

NAYS—209

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Ackerman | Hastings (FL) | Pascrell |
| Allen | Hill (IN) | Pastor |
| Andrews | Hilleary | Paul |
| Baird | Hilliard | Payne |
| Baker | Hinchev | Pelosi |
| Baldacci | Hinojosa | Peterson (MN) |
| Barcia | Hoeffel | Phelps |
| Barr | Holden | Pitts |
| Barrett (WI) | Holt | Pomeroy |
| Becerra | Hooley | Price (NC) |
| Bentsen | Hoyer | Rahall |
| Berkley | Inslee | Ramstad |
| Berman | Jackson (IL) | Rangel |
| Berry | Jackson-Lee | Reyes |
| Bishop | (TX) | Rivers |
| Blagojevich | Jefferson | Rodriguez |
| Boniore | John | Roemer |
| Borski | Johnson, E. B. | Rothman |
| Boswell | Jones (OH) | Roybal-Allard |
| Boucher | Kanjorski | Rush |
| Boyd | Kaptur | Sabo |
| Brady (PA) | Kennedy | Salmon |
| Brown (FL) | Kildee | Sanchez |
| Brown (OH) | Kilpatrick | Sanders |
| Capps | Kind (WI) | Sandlin |
| Capuano | Kleczka | Sawyer |
| Cardin | Klink | Scarborough |
| Carson | Kucinich | Schaffer |
| Chabot | Lampson | Schakowsky |
| Clay | Lantos | Scott |
| Clayton | Larson | Serrano |
| Clement | Lee | Sherman |
| Clyburn | Levin | Shows |
| Conyers | Lewis (GA) | Sisisky |
| Costello | Lipinski | Skelton |
| Coyne | Lofgren | Slaughter |
| Cramer | Lowey | Smith (WA) |
| Crowley | Lucas (KY) | Snyder |
| Cummings | Maloney (CT) | Spratt |
| Danner | Maloney (NY) | Stabenow |
| Davis (FL) | Markey | Stark |
| Davis (IL) | Martinez | Stenholm |
| DeFazio | Mascara | Strickland |
| DeGette | McCarthy (MO) | Stupak |
| Delahunt | McCarthy (NY) | Tanner |
| DeLauro | McGovern | Tauscher |
| Deutsch | McIntyre | Taylor (MS) |
| Dicks | McKinney | Thompson (CA) |
| Dingell | Meehan | Thompson (MS) |
| Dixon | Meek (FL) | Tiaht |
| Doggett | Meeks (NY) | Tierney |
| Dooley | Menendez | Toomey |
| Doyle | Millender-McDonald | Towns |
| Duncan | Miller, George | Traficant |
| Edwards | Minge | Turner |
| Eshoo | Mink | Udall (CO) |
| Etheridge | Moakley | Udall (NM) |
| Evans | Mollohan | Velazquez |
| Farr | Moore | Vento |
| Fattah | Moran (VA) | Visclosky |
| Filner | Murtha | Waters |
| Ford | Nadler | Watt (NC) |
| Gejdenson | Napolitano | Weiner |
| Gephardt | Neal | Wexler |
| Gonzalez | Obenstar | Weygand |
| Goode | Obey | Wise |
| Gordon | Olver | Woolsey |
| Green (TX) | Ortiz | Wu |
| Gutierrez | Owens | Wynn |
| Hall (OH) | Pallone | |
| Hall (TX) | | |

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|------------|------------|---------------|
| Baldwin | Frank (MA) | McNulty |
| Brown (CA) | Frost | Peterson (PA) |
| Burton | Gilchrest | Sanford |
| Chenoweth | Latham | Thurman |
| Coble | Luther | |
| Cooksey | McDermott | |

□ 2335

Messrs. BERMAN, HALL of Ohio, STENHOLM, DINGELL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Messrs. DIXON, BOYD and LAMPSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GOODLATTE, WATKINS, and METCALF changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON S. 1059, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees from the Committee on House Administration, for consideration of section 1303 of the Senate bill and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THOMAS, BOEHNER and HOYER.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—RETURNING TO THE SENATE S. 254, VIOLENT AND REPEAT JUVENILE OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I offer a resolution (H. Res. 249) returning to the Senate the bill S. 254.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

Resolved, That the bill of the Senate (S. 254) entitled the "Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999", in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such bill be respectively returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House.

Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule IX, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is necessary to return to the Senate the bill S. 254 of the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999. S. 254 contains an import ban and thus contravenes the constitutional requirement that revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives.

Section 702 of S. 254 would impose the ban by amending section 922(w) of Title 18, U.S. Code, to make it unlawful to import large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

□ 2340

While violators would be subject to criminal penalties, existing tariff laws

also generally provide that merchandise introduced into the United States contrary to law is subject to seizure and forfeiture. Therefore, by criminalizing the importation of these items, the amendment would cause the merchandise to be denied entry into the United States by these Customs officers at the border. This proposed change in law would be identical in law in operation, Mr. Speaker, to a direct import ban.

Further, the items covered by the amendment includes items that are subject to duty and Customs in fact collects measurable amounts of duty on them.

Accordingly, the change in law would have a direct impact on Customs revenues. The provision, therefore, is revenue affecting and constitutes a revenue measure in the constitutional sense. On that basis, I am asking that the House insist on its constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous precedents for the action I am requesting. For example, on October 22, 1991, the House returned to the Senate S. 1241, the Violent Crime Act of 1991, containing, among other things, a provision amending Section 922 of Title 18 U.S.C. making it illegal to transport or possess assault weapons.

I want to emphasize that this action speaks solely to the constitutional prerogative of the House and not to the merits of the Senate bill. In fact, the House spoke on this issue when it recently approved an identical proposal made by our colleague and chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

This proposed action, thus, is strictly procedural in nature and is necessary to preserve the prerogatives of the House to originate revenue measures, a point on which there has been longstanding and bipartisan agreement.

It makes clear to the Senate that the appropriate procedure for dealing with revenue measures is for the House to act first on a revenue bill and for the Senate to accept it or amend it as it sees fit. This will allow this legislation to proceed forward to conference in an orderly and expeditious manner.

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

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this resolution is necessary because the Constitution requires that revenue legislation originate in the House of Representatives.

Our action tonight is not a rejection of the merits of the Senate's so-called "ammo ban provisions." Rather, their so-called "blue slip" simply makes it clear to the Senate that the appropriate procedure for dealing with tax and tariff matters that affect revenues is for the House to act first and the Senate to add its amendment and to seek a conference.

With that said, no one supports the elimination of guns in our inner cities and in the hands of our children more than I do.

The dominance of guns in our community continues to threaten the lives of too many law-abiding citizens. The situation cannot be ignored any longer and must start with the cleanup of the deadliest murder weapons on our streets.

Why do some feel so threatened by preventing the importation of high-capacity ammunition clips? How many of us have even seen, let alone owned, these magazine belt drum belt strips and other types of ammunition devices that have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds of ammunition?

The troubled young man who killed two and injured 15 people in Springfield, Oregon, had a 30-round clip. The misguided youths who engaged in this horrific shooting spree at the Columbine High School were equipped with a TEC DC-9 with multiple round ammunition. These types of ammunition clips are not for hunting or sport. These clips are designed to kill a lot and to kill a lot quickly.

Yes, people will continue to kill with guns. And, yes, these criminals must not escape justice. However, the death count criminals are able to achieve before getting caught is unnecessarily much greater with the high-capacity ammunition clips.

No one has explained to me how society benefits from high ammunition clips or cop killer bullets, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) is a leader on this issue and is the author of the House-passed ammunition import ban. She should be commended for her commitment to ensuring that these provisions become law. I am confident that once the procedural problems created with the Senate's action are resolved, she will prevail on the merits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, this week, 80 Colorado high school students came to Washington to visit with Members of Congress. These students were literally lobbying for their lives. They eloquently insisted that Congress support child gun safety legislation in the name of the Columbine students who were so senselessly murdered. They were asking Congress to forward at least the three Senate-passed child gun safety provisions to the President's desk so they may return to a safer school next year.

After 15 funerals in one year, one student sadly stated to us that he refused to attend another. That is why he was here today, to give us a reality check.

