

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 306, noes 118, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No 299]

AYES—306

Aderholt	Etheridge	Larson
Allen	Everett	LaTourette
Andrews	Ewing	Lazio
Archer	Fletcher	Leach
Armey	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Bachus	Ford	Lewis (KY)
Baker	Fossella	Linder
Baldacci	Fowler	Lipinski
Ballenger	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo
Barcia	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Barrett (NE)	Gallely	Lucas (KY)
Barton	Ganske	Lucas (OK)
Bateman	Gekas	Luther
Bentsen	Gephardt	Maloney (CT)
Bereuter	Gibbons	Martinez
Berkley	Gillmor	Mascara
Berry	Gilman	McCarthy (MO)
Biggart	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Bilbray	Goode	McCollum
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	McCrery
Bishop	Goodling	McHugh
Bliley	Gordon	McInnis
Blunt	Goss	McIntosh
Boehlert	Graham	McIntyre
Boehner	Granger	McKeon
Bonilla	Green (TX)	Meek (FL)
Bonior	Green (WI)	Menendez
Bono	Greenwood	Mica
Borski	Gutknecht	Miller (FL)
Boswell	Hall (OH)	Miller, Gary
Boyd	Hall (TX)	Mollohan
Brady (TX)	Hansen	Moore
Brown (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)
Bryant	Hayes	Moran (VA)
Burr	Hayworth	Morella
Burton	Hefley	Murtha
Buyer	Herger	Myrick
Callahan	Hill (IN)	Napolitano
Calvert	Hill (MT)	Nethercutt
Camp	Hilleary	Ney
Canady	Hinojosa	Northup
Cannon	Hobson	Norwood
Capps	Hoeffel	Nussle
Cardin	Hoekstra	Obey
Castle	Holden	Ortiz
Chabot	Holt	Ose
Chambliss	Hoolley	Oxley
Clayton	Horn	Packard
Clement	Houghton	Pallone
Coble	Hoyer	Pascrell
Coburn	Hulshof	Pease
Combest	Hunter	Peterson (MN)
Condit	Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)
Cook	Hyde	Petri
Cooksey	Inslee	Phelps
Costello	Isakson	Pickering
Cox	Istook	Pitts
Cramer	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Crowley	(TX)	Porter
Cubin	Jefferson	Portman
Cunningham	Jenkins	Price (NC)
Danner	John	Pryce (OH)
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Quinn
Davis (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Rahall
DeMint	Kanjorski	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Regula
Dickey	Kasich	Reyes
Dicks	Kelly	Reynolds
Dooley	Kildee	Riley
Doolittle	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
Doyle	King (NY)	Roemer
Dreier	Kingston	Rogan
Duncan	Klecza	Rogers
Dunn	Klink	Rohrabacher
Edwards	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	LaFalce	Rothman
Ehrlich	LaHood	Roukema
Emerson	Lampson	Royce
English	Largent	Ryan (WI)

Ryun (KS)	Souder	Udall (NM)
Salmon	Spence	Upton
Sanchez	Spratt	Visclosky
Sandlin	Stabenow	Vitter
Sawyer	Stearns	Walden
Saxton	Stenholm	Walsh
Sensenbrenner	Strickland	Wamp
Sessions	Stump	Watkins
Shadegg	Stupak	Watts (OK)
Shaw	Sweeney	Weiner
Shays	Talent	Weldon (FL)
Sherwood	Tanner	Weldon (PA)
Shimkus	Tauzin	Weller
Shows	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Shuster	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Simpson	Terry	Wilson
Sisisky	Thomas	Wise
Skeen	Thornberry	Wolf
Skelton	Thune	Wynn
Slaughter	Tiahrt	Young (AK)
Smith (MI)	Toomey	Young (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Trafigant	
Smith (TX)	Turner	

