

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.Res. 467, 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 1, nays 420, answered “present” 2, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—1

Matsui

NAYS—420

Abercrombie	Costello	Hall (TX)
Ackerman	Cox	Hansen
Aderholt	Coyne	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Cramer	Hastings (WA)
Andrews	Crane	Hayes
Archer	Crowley	Hayworth
Army	Cubin	Hefley
Baca	Cummings	Heger
Bachus	Cunningham	Hill (IN)
Baird	Danner	Hill (MT)
Baker	Davis (FL)	Hilleary
Baldacci	Davis (IL)	Hilliard
Baldwin	Davis (VA)	Hinche
Ballenger	Deal	Hinojosa
Barcia	DeFazio	Hobson
Barr	Delahunt	Hoeffel
Barrett (NE)	DeLauro	Hoekstra
Barrett (WI)	DeLay	Holden
Bartlett	DeMint	Holt
Barton	Deutsch	Hooley
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Horn
Bateman	Dickey	Hostettler
Becerra	Dicks	Houghton
Bentsen	Dixon	Hoyer
Bereuter	Doggett	Hulshof
Berkley	Dooley	Hunter
Berman	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Berry	Doyle	Hyde
Biggart	Dreier	Inslee
Billbray	Duncan	Isakson
Bilirakis	Dunn	Istook
Bishop	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Blagojevich	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Bliley	Ehrlich	(TX)
Blunt	Emerson	Jefferson
Boehlert	Engel	Jenkins
Boehner	English	Johnson (CT)
Bonilla	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Bonior	Etheridge	Johnson, Sam
Bono	Evans	Jones (NC)
Borski	Everett	Jones (OH)
Boswell	Ewing	Kanjorski
Boucher	Farr	Kaptur
Boyd	Fattah	Kasich
Brady (PA)	Filner	Kelly
Brady (TX)	Fletcher	Kennedy
Brown (FL)	Foley	Kildee
Brown (OH)	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Bryant	Fossella	Kind (WI)
Burr	Fowler	King (NY)
Burton	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Klecza
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Klink
Calvert	Frost	Knollenberg
Camp	Galleghy	Kolbe
Campbell	Ganske	Kucinich
Canady	Gejdenson	Kuykendall
Cannon	Gekas	LaFalce
Capps	Gephardt	LaHood
Capuano	Gibbons	Lampson
Cardin	Gilchrest	Lantos
Carson	Gillmor	Largent
Castle	Gilman	Latham
Chabot	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Chambliss	Goode	Lazio
Chenoweth-Hage	Goodlatte	Leach
Clay	Goodling	Lee
Clayton	Gordon	Levin
Clement	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Clyburn	Graham	Lewis (GA)
Coble	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Coburn	Green (TX)	Linder
Collins	Green (WI)	Lipinski
Combest	Greenwood	LoBiondo
Condit	Gutierrez	Lofgren
Conyers	Gutknecht	Lowe
Cooksey	Hall (OH)	Lucas (KY)

Lucas (OK)	Petri	Snyder
Luther	Phelps	Souder
Maloney (CT)	Pickering	Spence
Maloney (NY)	Pickett	Spratt
Manzullo	Pitts	Stabenow
Markley	Pombo	Stark
Martinez	Pomeroy	Stearns
Mascara	Porter	Stenholm
McCarthy (MO)	Portman	Strickland
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Stump
McCollum	Pryce (OH)	Stupak
McCrery	Quinn	Sununu
McDermott	Radanovich	Sweeney
McGovern	Rahall	Talent
McHugh	Ramstad	Tancredo
McInnis	Rangel	Tanner
McIntyre	Regula	Tauscher
McKeon	Reyes	Tauzin
McKinney	Reynolds	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Riley	Taylor (NC)
Meehan	Rivers	Terry
Meek (FL)	Roemer	Thomas
Meeks (NY)	Rogan	Thompson (CA)
Menendez	Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)
Metcalfe	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Mica	Rothman	Thune
Millender-	Roukema	Thurman
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Royce	Tierney
Miller, Gary	Rush	Toomey
Minge	Ryan (WI)	Towns
Mink	Ryun (KS)	Traficant
Moakley	Sabo	Turner
Mollohan	Salmon	Udall (CO)
Moore	Sanchez	Udall (NM)
Moran (KS)	Sanders	Upton
Moran (VA)	Sandlin	Velazquez
Morella	Sanford	Vento
Murtha	Sawyer	Visclosky
Nadler	Saxton	Vitter
Napolitano	Scarborough	Walden
Neal	Schaffer	Walsh
Nethercutt	Schakowsky	Wamp
Ney	Scott	Waters
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Norwood	Serrano	Watt (NC)
Nussle	Sessions	Watts (OK)
Oberstar	Shadegg	Waxman
Obey	Shaw	Weiner
Olver	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Ortiz	Sherman	Weldon (PA)
Ose	Sherwood	Weller
Owens	Shimkus	Wexler
Oxley	Shows	Weygand
Packard	Shuster	Whitfield
Pallone	Simpson	Wicker
Pascarell	Sisisky	Wilson
Pastor	Skeen	Wise
Paul	Skelton	Wolf
Payne	Slaughter	Woolsey
Pease	Smith (MI)	Wu
Pelosi	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Peterson (MN)	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Peterson (PA)	Smith (WA)	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Blumenauer

Larson

NOT VOTING—11

Cook	John	Rodriguez
DeGette	McIntosh	Rogers
Dingell	Miller, George	Young (AK)
Ford	Myrick	

□ 1652

Mr. BOEHLERT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1830

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall number 116 and also 117 I was unavoidably detained and was absent for those two votes. Had I been present I would have voted “yea” on 116 and “nay” on 117.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1501, JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONYERS moves to instruct conferees on the part of the House that the conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 1501, be instructed to insist that the committee of conference meet and report a committee substitute that includes both:

(1) Measures that aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws with the scope of conference and

(2) Common-sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from getting access to guns within the scope of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

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

My colleagues, I am delighted to bring this motion to instruct conferees on the part of the House to insist that the committee of conference meet and report a committee substitute.

This motion to instruct suggests to our committee of conference members that we include both measures that aid in enforcement of gun safety and also include common sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from getting access to guns within the scope of the conference, and that the conference meet immediately.

I am joined on this motion by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY). What we are trying to do is to make it clear that this Congress and our instructions include that we meet immediately on our conference and report both sensible gun violence and gun enforcement provisions. We can and should do both.

The President of the United States has been trying to get our conference moving and, hopefully, this motion to instruct will accomplish that very important objective. Remember, the truth is that enforcement of gun laws is up under the Clinton administration. Gun prosecutions are up 22 percent in the Clinton years, the number of people behind bars for violent crimes with guns is considerably up, and violent gun crimes are down by 35 percent.

No President has ever had a more successful record in driving down violent crime than President Clinton, but we should do more and we want to do more. And so the only way that that

can happen is that my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, urge that we meet in conference and get the gun violence and the gun enforcement and the juvenile justice matters resolved, and get something on the floor and get a law on the books, or additional laws, as soon as possible.

