capacity-building services to microenterprise development organizations and to aid in researching and developing the best practices in the field of microenterprise and technical assistance programs.

Mr. Chairman, the PRIME Act is necessary to help people start and maintain businesses, contribute to their own individual self-reliance, and to strengthen our commerce. If there was ever a real solution to encourage people to work hard to control their own destiny, then certainly PRIME is the answer.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, if at all possible.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this particular amendment. As the gentleman knows, this amendment passed out of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services with unanimous support, bipartisan support. It passed the House in the conference committee overwhelmingly, but yet the subcommittee has not funded it. I would ask the chairman, if he would be so kind, to work in the conference committee, if this bill passes this House, to try to secure funding for the PRIME Act. Again, it has been endorsed and supported by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and it has strong bipartisan support.

With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would entertain a motion to withdraw this amendment if we could reach an understanding of some kind and if we can have some kind of consideration from the chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. This is an unauthorized program that has been requested, and given the spending constraints that we have been operating under, there are a lot of new programs that we just were not able to fund, this included. This is certainly not alone; there are a lot of other programs that we were not able to find money to fund.

I am really concerned about the gentleman's amendment, though, because it would cut the National Weather Service by some \$15 million. The administration has already said that we have underfunded the Weather Service; and yet this would cut another \$15 million from such things as providing tornado warnings and flash flood warnings, winter storm warnings, hurricane warnings and the like. So I would hope that the gentleman could see his way clear to withdraw the amendment, and we can discuss the PRIME program as we proceed to final conclusion on the bill; and I would appreciate the gentleman's advice as we do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) has expired.

Does the gentleman seek to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to adding 1 minute on both sides?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would briefly yield, I made a misstatement, the program is authorized. I said it was unauthorized. It is authorized, in fact.

Mr. RUSH. Well, since it is authorized, Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman change his determination?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, we have been under severe funding constraints, and I will be happy to work with the gentleman as we proceed to see if there is some way to do that.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 2030

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I also want to join the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), in thanking both our staffs for the work they have done on this bill, and to thank him personally for his treatment of this ranking member, and the diplomatic way in which he deals with me. We have a special relationship.

I also want to reiterate to the chairman, as I said before, that I will be supporting this bill tonight. Many Members on this side of the aisle will not. I will support the bill with the intent to continue to work with the chairman to make this the bill that I think it should be when this process is over.

However, I have to be honest, that unless some very dramatic changes take place in this bill, the second time around the gentleman will see even less support on this side. I do that understanding the gentleman's desire to work with me and to work with us in making sure this becomes a better bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. VITTER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 367, noes 34, answered "present" 7, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—367

Abercrombie	Burton	Duncan
Aderholt	Buyer	Dunn
Allen	Callahan	Edwards
Andrews	Calvert	Ehlers
Archer	Camp	Ehrlich
Army	Canady	Emerson
Baca	Cannon	Engel
Bachus	Capps	English
Baird	Cardin	Eshoo
Baker	Castle	Etheridge
Baldacci	Chabot	Evans
Baldwin	Chambliss	Everett
Ballenger	Chenoweth-Hage	Ewing
Barcia	Clement	Fattah
Barr	Coble	Filner
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Fletcher
Barrett (WI)	Collins	Foley
Bartlett	Combest	Forbes
Barton	Condit	Ford
Bass	Cooksey	Fossella
Bateman	Costello	Fowler
Becerra	Cox	Franks (NJ)
Bentsen	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bereuter	Crane	Frost
Berkley	Crowley	Gallegly
Berry	Cubin	Ganske
Biggert	Cummings	Gejdenson
Bilbray	Cunningham	Gekas
Bilirakis	Danner	Gephardt
Bishop	Davis (FL)	Gibbons
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Gilchrest
Blunt	Deal	Gillmor
Boehlert	DeFazio	Gilman
Boehner	DeGette	Gonzalez
Bonilla	Delahunt	Goode
Bonior	DeLauro	Goodlatte
Bono	DeLay	Goodling
Borski	DeMint	Gordon
Boswell	Deutsch	Goss
Boucher	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Boyd	Dickey	Granger
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Green (TX)
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Green (WI)
Brown (FL)	Doolley	Greenwood
Brown (OH)	Doolittle	Gutknecht
Bryant	Doyle	Hall (OH)
Burr	Dreier	Hall (TX)

Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Saxton	Kilpatrick	McCollum	Schakowsky
Hayes	McKinney	Scarborough	Klink	McIntosh	Shows
Hayworth	McNulty	Schaffer	Lazio	Peterson (PA)	Shuster
Hefley	Meeke (NY)	Scott	Lipinski	Pomeroy	Talent
Heger	Menendez	Sensenbrenner	Manzullo	Rangel	Vento
Hill (IN)	Metcalfe	Serrano	Markey	Rush	Waxman
Hill (MT)	Mica	Sessions	Martinez	Ryun (KS)	
Hilleary	Millender-Shaw	Shadegg			
Hinojosa	McDonald	Shaw			
Hobson	Miller	Shays			
Hoeffel	Miller, Gary	Sherman			
Hoekstra	Miller, Gery	Sherwood			
Holden	Minge	Shimkus			
Holt	Moakley	Simpson			
Hooley	Mollohan	Sisisky			
Horn	Moore	Skeen			
Hostettler	Moran (KS)	Skelton			
Houghton	Morella	Slaughter			
Hoyer	Myrick	Smith (MI)			
Hulshof	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)			
Hunter	Neal	Smith (TX)			
Hutchinson	Nethercutt	Smith (WA)			
Hyde	Ney	Snyder			
Inslee	Northup	Souder			
Isakson	Norwood	Spence			
Istook	Nussle	Spratt			
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Stabenow			
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Ortiz	Stearns			
Jefferson	Ose	Stenholm			
Jenkins	Owens	Strickland			
John	Oxley	Stump			
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Stupak			
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Sununu			
Jones (NC)	Pascarell	Sweeney			
Kanjorski	Pastor	Tancredo			
Kaptur	Paul	Tanner			
Kasich	Pease	Tauscher			
Kelly	Pelosi	Tauzin			
Kennedy	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)			
Kildee	Petri	Taylor (NC)			
Kind (WI)	Phelps	Terry			
King (NY)	Pickering	Thomas			
Kingston	Pickett	Thompson (CA)			
Klecicka	Pitts	Thornberry			
Knollenberg	Pombo	Thune			
Kolbe	Porter	Thurman			
Kuykendall	Portman	Tiahrt			
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Tierney			
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Toomey			
Lampson	Quinn	Trafficant			
Largent	Radanovich	Turner			
Latham	Rahall	Udall (CO)			
LaTourette	Ramstad	Udall (NM)			
Leach	Regula	Upton			
Levin	Reyes	Visclosky			
Lewis (CA)	Reynolds	Vitter			
Lewis (GA)	Riley	Walden			
Lewis (KY)	Rivers	Walsh			
Linder	Rodriguez	Wamp			
LoBiondo	Roemer	Watkins			
Lofgren	Rogan	Watts (OK)			
Lowe	Rogers	Weiner			
Lucas (KY)	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)			
Lucas (OK)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)			
Luther	Rothman	Weller			
Maloney (NY)	Roukema	Wexler			
Mascara	Royal-Allard	Weygand			
Matsui	Royce	Whitfield			
McCarthy (MO)	Ryan (WI)	Wicker			
McCarthy (NY)	Sabo	Wilson			
Ford	Salmon	Wise			
McGovern	Sanchez	Wolf			
McHugh	Sanders	Wu			
McInnis	Sandlin	Wynn			
McIntyre	Sanford	Young (AK)			
	Sawyer	Young (FL)			