NOES—118

Abercrombie	Forbes	Owens
Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Pastor
Baird	Gejdenson	Paul
Barr	Gutierrez	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bartlett	Hilliard	Pickett
Bass	Hinche	Pombo
Becerra	Hostettler	Rangel
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Blagojevich	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Blumenauer	Jones (OH)	Sabo
Boucher	Kennedy	Sanders
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Sanford
Brown (OH)	Kolbe	Scarborough
Campbell	Kucinich	Schaffer
Capuano	Kuykendall	Schakowsky
Carson	Lantos	Scott
Clay	Lee	Serrano
Clyburn	Levin	Sherman
Collins	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Lofgren	Snyder
Coyne	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Crane	Manzullo	Sununu
Cummings	Markey	Tancredo
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Tauscher
Deal	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McKinney	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Meehan	Tierney
Delahunt	Meeks (NY)	Towns
DeLauro	Metcalfe	Udall (CO)
Deutsch	Millender	Velazquez
Dingell	McDonald	Vento
Dixon	Miller, George	Waters
Doggett	Minge	Watt (NC)
Engel	Mink	Waxman
Eshoo	Moakley	Wexler
Evans	Nadler	Weygand
Farr	Neal	Woolsey
Fattah	Oberstar	Wu
Filner	Olver	

NOT VOTING—10

Baldwin	Gilchrest	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Latham	Thurman
Chenoweth	McDermott	
Frost	McNulty	

□ 1442

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1691, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2490, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 246 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 246

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or rule XCI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto of final passage without intervening motion except on motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1445

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this amendment, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2490, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President and certain independent agencies for fiscal

year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It waives House rules prohibiting consideration of unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill. The rule accords priority in recognition to Members who have their amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone votes and reduce the voting time on a postponed vote to 5 minutes so long as it follows a regular 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

H.Res. 246 presents this appropriations bill for House consideration under the normal processes by which appropriations bills may come to the floor. It is an open rule that permits Members to offer any amendments they wish, provided they are germane.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation makes the appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain other independent agencies. This is very important legislation. Nearly 90 percent of the activities funded under this bill are devoted to the salaries and expenses of approximately 163,000 employees who are responsible for administering programs such as drug interdiction, collection of revenues, presidential protection, violent crimes reduction, and Federal financial management.

Through a judicious bipartisan process of hearings and testimony, the Committee on Appropriations arrived at the funding levels contained in the legislation. The funding levels are consistent with this Congress' policy of fiscal discipline, yet provide sufficient funding for agencies within the bill's jurisdiction to carry out their statutory responsibility.

Specifically, this legislation allows increased funding to provide for more diligent enforcement of gun control laws, making it more difficult for convicted felons to obtain weapons. This legislation also appropriates funds necessary to carry out IRS reforms that were passed by the last Congress and stand to benefit all taxpayers across America.

The road to the House floor for this legislation has been very bipartisan indeed. In fact, it passed the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government with a unanimous vote under the stewardship of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), ranking member.

In his testimony before the Committee on Rules yesterday, the gentleman from Maryland was excessively

gracious in his praise for the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the bipartisan manner in which this legislation was crafted.

The rule, like the underlying legislation, deserves strong bipartisan support. Again, it is an open rule that permits any Member with germane amendments to have them considered by the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue this bipartisan effort in this legislation and to make sure that we support this fair rule.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule providing for the consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill. However, I am very disappointed with the substantial cuts that this bill makes. This bill came out of the subcommittee as a good bipartisan effort, but unfortunately the full committee markup changed all that.

Mr. Speaker, during the markup, my colleagues slashed \$239 million from this bill and, Mr. Speaker, those cuts will not be without repercussions. I am concerned that these drastic cuts will make it hard for some of our important agencies to function. Agencies that provide for 30 percent of our Federal law enforcement, including stopping the flow of drugs across our borders, enforcing gun and tobacco laws, enforcing United States customs laws and counterterrorism efforts. These are not small issues, Mr. Speaker, and we cannot afford to undercut them.

The agencies funded by this bill perform an invaluable service, and I hope that there will be a chance to restore their funding. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that they will have a hard time functioning under these very drastic cuts.

I am also disappointed that the Committee on Rules did not make in order the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) to limit handgun purchases to one per month, or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) to study the use of antique firearms used in crimes. These two amendments are excellent initiatives towards reasonable gun safety. I am sorry my Republican colleagues refused to consider them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the rule passes.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tucson, Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I will not use that time; however, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Sessions) yielding it to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say I am very pleased with the rule that we

have before us today which brings this appropriations bill for Treasury-Postal and General Government to the floor. It is a rule that I do not think anybody could possibly object to. It is an open rule, allows any striking amendment or any amendment dealing with appropriations matters to be offered.

The rule protects those items which are already in the bill, as we normally do, from being stricken on a point of order. And, quite frankly, a number of the agencies that this subcommittee funds are not authorized agencies because authorizing committees have not been able to get legislation to the floor for year after year after year to authorize those agencies. So this legislation, this resolution does exactly what it ought to do on an appropriation bill, allow it to be considered as an appropriation matter.

Any amendment dealing with appropriations may be offered and what is in the bill will be protected, and it does not include the offering of extraneous legislative matters that have not previously been considered in the subcommittee or the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good resolution. This is a good rule. It deserves the support of every Member in the body, and I hope that when we come to the question of the previous question, Members will support the previous question and they will vote "aye" on passage of this rule so that we can move on today to consideration of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me this time, and I urge adoption of this rule.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), ranking member, soon to be chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for noting my comments with respect to the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE). In the first instance, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and again repeat, as I will when we get to the debate on the bill, my appreciation of the handling of this bill by the gentleman from Arizona. He has been extremely cooperative and bipartisan and open in his handling of this bill. And, as I said earlier, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas bringing those remarks of mine to the Committee on Rules to the attention of the body, because I believe them very sincerely. The gentleman from Arizona is not only chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve, but also my good friend and an outstanding representative.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to speak on this rule. There are times, of course,

when we rise and oppose rules because we do not believe they are fair. In this instance, however, I rise in strong support of the rule. I think the Committee on Rules has issued a rule which is fair to both sides. I am sure in its protection of certain provisions of the bill and items within the bill that have not been technically authorized, that is appropriation accounts that have not had authorizing bills passed, that there would obviously be individuals who might want to object and they might object to the rule for that reason. But the Committee on Rules has been fair in treating both sides equally.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the other members of the Committee on Rules for passing a rule that I think provides for a fair and free and open debate on this bill. Therefore, I am going to urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle to strongly support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would observe that when we come to debate on the bill itself, as I did in the Committee on Rules, I will express reservation about the cuts that have been recommended by the committee. I think those cuts are unfortunate, and I think they will have an adverse impact. But as we know, this is not the final step on the process of passing and adopting this bill. Therefore, we will have other opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS), my colleague who is coming into the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to ask for the yeas and nays on the previous question when the question is called because it is my understanding that if the previous question is defeated, then an amendment will be in order to preclude a COLA adjustment in Members' pay. I support doing that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky. He has discussed this matter with me. I understand his view. And while he and I disagree on this issue, I certainly respect his right and his appropriate action in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, strong support of the previous question, and thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lexington, Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER).

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

Mr. Speaker, although I have utmost respect for the Committee on Rules and the work they do, I rise to express my opposition to the previous question to the rule on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill. As the rule is currently written, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr.

RILEY) to disallow the Members' COLA is not included. If the previous question is defeated, Members will have an opportunity to change the rule to allow a vote against the COLA.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention, if the previous question is defeated, to offer an amendment to the rule that would disallow the Members' COLA. For that reason I intend to vote against the previous question and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider the amendment contained in section 3 of the resolution. The amendment may be offered only at the appropriate place in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment or demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment are waived.

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

SEC. . Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 601. (a) Until adjusted under section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (2 U.S.C. 351 and following) or other provision of law, the annual rate of pay for—

"(1) each Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, and Delegate to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico,

"(2) the President pro tempore of the Senate, the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader and the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and

"(3) the Speaker of the House of Representatives,

shall be the rate payable for such position as of the date of enactment of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2000."

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Surfside, Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

□ 1500

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some bit of ambivalence with this rule, but I will support the rule. I was concerned about a special issue with the Post Office and was hoping that we could address this in detail, and that has to do with the regulations that I consider very onerous and very maliciously placed on private mailboxes, the Commercial Receiving Agencies. I was very hopeful that we could deal with that. But it appears we will have another chance to do that at a later date.

I have a House joint resolution under the Congressional Review Act, H.J. Res. 55. If that were to pass, we could rescind all those regulations. Currently, it is my understanding that

these regulations have been put on hold. They will not go into effect soon. But the problem still exists, and I see it as a serious problem.

First, let me talk about the Post Office. The Post Office is a true monopoly. In the free market, there are no true monopolies. Only government can allow a true monopoly.

We do have enough freedom in this country to some degree to offer competition to even this monopoly of the Post Office. By doing this, the private post offices have been set up to give additional service and privacy to many of our citizens, and they are well used.

But now the Post Office sees this as a competition because they are providing services that the Post Office cannot or will not provide. So instead of dealing with this, either providing legalized competition in the Post Office or providing these same services, instead, the Post Office has issued these onerous regulations to attack these customers.

They are forcing these private mailbox operators to develop profiles on every customer, have double identification, and then make this information available to the public and to the Post Office for no good reason.

When I first got involved in this, I did not know which constituencies would be interested in this issue. But one thing that I have discovered is that many of those women who need privacy will use private post offices to avoid the husband or some other individual who may be stalking them. They have been writing to me with a great deal of concern about what these regulations will do.

Also, it is a great cost to these operators as well as to all the customers. The Post Office would mandate that a special address be placed on each piece of mail, indicating that they are receiving mail at one of these private post offices. This costs a lot of money. There will be a lot of mail returned. If these regulations had gone into effect this week, as had been planned, a lot of mail, to the tune of hundreds of thousands of pieces, if not millions, would have been returned to the senders, and they would not have been permitted to be delivered.

I think this is tragic. I think it has to be dealt with. I am disappointed that we cannot do much with it today, but I know there is a growing support in this country and in this Chamber for doing something about this problem.

We as a Congress have the ability, and the authority, to undo regulations. For too long, we have allowed our regulatory bodies to write law, and we do nothing about it. Since 1994, we have had this authority, but we never use it. This is a perfect example of a time that we ought to come in and protect the people, try to neutralize this government monopoly and help these people who deserve this type of protection and privacy.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that I think he raises the question that is a good question; and it should be raised, should be looked at.

It will not come as a surprise to him that we do not agree on all the aspects of what he has said, but he certainly raises an issue that ought to be focused on. I know in talking to the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) that he shares that concern. I want to assure the gentleman that both the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and myself will be looking at this.

Furthermore, as the gentleman may know, the Postal Department has made very substantial changes to its initially sponsored resolution through the efforts of the organizations that the gentleman from Texas talked to and himself and others who raised these issues with the department, so that they are moving to ensure greater privacy and protection to the individuals of which the gentleman spoke.

The gentleman from Texas raises a legitimate issue. I certainly intend to, along with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), look at that further. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Maryland.

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

In furtherance of this discussion, as has been discussed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I would like to also say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) that I would like to thank them for bringing this issue up.

The gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) have also been a part of working with the Postmaster General, General Henderson, on reasonable changes as a result of the marketplace.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 147, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—276

Abercrombie	Gekas	Myrick
Andrews	Gephardt	Nadler
Archer	Gillmor	Napolitano
Armey	Gilman	Neal
Bachus	Gonzalez	Ney
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Northrup
Barr	Goodling	Nussle
Barrett (WI)	Goss	Oberstar
Barton	Graham	Obey
Bass	Granger	Olver
Bateman	Green (TX)	Ortiz
Bentsen	Greenwood	Owens
Bereuter	Gutierrez	Oxley
Berman	Gutknecht	Packard
Biggert	Hall (OH)	Pallone
Bilbray	Hansen	Pastor
Bilirakis	Hastert	Payne
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Pease
Blagojevich	Hastings (WA)	Pelosi
Bliley	Hefley	Pickering
Blumenauer	Hilliard	Pickett
Blunt	Hinchee	Pitts
Boehlert	Hobson	Pombo
Boehner	Hoekstra	Porter
Bonilla	Holden	Pryce (OH)
Bonior	Horn	Quinn
Bono	Houghton	Radanovich
Borski	Hoyer	Rahall
Boucher	Hunter	Rangel
Boyd	Hyde	Regula
Brady (PA)	Isakson	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Istook	Roemer
Burton	Jackson (IL)	Rogers
Buyer	Jackson-Lee	Rohrabacher
Callahan	(TX)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Camp	John	Rush
Campbell	Johnson, E. B.	Ryun (KS)
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Sabo
Cannon	Jones (OH)	Sawyer
Capuano	Kanjorski	Saxton
Cardin	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Castle	Kilpatrick	Scott
Clay	King (NY)	Serrano
Clayton	Kingston	Sessions
Clement	Kleczka	Shadegg
Clyburn	Klink	Shaw
Coburn	Knollenberg	Shays
Collins	Kolbe	Shuster
Combest	Kuykendall	Simpson
Condit	LaFalce	Sisisky
Conyers	Lampson	Skeen
Cooksey	Lantos	Skelton
Cox	Largent	Slaughter
Coyne	Larson	Smith (MI)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Crowley	Leach	Smith (TX)
Cubin	Lee	Snyder
Cummings	Levin	Spence
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lewis (KY)	Stenholm
Davis (VA)	Linder	Stupak
Deal	Lipinski	Sununu
DeGette	Lowe	Sweeney
DeLahunt	Lucas (OK)	Tanner
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
DeLay	Markey	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Martinez	Thomas
Dickey	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thornberry
Dixon	McCollum	Tiahrt
Dooley	McCrery	Towns
Doolittle	McHugh	Upton
Doyle	McInnis	Velazquez
Dreier	McIntosh	Vento
Ehlers	McKeon	Walsh
Ehrlich	Meek (FL)	Waters
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Watkins
Eshoo	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Everett	Metcalf	Watts (OK)
Ewing	Millender	Waxman
Farr	McDonald	Weiner
Fattah	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Filner	Miller, Gary	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Miller, George	Wexler
Forbes	Mink	Wicker
Ford	Moakley	Wolf
Fowler	Mollohan	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Young (AK)
Ganske	Morella	Young (FL)
Gejdenson	Murtha	

NAYS—147

Aderholt	Hill (IN)	Ramstad
Allen	Hill (MT)	Reynolds
Baird	Hilleary	Riley
Baker	Hinojosa	Rodriguez
Baldacci	Hoeffel	Rogan
Barcia	Holt	Rothman
Barrett (NE)	Hoolley	Roukema
Bartlett	Hostettler	Royce
Becerra	Hulshof	Ryan (WI)
Berkley	Hutchinson	Salmon
Berry	Inslee	Sanchez
Boswell	Jenkins	Sanders
Brady (TX)	Johnson (CT)	Sandlin
Brown (OH)	Jones (NC)	Sanford
Bryant	Kaptur	Scarborough
Burr	Kasich	Schaffer
Capps	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Carson	Kildee	Sherman
Chabot	Kind (WI)	Sherwood
Chambliss	Kucinich	Shimkus
Coble	LaHood	Shows
Cook	Lazio	Smith (WA)
Costello	LoBiondo	Souder
Cramer	Lofgren	Stabenow
Danner	Lucas (KY)	Stearns
DeFazio	Luther	Strickland
DeMint	Maloney (CT)	Stump
Deutsch	Manzullo	Talent
Doggett	Mascara	Tancredo
Duncan	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)
Edwards	McKinney	Terry
Emerson	Meehan	Thune
English	Mica	Tierney
Etheridge	Minge	Toomey
Evans	Moore	Trafficant
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Turner
Fossella	Nethercutt	Udall (CO)
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	Udall (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Ose	Visclosky
Gallely	Pascarell	Vitter
Gibbons	Paul	Walden
Goode	Peterson (MN)	Wamp
Gordon	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Green (WI)	Petri	Weygand
Hall (TX)	Phelps	Whitfield
Hayes	Pomeroy	Wilson
Hayworth	Portman	Wise
Herger	Price (NC)	Wu

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman	Frost	McNulty
Baldwin	Gilchrest	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Latham	Thurman
Chenoweth	McDermott	Wynn

□ 1526

Messrs. SANDERS, GALLEGLY, DEUTSCH, JENKINS, DEFAZIO, TAL-ENT, STEARNS, BARCIA and BECERRA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CLAY, CALVERT, MARTINEZ, METCALF, and COX changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.