In light of these kids' pleas, it seems ironic that here tonight the House is forced on procedural grounds to request the Senate to remove one of only three child gun safety provisions in the bill, a high-capacity ammunition ban.

There are, however, some actions this body can take to correct this technicality and ensure the passage of this important legislation to finally stop these deadly weapons from crossing into our country. When a dynamic group of young men and women like the kids from SAFE Colorado emerge to promote something the House has already passed, the least we can do is preserve the few provisions we all in good conscience supported last month.

Last month, when the House considered child gun safety legislation, there were many passionate disagreements and little agreement on which amendments we should pass. Just like now, at about midnight or a little after, one provision passed in the middle of the night with little fanfare and no objection on a voice vote.

Along with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), I introduced an amendment to the bill, my pending legislation, to ban high-capacity ammunition magazines.

As I said, this amendment passed with no objection and by a voice vote and strong bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the underlying juvenile justice bill did not. Therefore, the House has not communicated its will to the Senate or to the conference committee. We need to bring this bill to the floor, and we need to pass it once and for all so that it is included in any final conference committee report that is approved.

Mr. Speaker, in 1994, when Congress passed the Violent Crime Control Law Enforcement Act, we thought we banned magazines for semi-automatic weapons which hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition. However, because of a concession to firearms distributors, high-capacity ammunition magazines manufactured prior to September, 1994, were exempted by Congress. We only agreed to this compromise with the expectation that manufacturers would sell off existing stockpiles.

Unfortunately, contrary to the spirit of this compromise, supplies have been seemingly limitless because of uncontrolled imports of magazines from such countries as China and Russia.

□ 2350

As a result, these deadly clips are as readily available today as they were in 1994 and the only purpose for these clips is to kill human beings.

Denver police officer Bruce Vander Jagt, for example, was shot 15 times in the head, neck and torso by the rapid-fire capabilities of his assailant's weapon.

One answer to this technical flaw that we are seeing here tonight, I think, must be a bipartisan solution. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for his steadfast commitment to fighting for this ban in the

conference committee, but I am concerned that without a strong message from this House, a single conferee could procedurally block the ammunition ban from inclusion in the conference report.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is incumbent upon this House to pass H.R. 1037 which is the bill which has one purpose, and that is to ban these high capacity magazines, to pass it and say to the Senate, include it in the conference report. People will no longer tolerate a country where thousands of people die of gunshot wounds every year and seven school shootings occur within a 2-year period. We all supported this ban before. Let us send a message and support it now again as a full House.

Mr. Speaker, I have filed House Resolution 192, a discharge petition, to bring my ammunition magazine ban, H.R. 1037, to the House floor for a vote. It is at the desk, and in a moment I am going to ask for unanimous consent to bring H.R. 1037 to the floor for immediate consideration. If this motion is ruled out of order, I urge all Members from both parties who are for reasonable gun control legislation to sign the discharge petition.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring H.R. 1037 which would ban the sale, transfer and possession of high capacity ammunition magazines to the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). There is a question of privilege pending before the House.

In any event, under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers and recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentlewoman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

I wish we were here, Mr. Speaker, in fact this evening to seriously deal with the concerns that have been expressed by the students from Columbine High School, to seriously deal with the issue of 13 children dying every day from gunfire, and realizing that the responsibility of the House of Representatives is to answer the question about gun safety and gun safety responsibility. Yet what we find ourselves doing at 11:50 at night is to deal with a procedural question which would in fact stymie the opportunity to pass legislation banning large capacity ammunition clips.

Mr. Speaker, during the work recess, I had the opportunity to visit one of the many gun shows that show up in the Houston area. It reminded me of the very intense debate that we had just a couple of weeks ago around the issue of gun safety and safety as it relates to our children. The McCarthy