NOES—34

Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Berman	Hilliard	Oberstar
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Olver
Carson	Jones (OH)	Payne
Clay	Kucinich	Stark
Clayton	Lee	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Maloney (CT)	Towns
Conyers	McDermott	Velazquez
Coyne	Meek (FL)	Waters
Davis (IL)	Mink	Woolsey
Dingell	Moran (VA)	
Farr	Murtha	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Blumenauer	Lantos	Watt (NC)
Dixon	Larson	
Frank (MA)	Meehan	

NOT VOTING—26

Blagojevich	Cook	Hansen
Campbell	Gutierrez	Hinchey

□ 2251

Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, and Messrs. HILL of Montana, BLUNT, HOLT, ALLEN, CLEMENT, SHERMAN, WEXLER and CUMMINGS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from "no" to "present."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001".

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member supports and is deeply appreciative of the efforts of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and State, to address the many concerns within their jurisdiction. However, this Member rises to address a particular concern that is considered by the legislation before this body today. In particular, it is important to understand the security risks faced by U.S. embassy personnel and other public servants who are tasked with advancing America's interests overseas.

Following the devastating embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel (OPAP) was created. This Panel's recent report concluded that the U.S. overseas presence is near a state of crisis. Insecure and often decrepit facilities, obsolete information technology, outmoded administrative and human resource practices and poor allocation of resources threaten to cripple our nation's overseas capabilities. The percentage of the U.S. budget devoted to international affairs has been declining for four decades. The international affairs budget is now about 20% less in today's dollars than it was on average during the late 1970's and 1980's.

The legislation before this body today recommends a level for the Department of State and international broadcasting at \$6.6 billion. Although below the Administration's request, it represents a \$300 million increase over last year's enacted level. However, in a number of key areas recommended appropriations still fall far short of what is needed.

However, this Member would emphasize that he has serious doubts about the level of this Administration's commitment and progress in improving security for our overseas facilities. In past years the Administration's request for Embassy security funding has been woefully inadequate. This year, the Appropriations committee fully funded the Department's FY 2001 request of over \$1 billion for Embassy security (\$410 million for diplomatic and consular programs and \$648 million for the embassy security, construction and maintenance account.) However, the American Foreign Service Association is urging that Congress

appropriate \$200 million more than the Administration requested for overseas security. AFSA notes that 80 percent of our 260 posts abroad do not even meet current, much less Inman, security standards. With an additional \$100 million the Department could more than double the number of posts with upgraded perimeter security. The other \$100 million could provide enhanced protection from exploding glass windows at posts which are considered highly vulnerable. Otherwise, the level of precaution will not be reached under current circumstances for at least five years.

Mr. Chairman, there is a crying need for wholesale reform of the way our Embassies are financed and constructed, starting with changing OMB's scoring rules to allow lease/purchase and lease/buyback arrangements. It defies logic to constrain the leasing of secure, modern diplomatic facilities only for arcane budgetary scoring reasons—yet that is the case. The OPAP report provides an excellent series of recommendations that could help us build new secure facilities more quickly, which the Administration should seek to implement in their entirety as soon as possible.

Another area in which additional funds are needed is the capital investment fund which provides for new information technology and capital equipment. The Congress authorized \$150 million for this purpose, even though the Administration requested only \$97 million. Regrettably, the Committee provided only \$79.7 million, which is below even the current year's level. The OPAP report correctly notes that this is a critical need if we are to bring our representation abroad into the modern age.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this Member notes that on May 26th the President signed H.R. 3707 (P.L. 106–212), introduced by this Member, which authorizes \$75 million for the construction of a new facility for the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT). The current AIT is a dilapidated, rundown collection of buildings, or in some cases Quonset huts, that fails to meet even minimal security standards. The current AIT also fails to provide the necessary facility to adequately represent our country or to reflect the importance our country attaches to our long-standing, critically important relations with Taiwan. Construction of a new, secure facility will be an important indication that the U.S. presence will be maintained on Taiwan through the AIT for as long as it takes to assure that any reunification of China and Taiwan will be only by peaceful, non-coercive means.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this Member hopes the Appropriations Committee will in the future note the importance of this legislation, and that in turn the Department of State will act quickly to begin design and construction of a new facility.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4690) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001,

and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 529, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair announces that this vote will be followed by four 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules considered earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 195, answered “present” 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]  
YEAS—214