□ 1700

This motion says that we can do better. So if we want to separate ourselves from the extremities, from the inaction, if we want to associate ourselves with the clear sentiment of the vast majority of Americans, this is our opportunity to do so.

This motion tells the chairman of the conference to stop not meeting, to stop hiding behind process, and to get to work with a conference meeting that deals with both existing loopholes in gun laws and with stronger enforcement by closing loopholes that exist.

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

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

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), that I am with him a hundred percent on this resolution. We are going to support it. It asks for what we think ought to happen. We ought to have a meeting. We ought to discuss these things. We ought to settle them.

I would point out parenthetically that paragraph number 2, "common sense gun safety measure that prevent felons, fugitives and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from getting access to guns," is already the law.

The Brady bill, the Brady Law, Title 18, section 922(g), already prohibits fugitives, stalkers, and felons from buying or possessing a gun. And children already cannot buy handguns. I am proposing in my offer a ban on assault weapons being available to youngsters.

Now, I have been proposing a gun control bill for many, many months. Last November 4, I sent a copy of it to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and we have been talking about it on and off for, lo, these many months.

The proposal that I have offered accepts the trigger lock requirement, in fact, as a stand-alone bill, it passed 311-115; a juvenile Brady that says, if a juvenile commits a disqualifying crime, they will never be eligible for a gun. That passed 395-27. We passed a ban on these large ammunition clips, 10 cartridges or more. That passed by voice vote. And then we had a prohibition on juveniles from possessing assault weapons, which I mentioned earlier. That passed 254-69.

So we have already passed these things. We could have the makings of a decent gun bill. There is one sticking

point and that is the so-called "gun show loophole."

Now, we are confronted with two versions of a solution to the gun show loophole. We have the solution of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) out here, which is, in my humble opinion, unacceptable because it limits the instant check time to one day.

Now, we can get 95 percent of the applicants in one day. But there is 5 percent that require three business days. They are not easily cleared up. They are not easily answered. And those are the difficult ones. Those are the ones that may have criminal records. Those may be the people we do not want to get a gun. And, therefore, we need three business days. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) does not allow that, so I cannot accept that.

Now, over here we have the other Democrat gun show provision, and that is by the great Senator from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG. Well, his bill literally defines gun shows out of existence. He has the three business days. That is fine. But he also requires such burdensome provisions on people who are conducting a gun show that it is just unsupportable. It is too much the other way.

I propose meeting in the middle, a compromise, that requires every gun sold at a gun show to have an instant check, the purchaser, that requires three business days for the 5 percent that we have trouble getting the instant check on, and creating a class of instant-check registrars who are not licensed gun dealers but, nonetheless, are certified to be able to provide the instant check so the volume can be dealt with.

Now, that is a solution that meets the gun show loophole. It tightens that existing law, gives us the trigger locks, gives us a ban on the large ammunition clips, gives us a juvenile Brady, keeps assault weapons from the children.

What are we waiting for? Nobody will talk to me.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has written me a letter saying he will not negotiate with me unless and until the Senator calls a meeting of the conferees. Let us confront him with an accomplished fact, a fait accompli. Let us say, here is our proposal.

Now, all I need is three Democrats to join and we will have a proposal that they cannot ignore. What do they say? An offer they cannot refuse. Join me and ask the President to help. Give me just three signatures and we are off to the races.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman because I think we have created a way to get there. The 1-day check with the 95 percent that will clear in one day, plus the escape hatch for those who may take longer, two more days.

And so, when the gentleman asks, what we are waiting for, I want him to know I am not waiting for anything. I think that is an excellent way to resolve the matter. I only wish this were the conference committee itself. But I would urge that we both join in together in urging our dear chairman of the committee, based upon this, that we send him a letter telling him what we are agreeing to on the floor if he is not looking at it at this moment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that is a great idea. I say to my friend, I will join him in the letter or he can join me. But I suggest that he and I finish our job over here and confront the distinguished Members of the other body, as we refer to them deferentially, with an accomplished fact, our gun bill; and I think they will take it, and then we will have put this honorably to rest.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman very much. I am also very grateful for his support of the motion to instruct the conferees.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of his motion to instruct conferees. I am joined by the honorable gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

This motion to instruct, Mr. Speaker, promotes the enforcement of existing gun safety laws and advocates for common sense gun safety measures that protect children.

Just today, Mr. Speaker, in my clips that I receive from my Indianapolis office, in Fort Wayne, Indiana, an 8-year-old boy is lucky to be alive after his 12-year-old brother accidentally shot him while playing with a gun.

In Franklin, Indiana, Mr. Speaker, a boy charged in the fatal shooting of his cousin has been moved to a private residential treatment center in Pennsylvania. The boy was charged with criminal recklessness for tampering with his father's illegal gun when he fired it, killing 7-year-old Curtis Smith.

Mr. Speaker, I have been intrigued by the colloquy that has occurred between the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and believe that what I heard is that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is willing to support the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and others in their motion to instruct the conferees. I am very excited about that. I think it is a time that is long overdue, and I applaud the two gentlemen for their agreement on moving forward with sensible gun legislation in the way that they have described.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

This motion to instruct promotes the enforcement of existing gun safety laws and advocates for common-sense gun safety measures that protect children.

I am outraged that once again we are standing here talking about gun violence and yet Congress has failed to act and protect our children.

Over three weeks ago, the House went on record in support of the juvenile justice conference committee holding a meeting within two weeks. As of today, that deadline goes ignored.

We are now standing here again to ask the conferees to move forward and take action.

What are we waiting for? How many more children have to die? This Congressional do-nothing approach on gun violence shows Americans that the NRA lobby is more important than our children.

We have all too often witnessed the devastating effect that gun violence has on our children. Nearly 12 children die each day from gunfire in America, approximately one every two hours. That is the equivalent of a classroom of children every two days.

Next week is the anniversary of Columbine and we still have not passed strong common-sense gun legislation. We have seen a six-year-old shoot and kill his classmate and yet we have failed to provide preventative measures to protect our children.

Recently, I spoke with children from an elementary school within my district (the 10th district of Indiana) about gun violence. I asked the children how many had guns in their homes. About half raised their hands. I asked how many knew where these guns were in their homes. Most of them knew where to find the guns.

The answers to these questions show the scary reality that children face in this country.

I call on the Republican leadership to join together with Democrats in order to promote passage of sensible gun legislation that closes the gun show loophole, requires registration and licensing for all gun owners, and provides child-safety devices on handguns.

We, as Members of Congress, have the great privilege of establishing laws that promote the well-being of Americans, but with that privilege comes great responsibility to do what is right and what is ethical—and that is, supporting strong gun safety legislation and protecting our children.

Please, stand up for our children and support the motion to instruct.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every one of us here today wants to support this resolution because, on its face, I cannot imagine anybody who is not for effective enforcement of gun safety laws or common sense gun safety measures. That is certainly where I am, and that is where I have been all along on these matters.

I thought the chairman of the committee expressed it very well a few minutes ago that we come to a point

now in the debate over what is going on with the juvenile crime bill in discussing the gun issues where common sense ought to prevail. And common sense is very straight forward.

I know because I have been down that road and presented something pretty close to what the chairman has proposed that I am in agreement on now to try to compromise this matter, and we never got a vote on it on the floor. Instead, we had the two opposite ends arguing their motions and their amendments, and they had votes on those and not on the underlying proposition.

The reality is that when they go to a gun show to get their gun and want to buy it, there are certain dealers there and there are certain people who are not and they go to buy and they get an instant check in a matter of just a few minutes, if we have a provision which all of us agree on where an unlicensed person goes to the gun dealer who is the president of the gun show and asks that it be checked.

The problem with it is that about half the States have records that show if they have been arrested for a felony, whether they were convicted or it was dismissed or whether a plea bargain occurred, or whatever; and in those cases the check that they are doing will not show up the answer to that. So if their name goes in, bang, they find that out in a matter of just a few minutes. But in that tiny fraction of those whose names appear from the other 25 States that do not have the disposition results, they just are going to show that they were arrested for a felony, they might or might not be qualified and until the courthouse opens on Monday morning we are not going to know.

And it is only reasonable that we conform the check time for those few people who have their names appear to the current three business-day wait to do the check. And I think that is the right solution. That is the common sense solution.

The problem also, though, is that effective enforcement of gun safety is not what this administration has been doing on other levels; and I am really concerned about that. That is why we had Project Exile out here today in part.

The fact of the matter is that we are talking about the fact that many laws have not been enforced that are on the books. There are some 20,000 of them out there across the country. What I think is great about the bill we passed earlier today called Project Exile is that it provides a grant amount of money to the States and says to those States, for all their criminal justice needs if they want it, they can have this money, this \$100 million over 5 years that is available, if they will simply agree to do what Virginia has done; and that is to provide that for those who are found to be in the possession of a handgun, carrying it during the course of the commission of a violent crime or drug trafficking offence or

using it in that case, there is going to be a tack-on minimum mandatory 5-year sentence without the right to parole in addition to the underlying sentence.

They get an additional tack-on of 5 years minimum mandatory sentence if they are found to have the gun in their possession during the commission of those crimes. And if the State does not have that law, it can still qualify to get the grant money if it would agree to provide an understanding with the U.S. attorney in the area or the attorney general for the whole State to prosecute with this agreement those who are convicted felons in the State who are found in simple possession of a gun, whether they are in the commission of a crime or not. Because under the existing Federal law, there is a minimum mandatory sentence for 5 years there, too.

Why is this important? This is important because it is truly an effective gun measure. It provides deterrents that say, we are not going to stand for anybody using a gun in the commission of a crime; and if they commit a crime and the States adopt these rules, and most of the crimes in the States are in the States, not in the Federal system, then they are going to go away for a long period of time. And we have avoidable tragedies that are going to finally be avoidable.

They are avoidable in the sense that if they have people out on the streets who have been locked up before who have committed these violent crimes and go back out again, they are there to commit crimes again. And most of the violent crime with guns in this country, unfortunately, are committed by those who have been in prison previously.

So those tragedies are avoidable if the States will come forward and enact what Virginia has done in Project Exile and what we have encouraged in this bill we have passed earlier today, and that is a minimum mandatory 5-year sentence on top of what other crime they have if they committed it with a gun. And in addition, of course, we have the deterrent message that is involved in it. That is the kind of enforcement we need.

We are here today, though, talking about in this motion to instruct getting together on another bill. And I am all for doing it. I am for the safety locks, and I am for trying to have a small capacity involved in this with fewer clips; and I am for a lot of other things that are in that bill.

The sticking point in the gun shows can be resolved. It should be resolved. Common sense, which is the other part of this resolution, says it should be. I am for common sense. Let us adopt this motion to instruct and get it done.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have to say, since last August, we have certainly been trying to

meet and come up with some agreement. But this is spring, and spring is always the rebirth and the rethinking and the replanting and the regrowing. So maybe because we finally are seeing the American people and maybe because the Million Moms March is coming up on Mother's Day we are getting a lot of pressure to get actually something done because the American people want something done.

□ 1715

Certainly this side of the aisle is more than willing to work and hopefully we can get a bill done because I have always said, it does not matter whether you are Republican or Democrat, we should be protecting our children and our citizens. We certainly do support the Senate-backed gun safety provisions. They included closing the gun show loophole, banning high capacity ammunition clips, and requiring child safety locks on all new guns. To me those are all common sense.

Today obviously we have seen the President, he has been right next door in Maryland signing legislation that requires child safety locks in that State. New York State, we have got Governor Pataki putting forth his initiatives on gun violence in this country. We are seeing it with all our governors. I am very happy to see that the NRA has decided to work with us and say, well, maybe we should be doing something here today. I am very happy to work with the NRA. We always have been. Certainly I am sure they will be sitting with us when we come up to the conferees.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and I, we agree on something else. Today we passed and voted on the gentleman from Florida's bill, but I happen to think that Enforce, which is a bill that the gentleman from Michigan and I are there with, would add more resources to trying to stop the gun violence in this country, and the only way we are going to be able to do that, if we give our police, our ATF, and our local prosecutors and Federal prosecutors the backup that they need.

I hope while we are all in this good mood right before we go back on vacation that we can get all this done. I would be absolutely thrilled. Actually you might see me smile for the first time in a number of years. But all kidding aside, I am happy that we have come to this point. I am happy we have come to this point and I am happy that we are actually talking, because since August we have lost too many children on a daily basis, we have lost too many citizens on a daily basis, and we do not even have a count on how many are injured and have survived.

So anything that we can do to move this forward, to show the American people that we do care, because I have to tell you, the American people are starting to have a lot of second thoughts about the sanity that was inside this building. If we could all come together and work together to have a

meaningful bill passed, with this motion I certainly support it and thank everybody for getting us to this point.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY). She is certainly sincere. I just am concerned that expectations are so high that passing this sort of legislation is somehow going to fill the hearts and the souls of our young people that now somehow are empty and consumed with violence with sweetness and light. There is much more to the problem of the culture that encourages antisocial conduct, much more profound than simply restricting the availability of the weapons that cause all the problems.

I do not mean to demean the fact that we need legislation to narrow the access to these weapons of destruction, but to think that that is going to solve the problem I think misses the mark. There were some 17 Federal laws and some 14 State laws that were violated at Columbine. Adding more laws, I still think it is worth the effort, I do not denigrate that. It is worth the effort. We have to keep the focus on these things. But let us not end our quest for a solution to the wanton destruction of life, especially among our young people thinking if we remove the instruments of death somehow we will remove the incentives for treating life as a thing and as a throwaway item.

As I have said before, and I welcome this opportunity to say it again, we have a bill, we want your support, we have had it for many months, and the only contentious part is the gun show part, and the gun show part that we propose is a middle ground between the Dingell amendment and the Lautenberg amendment. Let us get on this and let us confront the Senate with it, which is another galaxy as we all know, but let us confront them with it and say, Here it is, we need your support.

If we can do that, as I say, the problem, the immediate problem of getting a decent, common sense response to the high school killings can be solved. I believe we can do it. I hate to be cynical. I hate to think that some people want the issue and not a bill, not a solution. I do not believe that. I refuse to believe that. I will not believe that. But right now we need cooperation and consultation. Let us put politics aside and let us agree that we have a plan and it is going to work.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to thank the gentleman, the chairman of the committee for his remarks, and also to thank him for joining in the letter that we are sending to the chairman of the conference committee, ORRIN HATCH.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) who has worked on gun safety for a couple of Congresses now.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for offering this motion, bringing us back to this point where we can engage in, hopefully, dialogue in conference. I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his position in wanting to be open to get this to conference and to resolve this issue.

We have long struggled as mothers and grandmothers in seeing so many children being killed at the touch of a gun, a gun that a trigger lock can be placed on and perhaps prevent the killings of over 13 children per day. Yes, I have introduced a bill in the 105th Congress and the 106th Congress talking about child safety locks. I looked at that as just common sense legislation, nothing too onerous but simply trying to make sure that our children are safe. There are mothers who are crying to me in the area that I represent in Watts, one of the most violent areas in this country, where violence has just absolutely permeated the streets. They are asking for this type of safety measure that will help us to bring our children back to some sensibility and hopefully will bring families together.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that this is not the end-all of all of it but it is the beginning of helping us cope with this issue. I say to the chairman and the ranking member, I hope in their final words today that they will give us some definitive dates or date by which we can convene this conference so that we can speak to the many questions that mothers are asking and fathers are asking about gun safety and their children. I say to them that this Nation has entrusted us with trying to do the best we can in the halls of Congress to bring about sensible legislation that will protect our children. I think this is a move in the right direction. I urge the chairman and the ranking member to give us dates as they leave today to help us to come to the point that we want to get to.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this motion directs members of the conference committee on the Senate-passed bipartisan gun violence bill to immediately meet and report both sensible gun violence and gun enforcement provisions. We can and should do both.

Instead, the majority bowing to the NRA has tried to stifle both gun violence legislation and gun enforcement legislation. They will not have the conference committee meet even though they tell the President they will try to do otherwise. Just weeks ago, the NRA attacked President Clinton with the rhetoric that made members of the majority party run away from them. They

even opposed the Lofgren motion that directed the conference to meet.

Even NRA sees that its extremeness has backfired. They are today supporting this motion that goes beyond Lofgren to say that we should meet and report legislation on loopholes and enforcement. Even the NRA is running for cover. But we do not want cover. We want action. Today, an enforcement bill was passed. I did not get a chance to speak on that issue but that bill does nothing more than prosecutors and U.S. attorneys can already do. Janet Reno implemented trigger lock, and trigger lock is already a program that allows U.S. attorneys and local prosecutors to proceed with serious enforcement of offenses committed with guns. So it was, in my opinion, not a good idea to vote for that because it only applied to six States.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) talked about it is more than mere enforcement. Yes, it is. Prosecution is more than just mere enforcement. Sometimes for children it means intervention, sometimes for children it means diversion, sometimes for children it means rehabilitation and not just warehousing which is what we traditionally do in this country with children who commit crimes.

I am not for people using guns and violence and I am not for people saying that they ought to be able to carry guns because in many of our States they do have a carrying a concealed weapon provision. You can walk around anywhere and carry a gun.

What I am for and what I am encouraging my colleagues to do is to in fact say, we are tired of this. What we want to do today is pass sensible, common sense gun enforcement and gun safety. Let us stop talking about we want to get rid of guns and in State legislatures enacting carrying concealed weapons provisions. Let us stop talking about we want to reduce violence in our country and then we proceed to pass nonsensical positions. Let us stop talking about we want to do enforcement when we want to say, well, we are not going to pass a loophole because we are going to keep it open for another day, that people ought to be able to buy a gun even when you cannot clear a record check. It does not make sense to me. Let us be sensible. The people of America expect us to be sensible and use common sense.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the words here today, I must say that I am more encouraged today than I have been since last August by what has been said. I am hopeful that we will in fact be able to achieve what I think is achievable. I think it is simply wonderful that the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Michigan are going to send a letter over to the chairman of the committee and ask that we meet. I commend both of them for doing that.

I was grateful to hear about the discussion that I know has been discussed privately but never I do not believe on the floor before today of how we can close the gun show loophole in a way that works that the gentleman from Illinois described and the gentleman from Michigan has described. I would just like to say that I hope that the very positive language is followed up with very positive action.

I know that action is hard to do because there are forces in the country that are opposed to taking action, and it will take us all working together to make sure that this gets done. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that there are many problems that face America. The overavailability of guns is one of them. But we know that there are people who are emotionally unstable, people suffering from untreated mental illness that go on rampages, children that have been abused or neglected and who do wrong things. All of those problems will continue to exist. But if we can reduce the availability of weapons that can hurt so many, then we will have achieved something and we will still have the other issues to work on.

I would just say that I am happy to hear the words. I am eager to see the action. I am hopeful that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois can sit down as soon as possible even after the vote on this motion today. The letter I think has now been reprinted and will be sent off. I am willing to do anything I can to be supportive of achieving this for the children and parents of America. We will be watching very carefully to make sure that we all do our part to make sure that this action actually becomes a reality.

□ 1730

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and thank our colleagues for bringing this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about the fate of some of our felons in America, they cannot vote; it is difficult to get a job. I often have those who have paid their dues and served time calling the congressional office back in Tennessee asking for assistance in trying to get a job to support their family. They have a hard time getting a job.

Yet they can go right across the bridge from where I live, I am from Memphis, Tennessee, Mr. Speaker; and they can go right across the bridge into Arkansas and even parts of my State to a gun show; and, if they are lucky, if it does not come up quite quick enough that they are a convicted felon, they can buy a gun. Now, we do not allow them to get a job to support their family, but if they get mad enough, we allow them to buy a gun to shoot their family. Cannot vote; cannot get a job.

This conference committee has not met since last August. We do a lot of talking in this Chamber about caring for American families and American workers. What worker in America cannot go to work for 7 or 8 months and claim that they are on the job?

We claim that we are busy around here. We all know better. We know that we are not accomplishing much legislatively here in this Congress. We have a minimum wage bill languishing in the Senate; we have a Patients' Bill of Rights languishing in conference. Finally those on that conference committee have gotten together. We have seniors clamoring for a seniors drug benefit. What is it we are doing that we are so busy we cannot work on this matter?

The States of Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York, all led by Republican governors, have all stared down Charlton Heston. Shame on Charlton Heston for referring to the President as a liar. Shame on Wayne LaPierre for suggesting that the President had blood on his hands for the shooting death of the former basketball coach of Northwestern University.

I understand tempers can flair and emotions can rise, and perhaps mine is right now, Mr. Speaker. But I am a member of that generation. I come from that generation that would have to deal with the legacy of laws passed here in this Congress. I applaud the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his reaching out in the earlier part of this debate, and I join my colleagues in hoping that a resolution can be achieved between both sides. But that should not stop this conference committee from doing its work.

I close with this. Some on the other side suggested we ought to be focused on gun enforcement as opposed to gun safety. We can do both, and we know that. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and Senator SCHUMER have offered something that will allow us to do that very thing.

I thank the chairman. I look forward to working with him. I ask the conference committee on juvenile justice to do the right thing, to come together and meet. I do not know of any worker in America who could not go to work for 8 months and ask for a paycheck.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion; and I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, that according to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a Member who has been working on this issue, and our ranking member of the committee, I am very glad that they seem optimistic that there has been some discussion on the floor today that there will be meetings, that there will be movement, that we can get a bill passed, because I do not know how the rest of my colleagues feel, but I am so frustrated.

I listen to my friends, my neighbors, my constituents. They are angry. They are all preparing for that Million Mom March on Mother's Day, and they are angry. They do not get it; they do not understand it. They feel that no matter how much we argue, no matter how hard we work, our efforts to pass common sense gun safety legislation and to strengthen the enforcement of gun safety laws seem to be blocked by this Congress.

The cries of the American people, the cries that so many of my colleagues and I have tried to echo and amplify in this Chamber, have fallen on deaf ears. While our constituents demand real concrete action, the Republican leadership puts up impassable roadblocks to progress on any front. Any bill with teeth, any bill that will really enforce gun safety laws and will really prevent children and felons from getting guns, is immediately disqualified from consideration.

I do believe the American people get it. They are on to the tactics of the NRA and its friends in this Congress. So it is time for Congress to pay attention to the American people, not just lip service. The Juvenile Justice Conference Committee should meet now, and it should not stop meeting until we have a real bill to consider, with effective common sense gun safety and enforcement provisions.

Preventing the committee from meeting and blocking the debate from happening is undemocratic. We have no room for these tactics. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter recently signed by myself and the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) to Chairman HATCH asking that we have a Juvenile Justice Conference meeting.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, April 11, 2000.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HATCH: We write to request a juvenile justice conference meeting as soon as possible.

As you are aware, in the last two months, we have witnessed a succession of gun violence tragedies. We have been shocked by a six-year-old shooting a six-year-old in Mount Morris Township, Michigan. We have seen a nursing home held hostage and a mass shooting in Pittsburgh. In February, Memphis firefighters responding to a call were shot and killed by a disturbed man. It is clear that the Nation would like Congress to respond.

We know that there is not complete agreement on all of the issues before the Conference. We also recognize the need for compromise. We have already agreed in principle to proposed language to reduce the waiting period to 24 hours in most cases, but are still trying to resolve appropriate "safety hatch" exceptions.

We have pledged to each other to begin anew negotiations. We believe, however, that beginning the work of the Conference will play a constructive role in the necessary process of narrowing our differences.

We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,  
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee.  
JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,  
Ranking Member,  
House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, for 4 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), I think I was on the floor earlier today and acknowledged that the legislation that we were debating, the civil asset forfeiture law, was truly a bipartisan legislative initiative. It had wound its way to the floor, and we were glad to support it as both Democrats and Republicans.

I can truly say today that where we are today represents at least bipartisan commitment on behalf of the House of Representatives. So I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for being part of this debate, but as well acknowledging that the motion to instruct as offered by the ranking member pursuant to his leadership, along with myself and the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MCCARTHY), is in fact the right way to go.

Just a few hours ago I took issue with the Project Exile, not because the State of Texas might not have the opportunity to be a participant, but I used the term "holistic." That is why I think this motion to instruct is effective, because it talks about the holistic approach to gun regulation. It acknowledges that we do have a Constitution, but in fact it talks about preventing children from getting guns. That is the angst of what all of us are crying out, that is the pain of Columbine, that is the pain of Kentucky, that is the pain of Arkansas, when our children get guns and do violence.

The picture of this precious life reflects when a child has gotten a gun. It has nothing to do with Project Exile and locking up grown people that have guns. It has a lot to do with keeping guns out of the hands of children. The motion to instruct talks about keeping guns out of the hands of children.

I would hope that we could encourage the other body to sit down and meet. I would hope that we, Members of the House of Representatives, now knowing that the NRA and Handgun, Inc., is supporting this motion to instruct that deals specifically with access to guns and keeping them away from children, can we not have a meeting of the minds to save lives?

Just last week in my district, a young boy took four pistols, I did not

say one, I did not say two or three, but I said four, in his knapsack, if you will, to his school. That shows that locking up criminals, which is extremely important, that use guns, and I am a strong supporter of that, it requires us to have gun prevention; it requires us to hold adults responsible when they have guns, and allow them to get in the hands of children.

So what I say today is can we not stand on the floor of the House with the motion to instruct and have it embedded not only in our heart, but in our action? Can we realize that this life would not have been saved on the basis only of locking up that criminal who had a gun? It would likewise have been saved with a trigger lock. It would likewise have been saved with holding adults responsible for letting guns get in the hands of children.

The American Association of Pediatrics has put it in the right way. This is a health phenomenon. We are losing more children's lives through guns. In 1997, there were 32,000 firearm-related deaths; 4,000 of those victims were children and adolescents 20 years of age and younger.

So the American Association of Pediatrics has said that the most important thing is that we decrease the number of guns in the hands of our children and in the hands of this Nation.

Guns, yes. Guns are something that we happen to own in this country, and I recognize that. I recognize the second amendment. But I think it is important that we also recognize that we collectively can save lives. I would hope that the mutual work of those of us who have offered this motion to instruct, and I would hope that the ranking member and chairman of this Committee on the Judiciary will find the momentum to move us forward to holistically approach this, gun safety, gun regulation, gun wisdom, and, of course, guns that are in the hands of individuals that will not cause us to lose lives.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, finding myself with more time than I need, I would be pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like in particular to read the statement of the American Association of Pediatrics, and that is that because firearms-related injury to children is associated with deaths and severe morbidity and is a significant public health problem, child health care professionals can and should provide effective leadership in efforts to stem this epidemic.

The statement concludes that while there has been a slight decrease in numbers in the last few years, the number of victims of firearm-related injuries constitutes a public health problem that must be addressed. Therefore, they recognize the importance of a variety of countermeasures, educational,

environmental, engineering, enactment, enforcement, economic incentives, and evaluation.

The most important aspect of this is to keep guns out of the hands of children and out of the homes where children are.

So I close my remarks, and I thank the chairman very much, because this has hit all of us very close to home. Because of the fact it has hit us very close to home, I do not think we can wait any longer to pass legislation. So I would hope that though we think that we can only do it by enforcing those hard laws, which are part of it, we can also do it with prevention, closing the gun show loopholes, providing trigger locks, holding parents responsible, so that we can ensure that we do not lose these precious lives on the basis of the reckless use of guns or children getting guns.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his bipartisan spirit. I hope we get that kind of vote on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague from Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CARSON from Indiana, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD from California and Ms. MCCARTHY from New York. As a cosponsor of this motion I offer this motion to instruct conferees on the Juvenile Justice legislation. This is the second motion to instruct the conferees to meet to have substantive meetings to offer the President and the people of the United States a viable gun bill.

I strongly support this motion to instruct because the American people have waited long enough for us to act on this legislation. We can no longer delay. We must move forward before another tragedy like that of 3-year old Alisha Jackson who died just a couple of weeks ago because she got a hold of a gun while playing in her home.

Little Alisha Jackson, a vivacious 3-year-old girl who liked to watch Barney and the Teletubbies, was killed Thursday, March 23 as she was playing with a gun in her home. Her father stated that Alisha had found a pistol in the house and was handling it when it somehow discharged.

As the motion states, I agree that the committee on the conference must not only meet to discuss the current Juvenile Justice Bill, the committee report should include:

Measures that aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of the conference, and

Common-sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives and stalkers from obtaining fire arms and children from getting access to guns within the scope of conference.

Just yesterday, in my state of Texas a 13-year-old eighth-grader carried four pistols—three loaded—into a junior high school classroom in a gym bag here. Fortunately he was caught, but the question remains how did this child get a hold of these guns.

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) strongly stresses that the most effective measure to prevent firearm-related injuries to children and adolescent is to remove guns from homes and communities.

Though this may stop the proliferation of firearm tragedies, I do believe that there are alternative means to decrease the prevalence of child firearm injuries.

The Juvenile Justice Bill provides such an alternative and it is time for the conferees to meet to address the concerns of the American people.

In the past few weeks my office has received many calls and letters from constituents whom mistakenly believe that we support legislation that will take away their guns.

It is obvious that the propaganda machine of the national Rifle Association is working to change our focus from the issue of children and guns and gun ownership in general. Like many of my Colleagues, I do not oppose responsible gun ownership.

However, like President Clinton, I am concerned about children and their access to guns. I am concerned that guns are not regulated in the same way that toys are regulated.

I am concerned that we do not have safety standards for locking devices on guns. I am concerned that we do not prohibit children from attending gun shows unsupervised. I am concerned that we have not focused on the statistics on children and guns.

According to the AAP statement:

The United States has the highest rates of firearm-related deaths among industrialized countries.

The overall rate of firearm-related deaths for children younger than 15 years of age is nearly 12 times greater than that found for 25 other industrialized nations.

The Academy even predicts that by the year 2003, firearm-related deaths may become the leading cause of injury-related death!

Already, among black males 10 through 34 years of age, injuries from firearms are the leading cause of deaths.

Even more tragic is the fact that most firearm-related deaths of children occur before their arrival at the hospital.

Thus, most of our children that injured by firearms do not even have a chance. This is the reality in our country that must not be denied!

Another important fact pointed out by the American Academy of Pediatrics is that:

In 1994, the mean medical cost per gunshot injury was approximately \$17,000 producing 2.3 billion in lifetime medical costs, 1.1 billion of which was paid by U.S. taxpayers.

Thus, it not only makes common sense, but economic sense for the Juvenile Justice bill to include child safety measures so that we can prevent tragedies like Columbine and Littleton Colorado from occurring again.

Thirteen die everyday from firearms. Why can we not rise above our political differences to pass effective gun legislation that would address this heartbreaking situation?

It would seem that in almost the year since the Littleton shootings, we have done little to move forward on the Juvenile Justice Bill.

Despite the majority's reluctance to meet and discuss the current Juvenile Justice Bill, I am confident that the American people will not allow this matter to rest.

This motion to instruct urges the conferees to act immediately on the Juvenile Justice Bill. We cannot wait for another tragedy to occur. I urge my Colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this motion to instruct con-

ferees on H.R. 1501, the juvenile justice bill. I appreciate the constructive comments made by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. Speaker, how many Americans must die before Congress makes a commitment to keeping guns out of the hands of children and criminals? How many more news reports do we need to see of innocent children gunned down, of families and communities devastated by gun violence? At Columbine High last year, 13 children were killed, 23 injured, with a weapon originating at a gun show. We thought this was the last straw, but we thought Paducah was the last straw, we thought Conyers was the last straw, we thought Jonesboro was the last straw, we thought Springfield was the last straw.

Just weeks ago, little Kayla Rolland was gunned down in a Michigan elementary school, murdered by a 6-year-old child who learned how to kill with a handgun before he learned how to read.

□ 1745

It is time to put a stop to these tragedies. Compare our record, compare the epidemiology with any other country. We have a serious public health epidemic. Yes, epidemiology is the right word. This is a public health problem.

This motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501 to meet and report a committee substitute is important. It would include common-sense gun safety measures. The conferees must take action to close gun show loopholes that allow criminals and children and the mentally ill to buy firearms.

Mr. Speaker, it must include provisions to require child safety locks and other safety measures that save children's lives. They must provide maximum support for measures that help enforce our Nation's gun safety laws and protect our children from gun violence.

Now is the time for action. Let us prevent tragedies. Let us pass this motion.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the 1-year anniversary of the tragic shooting at Columbine High School. That horrible day not only claimed the lives of innocent students but also shed new light on the gun violence that robs too many of our young people.

The Columbine shootings were a watershed event that reshaped the way that Americans think about gun violence. Parents asked themselves today, Is it safe to send my daughter to school? They pray, Don't let a shooting like Colorado claim my son's life.

People understand that the causes of such tragedies are complex and varied. They also want to keep kids and criminals from obtaining deadly weapons. They overwhelmingly support common-sense measures that would keep



guns out of the wrong hands without jeopardizing the rights of law-abiding citizens, but the Republican leadership, taking their cues from the gun lobby, has failed to enact common sense gun safety laws.

In that year since Columbine, the Republican leadership has tried to cover their failure with sleight of hand by presenting a false choice between enforcement and efforts to close gaping loopholes that allow criminals to buy guns. The American people rightly reject this false choice, and we were here to say that Congress should take a strong stand in favor of both enforcement and of enactment of needed gun safety measures.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my Republican colleagues to join Democrats and support effective enforcement of gun laws, support the President's measure to devote more resources and prosecutors to tackling gun crimes. Congress must also send to the President gun safety provisions passed by the Senate, shut down the loopholes at gun shows that puts guns in the hands of criminals, require a child safety lock to be sold with handguns, and ban the importation of high capacity ammunition clips. These are simple steps voted on in a bipartisan way in the United States Senate.

These are simple steps which close dangerous avenues to illegal gun ownership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield my last 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I yield 30 more seconds to the gentlewoman so she may have a full minute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, how generous of the chairman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this is bipartisan day.

Ms. DELAURO. It is. It is wonderful. I urge the gentleman from Illinois to support the motion.

Mr. Speaker, too much delay, too many lives lost have been destroyed since Columbine. Americans want and they deserve better.

Yesterday, in North Haven, Connecticut, I stood with the head of the Connecticut Chiefs of Police; the Chief of Police, Kevin Connelly of North Haven; with the representatives of Mossberg & Company, gun manufacturers; Marlin Firearms, which manufactured guns in my community; with a representative of the National Sports Shooting Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I was there was to talk about gun safety locks on guns. It was a collaborative effort with the industry, with the law enforcement community, and with the political structure that can come together around these issues. If only the Members of this body could come together and say that, yes, in fact, what we are going to do is to make sure that we do have enforcement, but at the

same time pass those gun safety measures that would make a difference in the lives of our community today.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has the right to close. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, might I have a minute for the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL)?

Mr. HYDE. I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for yielding me the 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I support this motion. Its adoption will remind the conferees that they have a job to do and call on them to get started. Each of us have been elected to debate and act on proposals to address the country's business. Of course, it is not always convenient, and sometimes it does mean foregoing other things that we would like to do.

Mr. Speaker, for example, I would have liked to have accepted the invitation tomorrow to accompany the President when he travels to Colorado for a public appearance related to these very issues we are asking the conferees to consider, gun safety and steps to make it harder for criminals to obtain firearms.

But even though I would have liked to have gone to Colorado, I have decided I am going to stay here in order to take part in the debates and votes on the matters that will come before the House. For me that is the priority, and I think that seeking to reach agreement on these important public safety issues should be a priority for the conferees, so I urge the House to agree to this motion.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise almost to a point of inquiry of the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), or the supporter of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Certainly, what the Members have explained to the Congress this afternoon I do not think anyone could object to. I am happy to see that the two Members are drinking out of the same dipper, as we say in Alabama. But there is a question that I have that is sort of confusing to me. That is the underlying bill.

As I understand the motion the gentleman from Michigan has made, we are instructing the conferees to do a couple of things that sound good, meas-

ures that aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of the conference. Certainly we support that. I think all of us in this House would do that.

Two is commonsense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives, and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from getting access to guns, within the scope of the conference. Who could be opposed to that?

Our problem is, Mr. Speaker, that the Members also instruct the conferees to immediately report out a compromise measure. If I vote in favor of instructing the conferees to do these two things, and then thirdly, instruct them to report a compromise bill out, what if I am opposed to what they compromise on? Does my vote here in favor of this indicate that regardless of what they send out of the conference committee, am I obligating myself to vote for that, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

There are three things we do. First of all, we ask them to meet, and then accomplish these two things. I will leave to the gentleman's conscience and to the Members' conscience whether we are going to vote on the finished product, because nobody knows what it is going to be. But these are our instructions, and I hope that they can come as close to them as they can.

Two of the members of the conference are on the floor, maybe three, so they will be trying to live up to this commitment in our motion to instruct.

Mr. CALLAHAN. To those of us, Mr. Speaker, who are not famous on the floor of this House for voting for any gun control measures, we could have a strategy where the longer an offensive bill stayed in the conference, the better off we are.

Yet, I am in a position of double jeopardy. I support what the gentleman is saying with respect to effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of the conference, and commonsense gun safety measures. I support that. But this does not compel the conferees, as I understand it, to comply with the gentleman's request. It just simply says, reach a compromise and report back to this House some gun safety law.

I am afraid that if indeed the conferees are inclined, they might bring something back to the floor that is so offensive to me that I might have to vote against it, which is all right. That is my prerogative. But at the same time, I am really giving up the position that I am in now, where I know as long as it stays in conference, it is not going to be offensive to me.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's analysis. He will at all



times retain his autonomy and vote, as he has in the years he has been here, according to the dictates of his conscience and his judgment. But this is simply an effort to get some motion forward.

We are confronted with this issue. It is not going to go away. I think we can solve it on the merits intelligently and effectively. I hope and pray that we can come up with a product that would satisfy the gentleman, and I know the gentleman's predilection against gun control measures. I hope the gentleman gives us an opportunity to proceed.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I will do that, sir.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this motion. I appreciate the manner in which it is presented. I appreciate the fact that the ranking member of this committee and the chairman of this committee can articulate the fact that reasonable people may disagree sometimes on the means to be able to acquire the goal, but there is a common goal here. That is firearms safety, protecting our children, protecting our families.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is very simple. First of all, I think it is the place where we can all meet. The first part of this motion specifically says that we need to take measures to aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of the conference.

It can also be pointed out, the fact that there is more we need to do in enforcement of the law. The President in the State of the Union pointed out and said that we are not doing enough of enforcing the laws we have on the books. I think we can all agree to that. I think that both Republicans and Democrats can join with the President in saying we need to have more enforcement.

But the other point of this motion also points out that commonsense safety measures are not a threat to the second amendment rights, they are the best guarantee in the long run of preserving those rights. We are not talking about extraordinary measures here.

There have been disagreements between Republicans and Democrats on certain issues. One of those issues that we have been talking about is the gun show loophole. The ranking member, actually the dean of the Democratic Party, may disagree with some of us who are Republicans saying that there is a gap there that needs to be addressed. The ranking member agrees with this Member that there was never meant to be a loophole to allow people to purchase guns at a gun show that they could not purchase outside from a licensed dealer.

Now, I know that there are Members on both sides of the aisle that may talk about the fact that to close the loophole would end gun shows as we know it. I want to point out to the Members that California has a 10-day waiting pe-

riod, and has the largest gun shows in the world.

It is not the way to destroy gun shows. It is an inconvenience, but frankly, as a gun owner, a lot of us feel that that inconvenience is well worth the process.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask all of us to look at the motion and let us talk about this. The extremists on either side do not want this motion to pass, and they do not want this issue to be settled before this Congress adjourns. There are people in extreme components on both sides of this aisle that want to see this issue be used for political advantage, rather than public safety.

I want to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), for bridging that gap and leaving those extremists out where they belong, in the wings. I want to thank the Members for bringing this motion up to address this issue.

I would ask everyone to take the words of the chairman saying, as the House of Representatives, let us sit down and build a common agenda to present to the other body so that we can move this agenda and get it done and do what we tell the American people we really want done, that we actually want good gun law, that we actually want gun safety, not just partisan political bickering.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to be able to address this issue. It is a very emotional issue. It is an issue that bears a lot of weight and I just think that those of us that really want to be able to go back to our district and say we stood up for gun safety, we stood up for public safety, we stood up for people's rights to be protected and to be safe in their home and the fact is now is the time for the ranking member and the chairman to get together, for us to follow their leadership and find time to agree on good, commonsense safety measures and let us walk away from the excuses of always finding a way to fight about this issue. This is a place we can meet and I thank the chairman for that chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

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

Mr. CONYERS. 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 406, nays 22, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Ackerman	DeLay	(TX)
Aderholt	Deutsch	Jefferson
Allen	Diaz-Balart	John
Andrews	Dickey	Johnson (CT)
Archer	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Armey	Dingell	Johnson, Sam
Baca	Dixon	Jones (OH)
Bachus	Doggett	Kanjorski
Baird	Dooley	Kaptur
Baker	Doolittle	Kasich
Baldacci	Doyle	Kelly
Baldwin	Dreier	Kennedy
Ballenger	Duncan	Kildee
Barcia	Dunn	Kilpatrick
Barrett (NE)	Edwards	Kind (WI)
Barrett (WI)	Ehlers	King (NY)
Bartlett	Ehrlich	Kingston
Barton	Emerson	Klecza
Bass	Engel	Klink
Bateman	English	Knollenberg
Becerra	Eshoo	Kolbe
Bentsen	Etheridge	Kucinich
Bereuter	Evans	Kuykendall
Berkley	Everett	LaFalce
Berman	Ewing	LaHood
Berry	Farr	Lampson
Biggert	Fattah	Lantos
Bilbray	Filner	Largent
Bilirakis	Fletcher	Larson
Bishop	Foley	Latham
Blagojevich	Forbes	LaTourette
Blumenauer	Ford	Lazio
Blunt	Fossella	Leach
Boehlert	Fowler	Lee
Boehner	Frank (MA)	Levin
Bonilla	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Bonior	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)
Bono	Frost	Lewis (KY)
Borski	Galleghy	Linder
Boswell	Ganske	Lipinski
Boucher	Gejdenson	LoBiondo
Boyd	Gekas	Lofgren
Brady (PA)	Gephardt	Lowey
Brady (TX)	Gibbons	Lucas (KY)
Brown (FL)	Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)
Brown (OH)	Gillmor	Luther
Bryant	Gilman	Maloney (CT)
Burr	Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)
Burton	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Buyer	Goodling	Markey
Callahan	Gordon	Martinez
Calvert	Goss	Mascara
Camp	Graham	Matsui
Campbell	Granger	McCarthy (MO)
Canady	Green (TX)	McCarthy (NY)
Cannon	Green (WI)	McCollum
Capps	Greenwood	McCrery
Capuano	Gutierrez	McDermott
Cardin	Gutknecht	McGovern
Carson	Hall (OH)	McHugh
Castle	Hall (TX)	McInnis
Chabot	Hansen	McIntyre
Chambliss	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Clayton	Hayes	McNulty
Clement	Hefley	Meehan
Clyburn	Herger	Meek (FL)
Coble	Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)
Collins	Hilleary	Menendez
Combest	Hilliard	Mica
Condit	Hinchey	Millender-
Conyers	Hinojosa	McDonald
Cooksey	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Costello	Hoefel	Miller, Gary
Cox	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Coyne	Holden	Minge
Cramer	Holt	Mink
Crane	Hooley	Moakley
Crowley	Horn	Moore
Cubin	Houghton	Moran (KS)
Cummings	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Cunningham	Hulshof	Morella
Danner	Hunter	Murtha
Davis (FL)	Hutchinson	Nadler
Davis (IL)	Hyde	Napolitano
Davis (VA)	Inslee	Neal
Deal	Isakson	Nethercutt
DeFazio	Istook	Ney
Delahunt	Jackson (IL)	Northup

Norwood	Ryun (KS)	Tauscher
Nussle	Sabo	Tauzin
Oberstar	Salmon	Taylor (MS)
Obey	Sanchez	Taylor (NC)
Olver	Sanders	Terry
Ortiz	Sandlin	Thomas
Ose	Sawyer	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Saxton	Thompson (MS)
Oxley	Scarborough	Thornberry
Packard	Schaffer	Thune
Pallone	Schakowsky	Thurman
Pascarell	Scott	Tiahrt
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Tierney
Payne	Serrano	Toomey
Pease	Sessions	Towns
Pelosi	Shadegg	Trafficant
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Turner
Petri	Shays	Udall (CO)
Phelps	Sherman	Udall (NM)
Pickering	Sherwood	Upton
Pickett	Shimkus	Velazquez
Pitts	Shows	Vento
Pomeroy	Shuster	Visclosky
Porter	Simpson	Vitter
Portman	Sisisky	Walden
Price (NC)	Skeen	Walsh
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Waters
Quinn	Slaughter	Watkins
Radanovich	Smith (MI)	Watt (NC)
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Watts (OK)
Rangel	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Regula	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Reyes	Snyder	Weldon (FL)
Reynolds	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Rivers	Spratt	Weller
Roemer	Stabenow	Wexler
Rogan	Stark	Weygand
Rogers	Stearns	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Stenholm	Wicker
Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland	Wilson
Rothman	Stupak	Wise
Roukema	Sununu	Wolf
Roybal-Allard	Sweeney	Woolsey
Royce	Talent	Wu
Rush	Tancred	Wynn
Ryan (WI)	Tanner	Young (FL)

## NAYS—22

Barr	Jenkins	Riley
Chenoweth-Hage	Jones (NC)	Sanford
Coburn	Metcalf	Souder
DeMint	Mollohan	Stump
Goode	Paul	Wamp
Hayworth	Peterson (MN)	Young (AK)
Hill (MT)	Pombo	
Hostettler	Rahall	

## NOT VOTING—6

Bliley	DeGette	Myrick
Cook	McIntosh	Rodriguez

□ 1822

Messrs. SOUDER, WAMP, PETERSON of Minnesota, RAHALL, MOLLOHAN, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. HEFLEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2328, THE CLEAN LAKES PROGRAM

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-571) on the resolution (H. Res. 468) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2328) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-572) on the resolution (H. Res. 469) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3039, CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-573) on the resolution (H. Res. 470) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3039) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 94, TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-574) on the resolution (H. Res. 471) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 94) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES SHOULD ENCOURAGE FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS AND RESPECT FOR DEMOCRACY IN PERU

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should encourage free and fair elections and respect for democracy in Peru, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes an important statement of American policy towards Peru. It was passed unanimously by the Senate.

Independent election monitors in Peru have expressed grave doubts about the fairness of the electoral process now under way in Peru.

This resolution notes the absence of free and fair elections in Peru would constitute a major setback for the Peruvian people and for democracy in the hemisphere. It could result in instability in Peru and could jeopardize United States anti-narcotic objectives in Peru and the region.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment, Peru's electoral authorities are moving to finalize the vote count for the first round of that election. It is important that the House add its voice to the unanimous voice in the Senate and send a proper signal of U.S. support for democracy in Peru.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for bringing this resolution to the floor.

This resolution really comes at a very decisive moment in Peru's history. The votes from this past Sunday's election in Peru are being counted as we speak. International and Peruvian observers have already declared the electoral process to be damaged. The Organization of American States, the National Democratic Institute, and the Carter Center are among them.

Mr. Speaker, I have served as an international observer in the recent Nigerian elections and also in the elections in South Africa several years ago. We must value the importance of our international observers in their understanding and clarification of what is taking place abroad.

These nonpartisan Peruvian observers also have included the well-respected group Transparencia, and they have noted that the Fujimori government has attempted to unfairly manipulate this process to President Fujimori's advantage.

Now, the legitimacy of the entire process is in the balance. Pre-election polls and, more telling, election day exit polls and independent quick counts all point to President Fujimori's coming short of the 50 percent vote needed to win in the first round. Official vote counts appear to be inching toward 50 percent while independent tabulations show the count to be 47 to 49 percent.

This resolution, S.J. Res. 43, actually calls on Peru's government to ensure a clean, legitimate electoral process. For the Peruvian people and for the U.S.-Peruvian relations, we implore President Fujimori's efforts, and we implore him to do the right thing in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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