amendment, for example, that would close the gun show loophole. We failed to do our job at that time, Mr. Speaker, and now we come at 11:50 again to deal with the procedural constitutional question to make in order the Senate bill because it is not consistent with the House legislation. While we are doing that, we are ignoring why we should be here. Every day we are allowing large capacity ammunition clips to be available, gun shows continue to proliferate around the Nation, guns are proliferating in the hands of children, there is no waiting period. In fact, we are finding individuals, felons who are not supposed to have guns in their hands, every day are securing them. Tragedies are occurring in places like Chicago where hate crimes are being perpetrated against blacks and Jews and others because guns are so freely utilized in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we are not opposed to the second amendment. We want to just get to work. It is unfortunate tonight that we cannot cure the problem and provide a ban for large capacity ammunition clips, but more importantly it is very sad that we cannot respond to the children of America as they are playing and enjoying their summer but looking toward to the start of a new school year, we cannot say to them that this Congress has joined together to ensure that they will enter the new school year with dreams and aspirations and the belief that they will be safe.

Let us not perpetrate another Columbine. Let us tell the students of America that we are much more willing to stand with them than we are to stand with the National Rifle Association. Although this is a procedural discussion tonight, I want to offer my sadness and encourage the Speaker and encourage my colleagues in a bipartisan way to get back to work on gun safety legislation, to look seriously at juvenile justice and really look seriously at banning large capacity ammunition clips as was noted by my colleague from Colorado that was passed by voice vote. We can get to work and stand on the side of our children and against those who would provide or create an atmosphere that was not safe.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that Congress has not yet enacted common sense gun safety legislation to save the lives of American children. Today, we heard firsthand from Colorado students who pleaded for Congress to take the steps needed to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children.

But congressional leaders have not acted. Congress has not listened to the children whose classmates' lives were claimed by gun violence. And today we see even more delay, more obstacles blocking efforts to save children's lives. The time is long past to enact

gun safety measures, but sadly the leaders of this Congress have consistently turned their backs on limited common sense measures that would take children out of the line of fire.

Today I listened to a young woman named Erin from Columbine High School talk about the tragic loss she suffered when close friends of hers were shot dead. She fought back tears as she said that no one should have to experience the loss that she has. Erin and her fellow Colorado high school students urged the Congress to move forward to protect young people with reasonable gun safety measures such as those passed by the Senate. Ensuring that criminals will not be able to buy weapons at gun shows, that child safety locks will be provided with handguns and that unnecessarily lethal high capacity ammunition clips will be kept out of the country.

This effort tonight is just one more excuse not to do what the American public would like us to do. If this was a problem, why did we not deal with it weeks ago? If it is not a problem, it appears that Republican leaders are using procedural gimmicks to go back on the commitment made to appoint conferees who will support gun safety measures, including a ban on importing dangerous high capacity ammunition clips. The clip ban passed without objection in the House and must be part of any gun safety package that this Congress passes.

When students who have experienced tragic gun violence put their pleas in heartfelt and straightforward terms as Colorado students did today, how in good conscience can Congress delay any longer? Let us go to conference, let us do what it takes to make our schools and our streets safer for our young people by passing gun safety legislation. Let us stop making excuses and start making progress.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a lot of people do not understand the damage that large capacity clips can do. I know firsthand the damage they can do. On the Long Island Railroad, Colin Ferguson had large capacity clips. Many people said it would not have made any difference. It would not have made a difference to the people that were killed in the front of the train, but at the end of the train where the clips were finally taken away from him, we might have been able to save some young people at the end of the train. That is what large capacity clips do.

I beg the Speaker to bring it forward again so we can get going on this. We saw so many young people here today in Washington, bright young people, people I think that are smarter than us here in Congress. If you listen to them, they are the ones that were facing the violence in the schools.

The other day in my district, we talked about gun violence. Our parents,

our children, they are scared. We have to do something. We can do it bipartisanship. We can. We can work together and work something out. The bottom line is we have to keep guns, high capacity clips, away from criminals. And we certainly have to make sure guns do not get into the hands of children. That is all we are asking. Nothing more, nothing less. I think if we all sit down together and work together, we can do this.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

□ 0000

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, what are we waiting for? Instead of moving forward and appointing conferees, we are playing more political games with the lives of children, using the cloak of what is unobjectionable through unnecessary procedure to create the illusion of forward progress, doing nothing while we create the illusion of progress, doing nothing while 13 children are killed as a result of gun violence in this Nation every day.