Abercrombie	Emerson	LaTourette
Aderholt	English	Leach
Archer	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Armey	Ewing	Lewis (KY)
Bachus	Fletcher	Linder
Baker	Foley	LoBiondo
Ballenger	Forbes	Lucas (KY)
Barcia	Fossella	Lucas (OK)
Barrett (NE)	Fowler	McCarthy (MO)
Bartlett	Franks (NJ)	McCrery
Barton	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Bass	Gallely	McKeon
Bateman	Ganske	Meek (FL)
Becerra	Gekas	Metcalf
Bereuter	Gibbons	Mica
Berry	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Biggart	Gillmor	Miller, Gary
Bilbray	Gilman	Mink
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Mollohan
Biley	Goodling	Moran (KS)
Blunt	Goss	Murtha
Boehlert	Granger	Myrick
Boehner	Green (WI)	Nethercutt
Bonilla	Greenwood	Ney
Bono	Gutknecht	Northup
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Nussle
Boyd	Hastert	Ortiz
Brady (TX)	Hastings (FL)	Ose
Bryant	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Burton	Hayes	Packard
Buyer	Hayworth	Pastor
Callahan	Hill (MT)	Pease
Calvert	Hilleary	Peterson (PA)
Camp	Hobson	Petri
Canady	Hoekstra	Pickering
Cannon	Horn	Pitts
Castle	Hostettler	Pombo
Chabot	Houghton	Porter
Collins	Hulshof	Portman
Combest	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Cooksey	Hutchinson	Quinn
Cox	Hyde	Radanovich
Cramer	Isakson	Ramstad
Cubin	Istook	Regula
Cunningham	John	Reyes
Davis (VA)	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Riley
DeLay	Kasich	Rogan
DeMint	Kelly	Rogers
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Dickey	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	Knollenberg	Roukema
Doollittle	Kolbe	Ryan (WI)
Dreier	Kuykendall	Salmon
Dunn	LaHood	Saxton
Ehlers	Largent	Scarborough
Ehrlich	Latham	Serrano

Sessions	Sununu
Shaw	Sweeney
Shays	Tauzin
Sherwood	Taylor (MS)
Shimkus	Taylor (NC)
Simpson	Terry
Skeen	Thomas
Smith (MI)	Thornberry
Smith (NJ)	Thune
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt
Souder	Traficant
Spence	Upton
Stabenow	Visclosky
Stearns	Vitter
Stump	Walden

Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—195

Ackerman	Gephardt	Oberstar
Allen	Gonzalez	Obey
Andrews	Goode	Olver
Baca	Gordon	Owens
Baird	Graham	Pallone
Baldacci	Green (TX)	Pascrell
Baldwin	Hall (OH)	Paul
Barr	Hefley	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Hill (IN)	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hinojosa	Phelps
Berman	Hoeffel	Pickett
Bishop	Holden	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Holt	Rahall
Bonior	Hoolley	Rivers
Borski	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Boswell	Inslee	Roemer
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Rothman
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Royce
Burr	Jefferson	Rush
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Capuano	Jones (NC)	Sanchez
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Sanders
Carson	Kanjorski	Sandlin
Chambliss	Kaptur	Sanford
Chenoweth-Hage	Kildee	Sawyer
Clay	Kind (WI)	Schaffer
Clayton	Kleccka	Schakowsky
Clement	Kucinich	Scott
Clyburn	LaFalce	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lampson	Shadegg
Coburn	Lantos	Sherman
Condit	Larson	Siskisky
Conyers	Lee	Skelton
Costello	Levin	Slaughter
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Crane	Lofgren	Snyder
Crowley	Lowey	Spratt
Cummings	Luther	Stark
Danner	Maloney (CT)	Stenholm
Davis (FL)	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
Davis (IL)	Mascara	Stupak
DeFazio	Matsui	Tancredo
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Delahunt	McDermott	Tauscher
DeLauro	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Deutsch	McInnis	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McIntyre	Thurman
Dixon	McKinney	Tierney
Doggett	McNulty	Toomey
Dooley	Meehan	Towns
Doyle	Meeks (NY)	Turner
Duncan	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Edwards	Millender-McDonald	Udall (NM)
Engel	Miller, George	Velazquez
Eshoo	Minge	Waters
Etheridge	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Evans	Moore	Weiner
Farr	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Fattah	Morella	Weygand
Filner	Nadler	Wise
Ford	Napolitano	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Neal	Wu
Frost	Norwood	Wynn
Gejdenson		

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Hergert  
NOT VOTING—25

Blagojevich	Klink	Rangel
Campbell	Lazio	Ryun (KS)
Cook	Lipinski	Shows
Gutierrez	Manzullo	Shuster
Hansen	Markey	Talent
Hinchey	Martinez	Vento
Jenkins	McCollum	Waxman
Kennedy	McIntosh	
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	

□ 2308

Mr. TOOMEY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BECERRA changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 326 I inadvertently voted “present.” I intended to vote “no.”

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in my District, I was unable to record my vote on the amendments offered to H.R. 4690 by Mr. SANFORD (Roll Call No. 322), Mr. OLVER (Roll Call No. 323), Mr. HOSTETTLER (Roll Call No. 324), Mr. VITTER (Roll Call No. 325), and on the vote for final passage of H.R. 4690, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State for Fiscal Year 2001 (Roll Call No. 326). Had I been present I would have voted “no” on Roll Call No. 322, “yes” on Roll Call No. 323, “no” on Roll Call No. 324, “yes” on Roll Call No. 325, and “no” on final passage, Roll Call No. 326.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H.R. 3417, by the yeas and nays;
- S. 148, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 4408, by the yeas and nays; and
- H.R. 3023, by the yeas and nays.

□

PRIBILOF ISLANDS TRANSITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3417, 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3417 as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 3, answered “present” 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie	Archer	Baker
Ackerman	Armey	Baldacci
Aderholt	Baca	Baldwin
Allen	Bachus	Ballenger
Andrews	Baird	Barcia

Barr	Evans	Lee
Barrett (NE)	Everett	Levin
Barrett (WI)	Ewing	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett	Farr	Lewis (GA)
Bass	Fattah	Lewis (KY)
Becerra	Filner	Linder
Bentsen	Fletcher	LoBiondo
Bereuter	Foley	Lofgren
Berkley	Forbes	Lowey
Berman	Ford	Lucas (KY)
Berry	Fossella	Lucas (OK)
Biggert	Fowler	Luther
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Maloney (CT)
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Maloney (NY)
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Bliley	Frost	Mascara
Blumenauer	Galleghy	Matsui
Blunt	Ganske	McCarthy (MO)
Boehkert	Gejdenson	McCarthy (NY)
Boehner	Gekas	McCrery
Bonilla	Gephardt	McDermott
Bonior	Gibbons	McGovern
Bono	Gilchrest	McHugh
Borski	Gillmor	McInnis
Boswell	Gilman	McIntyre
Boucher	Gonzalez	McKeon
Boyd	Goode	McKinney
Brady (PA)	Goodlatte	McNulty
Brady (TX)	Goodling	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Gordon	Meek (FL)
Brown (OH)	Goss	Meeks (NY)
Bryant	Graham	Menendez
Burr	Granger	Metcalf
Burton	Green (TX)	Mica
Buyer	Green (WI)	Millender-
Callahan	Greenwood	McDonald
Calvert	Gutknecht	Miller (FL)
Camp	Hall (OH)	Miller, Gary
Canady	Hall (TX)	Miller, George
Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Capps	Hastings (WA)	Mink
Capuano	Hayes	Moakley
Cardin	Hayworth	Mollohan
Carson	Herger	Moore
Castle	Hill (MT)	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hilleary	Moran (VA)
Chambliss	Hilliard	Morella
Chenoweth-Hage	Hinojosa	Murtha
Clay	Hobson	Myrick
Clayton	Hoefel	Nadler
Clement	Hoekstra	Napolitano
Clyburn	Holden	Neal
Coble	Holt	Nethercutt
Coburn	Hooley	Ney
Collins	Horn	Northup
Condit	Hostettler	Norwood
Conyers	Houghton	Nussle
Cooksey	Hoyer	Oberstar
Costello	Hulshof	Obey
Cox	Hunter	Olver
Coyne	Hutchinson	Ortiz
Cramer	Hyde	Ose
Crane	Inslee	Owens
Crowley	Isakson	Oxley
Cubin	Istook	Packard
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Cunningham	Jackson-Lee	Pascrell
Danner	(TX)	Pastor
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Paul
Davis (IL)	Jenkins	Payne
Davis (VA)	John	Pease
Deal	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)
DeLahunt	Jones (NC)	Petri
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Phelps
DeLay	Kanjorski	Pickering
DeMint	Kaptur	Pickett
Deutsch	Kasich	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Pombo
Dickey	Kennedy	Porter
Dicks	Kildee	Portman
Dingell	Kind (WI)	Price (NC)
Dixon	King (NY)	Pryce (OH)
Doggett	Kingston	Quinn
Dooley	Klecza	Radanovich
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Rahall
Doyle	Kolbe	Ramstad
Dreier	Kucinich	Regula
Duncan	Kuykendall	Reyes
Dunn	LaFalce	Reynolds
Edwards	LaHood	Riley
Ehlers	Lampson	Rivers
Ehrlich	Lantos	Rodriguez
Emerson	Largent	Roemer
Engel	Larson	Rogan
English	Latham	Rogers
Eshoo	LaTourette	Rohrabacher
Etheridge	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen

Rothman	Smith (WA)	Traficant
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Turner
Rush	Souder	Udall (CO)
Ryan (WI)	Spence	Udall (NM)
Salmon	Spratt	Upton
Sanchez	Stabenow	Velazquez
Sanders	Stark	Vislosky
Sandlin	Stearns	Vitter
Sawyer	Stenholm	Walden
Saxton	Strickland	Walsh
Scarborough	Stump	Wamp
Schaffer	Stupak	Waters
Schakowsky	Sununu	Watkins
Scott	Sweeney	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Tancredo	Watts (OK)
Sessions	Tanner	Weiner
Shadegg	Tauscher	Weldon (FL)
Shaw	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Weller
Sherman	Terry	Wexler
Sherwood	Thomas	Weygand
Shimkus	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Simpson	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Sisisky	Thornberry	Wilson
Skeel	Thune	Wise
Skelton	Thurman	Wolf
Slaughter	Tiahrt	Woolsey
Smith (MI)	Tierney	Wu
Smith (NJ)	Toomey	Wynn
Smith (TX)	Towns	Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Royce	Sanford	Sensenbrenner
-------	---------	---------------

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Hefley	Hill (IN)
--------	-----------

NOT VOTING—29

Barton	Klink	Ryun (KS)
Bateman	Lazio	Sabo
Blagojevich	Lipinski	Shows
Campbell	Markey	Shuster
Combest	Martinez	Talent
Cook	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Gutierrez	McIntosh	Vento
Hansen	Pomeroy	Waxman
Hinchey	Rangel	Young (AK)
Kilpatrick	Roukema	

□ 2316

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 148, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 148, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 22, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

YEAS—384

Abercrombie	Baird	Bartlett
Ackerman	Baker	Bass
Aderholt	Baldacci	Becerra
Allen	Baldwin	Bentsen
Andrews	Ballenger	Bereuter
Archer	Barcia	Berkley
Armey	Barr	Berman
Baca	Barrett (NE)	Berry
Bachus	Barrett (WI)	Biggert