In one month exactly the children who attend Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, will be returning to school. That means we have only 3 weeks to settle the gun safety issues before we adjourn for summer recess. It has been 3 months, 90 days, since the tragedy in Columbine occurred.

Just several years ago the Republicans took 1 week to propose legislation to undo the assault weapons ban, but a simple proposal to close the gun show loopholes to keep guns out of the hands of children takes months and months. We all know it is a stall.

The entire process on gun violence has been a shell game, but as parents and children shop for clothes and notebooks and backpacks, and my children and I will be shopping for backpacks in the next 3 weeks, they should be free from worries about their children's safety from gun violence in schools.

We have differences to settle between the House and Senate passed gun safety and juvenile justice bills. We should be appointing conferees and getting down to the serious work of debating and voting on the gun safety provisions passed by the Senate instead of wasting more time.

This conference should be a careful and deliberative process that American families and schoolchildren can be proud of. We should get started today.

All we are proposing are modest and reasonable steps to make all of us, especially the children, safer from dangerous people and disturbed kids with guns, plugging the gun show loophole, requiring the gun safety locks, banning the high capacity ammo clips, the Hyde-Lofgren amendment banning juvenile possession of semiautomatic assault weapons.

What criminals are stopped from getting guns from licensed dealers because of the Brady background check? Murders, rapists, child molesters, fugitives,

stalkers, batterers, and who wants these people to buy guns and threaten us and our children? Why would anyone want criminals to get guns?

We should plug the loophole and stand up to the gun lobby.

Mr. Speaker, kids are going back to school. It is time for Congress to act before they end up there. Let us stop the stalling. Let us stop the games. Let us do our job.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), beloved former candidate for the United States Senate.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the dean for his generosity at midnight.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely unfortunate that we are here tonight at midnight debating this procedural motion, but I have to say that it is just typical of the way the leadership has managed the gun safety issue. Instead of appointing conferees and enacting meaningful gun safety measures, they are once again throwing an obstacle in the way of legislation to protect our children from gun violence. The truth is that there have been delaying tactics at every turn.

The long, sad saga of this bill is a disgrace to this House. First we were told not to offer gun safety amendments to an appropriations bill because we would consider the juvenile justice bill in regular order. Then, after the Committee on the Judiciary was totally bypassed and a sham juvenile justice bill was put up on the floor and defeated, we were told that conferees would be appointed before July 4. Then we were told again just 2 days ago not to offer or vote for amendments to appropriation bills on gun safety because the conference would be meeting soon on juvenile justice.

Well, here we are months after the tragedy of Columbine High School, we still do not have conferees appointed. What is it going to take for the leadership to wake up and listen to the cries of American families? When are our colleagues going to understand that the issue is not going away? How long will we have to wait before Congress does something to protect our schools from gun violence?

Each time we are faced with a delay, our calls will only get louder. We will not back down, we will not go away, we will continue to insist that Congress do its part to make our communities safer.

It is clear that the American people are demanding action now, and it is time for us to say loud and clear that we cannot allow the NRA to write our Nation's gun laws any more.

Mr. Speaker, after talking to these young people that came to Washington today, I do not know how any of us can look in their eyes and not make a very clear commitment that we are going to do our best to pass common sense gun legislation now.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my colleagues again that tonight we are only dealing with a procedural issue, and it is one that is very important because it is necessary to protect the prerogatives of the House, something I know the gentleman, the courteous gentleman from New York, and many other Members of this House feel very strongly about. This is not about the substantive policy issue of the legislation. In fact, the action tonight will allow the juvenile justice legislation to move toward conference in a more expeditious and orderly manner.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 434, AFRICA GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-236) on the resolution (H. Res. 250) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2415, AMERICAN EM-BASSY SECURITY ACT OF 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 247 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 247

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. 2415) to enhance security of United States missions and personnel overseas, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the first amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Gilman or his designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a

demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against that amendment are waived. After disposition of that amendment, the provisions of the bill as then amended shall be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. No further amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of this resolution. Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. 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 to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on International Relations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of or germane modifications of any such amendment. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read (except that modifications shall be reported), shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in such amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 3. After passage of H.R. 2415, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 886 and to consider the Senate bill in the House. All points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2415 as passed by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived.

□ 0010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida