

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, last year, as thousands of children do every day, a 15-year-old girl from my district logged onto her computer and struck up an online acquaintance. Little did she or her family realize that this was the beginning of a nightmare that continues to this day.

Lindsay's new online friend turned out to be a sexual predator who eventually convinced her to run away from her home in Florida, eventually to Greece. One of the most troubling aspects of this case was the lack of support and the disinterest from Federal authorities. Not only was the FBI reluctant to become involved, but the U.S. Attorney's Office has declined to enforce existing laws, claiming that this series of crimes involving interstate and international air transport and the use of the Internet to lure a child away from home into international sexual servitude is not a matter of Federal jurisdiction.

In response to this failure and the failure of the FAA and the Department of Transportation to use their rule-making authority to address any of these issues, I have filed legislation that would clarify the power of the Federal Government to bring such predators to justice.

The Children's Air Travel Protection Act and the Parental Rights Protection Act would require that airlines get a written certification that a minor has parental or guardian's permission and would forbid the use of the Internet to interfere with a parent's authority or induce a minor to run away from home.

I would encourage my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 2600 and 2601.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my strong support for a real Patients' Bill of Rights, H.R. 2563, which is sponsored by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

In working to craft patient protection, we must ask ourselves, are we really helping the patient? One of the biggest concerns raised by the proponents of the competing bill is that the liability limit on punitive damages is too high in the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry bill.

But I ask the Members, can anyone put a price tag on someone's life? If an HMO is found guilty of negligence, they should be held accountable for their actions; and HMOs exist to help patients, not to harm them. Opponents of the legislation argue that employers will be hurt by the liability provisions in this bill. This is misleading. Em-

ployers who do not directly participate in making medical decisions are protected from liability. Employers are also protected by language in the bill which allows them to name a designated decisionmaker to make decisions on their behalf.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2563, the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2590, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 206

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. 2590) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. The amendment printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 5 pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII may be offered only by Representative Smith of New Jersey or his designee and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill. All points of order against that amendment are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending

which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 206 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2590, the fiscal year 2002 Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

House Resolution 206 also provides that the two amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the rule shall be considered as adopted. This rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill.

House Resolution 206 provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment by paragraph. The rule also waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5, which may be offered only by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) or his designee, and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, and shall be considered as read.

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority. The underlying bill, H.R. 2590, provides a total of roughly \$17 billion in funding for a variety of Federal agencies and departments, about \$1.1 billion more than the current fiscal year, and \$400 million more than President Bush's budget request.

The Committee on Rules approved this rule by voice vote last night, and I urge my colleagues to support it so that we may proceed with general debate and consideration of this bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Treasury-Postal Operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 and in support of the rule.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for their work on this bill and for their recognition of the importance to the entire country of the necessary departments and agencies it funds.

For a moment, let me just say how important this bill is to the American people. It funds such diverse agencies as Customs and the Postal Service. It

increases funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the National Archives.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the programs and agencies of national interest that I just alluded to, this bill contains a number of significant projects important to my home State of Florida that I would like to highlight briefly.

I am pleased that this bill contains \$15 million for the completion of the new Federal courthouse in Miami. I cannot overemphasize the importance to our region that this facility will have. I know full well the burdens that our courts and judges face today. They have a difficult job in ideal circumstances. However, when these jurists are not given adequate facilities and resources, their job is made that much more difficult.

For the very same reasons, it is worth noting that this bill continues significant funding for the proposed new United States Courthouse in Orlando. I am especially pleased to see that the Committee on Appropriations has directed that the courthouse must complement the historic community and the future Florida A&M college of law.

As an alumnus of the law school, I am certain that the new facility in Orlando will continue the proud tradition of FAMU.

Additionally, this bill contains funding for improvements to the Federal building in Jacksonville and to the Federal Courthouse in Tallahassee. Let me be perfectly clear, these are necessary funds; and, frankly, they are needed throughout the country.

As the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the others note in the report that accompanies this bill, this is not an issue of luxury for the judiciary. The courthouse requests represent an effort to keep up with the skyrocketing judicial workload while ensuring a safe environment for employees, detainees, and the public. I could not agree more.

Mr. Speaker, very soon in this debate my colleague and neighbor, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), will seek time to explain a very worthy program that she has fought tirelessly for.

Let me briefly extend my support to the First Accounts program. While the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) will go into more detail, suffice it to say that this is one of the few programs in this bill which specifically targets low-income Americans. I wholeheartedly support the program and urge its full funding and authorization.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss what I perceive to be one major omission of this otherwise good bill. This bill funds the Federal Election Commission. It has now been 240 days since our last Federal election, 240 days since we discovered what problems exist in this country when it comes to elections.

Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed to report to the American people that, since

the last election, Congress has done nothing, nothing in the area of appropriations. While we are spending millions of dollars on the Salt Lake Olympics and billions on a tax cut for the wealthy, we have not spent one penny to fix the problems that plague the last election, not one cent.

Columnist E.J. Dionne said yesterday, "Some problems are genuinely difficult to solve. Some problems are easy. When the solutions are clear, a failure to act is irresponsible, the result of a lack of will."

I submit to my colleagues and to the American people that the solutions to our disgraceful election systems are abundantly clear. Congress' failure to act is worse than irresponsible, it is shameful. The amendment I will offer later today is the first step toward fixing the problems that our States face in updating and modernizing their election equipment.

In fact, to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, this will be the first time that Congress discusses this issue in the context of floor consideration of a relevant appropriations measure. Sure, Members have spoken in special orders, in travel around the country, or in hearings. They have had 1-minutes here on the floor. But, until today, we have been unable to discuss dollars and cents. I look forward to the candid debate that I am certain the amendment will generate.

With that aside, Mr. Speaker, let me again say that this is a reasonably good bill, and the rule is fine as far as it goes. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for bringing this bill to the House.

This is a mostly bipartisan bill that helps millions of Americans from coast to coast, and I urge passage of the bill and adoption of the rule.

□ 1045

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, Mr. Speaker, and I rise in support of the rule. I think the rule is a fair rule that gives opportunity to debate this bill and protects some of the more controversial items that are within the bill for full debate.

I also want to say that I agree with the member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who has observed that this is a good bill and deserves passage. He is correct on that. I will be speaking more to that in the course of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise to comment on the amendment that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will offer at the time of the bill's consideration. He will offer an amendment that will provide \$600 million, as I un-

derstand it, to the FEC, for the purposes of effecting reforms in our election process throughout the United States.

It is clear that we need to invest in democracy. We invest a lot of dollars in national defense. We invest a lot of dollars in health care, education, and domestic spending. We invest a lot of dollars in entitlement programs. All of those dollars, in my opinion, are well invested, for the most part. But the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, has never invested dollars in Federal elections. Never.

We have always allowed that to be a burden that we place on the States and local subdivisions. We assumed, correctly in most instances, incorrectly in some, that those elections would be held in a manner that would serve our democracy well. But, Mr. Speaker, our democracy is not served well when some Americans go to the polls, having registered to vote, and show up at the polls and, in the first instance, may find that their name is not on the list and, therefore, they are not allowed to vote, but are told that someone will try to get on the telephone and see if it can be straightened out, but find that in this high-tech age in which we find ourselves happily that lo and behold they cannot get through to the central office and cannot find out whether that individual is able to vote.

Too many jurisdictions do not have the ability to provide a provisional ballot to say, here, go ahead and vote, and then when tomorrow comes we will have some time and we will check to see whether or not this individual is a valid voter; and if they are, because they are entitled to vote, they will also ensure that that person's vote is counted. Every American that goes to the poll assumes that they go to the poll for the purposes of expressing their opinion in this, the greatest democracy on the face of the earth. They expect to play a role in the decision-making process of their country. And if their vote is not counted, they are discriminated against, they are precluded from participating fully in our democracy.

Happily, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and myself and many others, including the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), have sponsored legislation which will do what the gentleman from Florida seeks to do, and that is, A, provide resources; provide resources for technology that will ensure at least that technology does not undermine the voter's intent and constitutional right. In addition, it will say to States who take any Federal dollars that they need to comply with certain requirements; that they need to have a registration system that works; that they need not disqualify, they must not disqualify otherwise totally qualified Americans from voting by some inadvertent or mistaken or perhaps conscious effort to undermine the ability to vote of some Americans.

In addition, we are going to provide for provisional ballots, good registration, purging that is not unfair, and a system that has technology that works for every American. That is the minimal that we ought to do as a Nation.

We are proposing the investment this year, for which we are budgeting fiscal year 2002, of \$550,000 million. That sounds like a lot of money. It is a lot of money. But spread across the 50 States, it is not. And I would hope that we will have full debate on the gentleman's amendment.

I am not sure what the disposition will be today, but in the final analysis we ought to adopt the gentleman's proposal. It is a proposal for democracy for our Nation's ideals and for our objectives.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume merely to respond to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member of the committee, that the jurisdiction allows for what is being contemplated today. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) because I know of his sincerity in proposing measures that will assist in remedying the many problems in this country with reference to our election system.

I have been asked often, as I travel about the country, how much is it going to cost? And my reply has been and will continue to be that democracy does not have a price. We spend money around here on fleas knees studies. So it would seem to me that we could find money to correct problems that exist throughout this Nation with reference to the infrastructure for our election systems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the previous question. I am very concerned about the fact that we are looking today at allowing a congressional pay raise as part of this rule.

I have to tell my colleagues that at this time, when we have just completed a decade where the watchwords have been fiscal responsibility, where we have been able to move to the point where we no longer have annual budget deficits, where we have actually paid down some debt, where we have had a great history over the last few years, and since I came to Congress to continue in that tradition, to preach frugality, to show fiscal responsibility, to be aggressive about paying down the debt, in my own State right now we have uranium miners, we have people who are exposed to radiation through fallout from Federal testing of nuclear weapons. They are dying right now and the Federal Government will not even fund them the compensation they are due. The Federal Government is sending them IOUs saying, well, we do owe you this money, we just do not have the money to give you, but we are okay giving a congressional pay raise.

I just do not think that fits with the times. And I think it is up to the Members of Congress to stand up and say we really do believe in fiscal responsibility. It is important we make a statement to the American people about our concerns about being responsible with their tax dollars.

This is an interesting procedural issue. We do not get to specifically have a straight up-or-down vote on a pay raise. I think we should. I think people deserve that. I think Congressmen ought to stand up and say whether or not they are for that. So for that reason I make these comments in opposition to the previous question and urge my fellow Members to vote "no" as well.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that nothing in this bill whatsoever deals with a Member of Congress' pay. No word whatsoever in this bill deals with congressional pay.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would say to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) that it is regrettable that it does not, because I for one believe that we are deserving of a cost of living adjustment, just so I go on record.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify the situation. We have historically, on this bill, on the previous question, had a vote. We have had a vote because we think the public is entitled to that. If the previous question were not passed, an amendment may be in order to preclude the cost of living adjustment for Members.

Long ago we decided, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, that that was the fair and proper thing to do. Everybody in the leadership on both sides has agreed that cost-of-living adjustments that go to everybody in the Federal service are justified.

This is not in that sense a pay raise. It is what most Federal Government employees receive, and we will receive less than, by about 1.2 percent, than Federal employees do.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, and I will be glad to yield him a minute of my time?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, does the gentleman from Maryland expect to vote for the previous question?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida will yield to me for a response.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman from Maryland will certainly vote for the

previous question, and I urge the Members to vote for the previous question.

Mr. LINDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am humbled and privileged this morning to have been given time by a young man for whom I have great admiration and praise, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is now a member of the Committee on Rules. God has wrought that I should stand here and be able to speak after he gives me the opportunity. I thank him so much.

I am pleased to be a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, serving with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); and I rise in support of the rule for this bill. It is an open rule. The rule provides a self-executing amendment that I offered that will make the \$10 million in fiscal year 2002 funding that the bill provides for the First Accounts program contingent upon the authorization of the program.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), of the Committee on Financial Services, had asked the Committee on Rules not to protect the First Accounts program from a point of order. The self-executing amendment is a means to address the concerns of the gentleman from Ohio, and I thank him and the Committee on Rules for supporting my amendment.

The First Accounts initiative is a demonstration program that is designed to help check-cashing ripoffs by improving the access of low- and moderate-income Americans to basic financial services that most of us take for granted. Most of us take for granted that we can go to the nearest corner to an ATM machine or to a bank and have our financial services needs met. That is not so in all communities in this country. It is one of the few programs in this Treasury, Postal bill that is specifically geared to helping low-income Americans.

It is estimated that 8.4 million low-income American families, 22 percent of all such families, do not have bank accounts. And, remember, families without bank accounts frequently resort to check-cashing services to pay bills and cash checks. My colleagues may have read in the newspapers recently of one very large check-cashing firm which has now been sued for having 30 stores across this country that were charging very high interest to low-income people. It is a ripoff, it is a sham, and of course this First Accounts services will allow people who do not have banks in their areas, who do not have credit unions in their areas to be able to cash their checks without having to pay such large interest on it.

We want to provide these “unbanked” families with low-cost access to financial services, and we think this will increase the likelihood that they will begin a savings program and accumulate some assets. It also will significantly decrease their reliance upon high-cost check-cashing services. In some of these neighborhoods, dotted throughout the neighborhoods, there are these big signs “check cashing services”; and of course on the day these people are paid, they are standing in line to get their checks cashed at these high-interest ripoffs in their community.

We are very happy that there is a placeholder in the bill to address election reform. And of course, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has spoken to that and so has the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). If this country is going to right itself from the many wrongs we have seen in the last election, there certainly will be great attention to election reform. We must address it this year, not only for the problems we have in Florida but the problems we have throughout this Nation.

Because this is a Nation of laws, we must begin to provide laws and provide resources so people will get the right to vote. I cannot emphasize that too strongly and that people have died for this right. Certainly we in Congress would be remiss if we do not give them a fine, strong intellectual system; and I think this bill will sooner or later provide for that.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, I thank the committee and the people who are members of this committee. We will go forward certainly from this after passing this strong rule to pass the Treasury and General Government Appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the members of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, consistent with the work of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) and the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), is included in the rule as self-executing, and I thank the Committee on Rules for doing that.

I rise first to congratulate the gentlewoman from Florida for working on this issue. It is a critically important issue to millions of what the gentlewoman referred to as the “unbanked,” those who are not in the banking system. They do not have checks or ATM cards. They get ripped off every week when they try to cash their check or when they need a little money to bide them over. It is a significant problem.

I am pleased that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentle-

woman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) have reached an agreement on this; and I hope the Committee on Financial Services will, in the very near future, authorize this program so this money, which is now fenced, subject to authorization, can move forward and the Treasury Department can implement a program which is critically necessary.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 293, nays 129, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—293

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Castle

Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Farr

Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Heger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton

Hoyer
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lampson
Largent
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink

Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schrock
Scott

Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Simpson
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—129

Aderholt
Baird
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Bartlett
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Capito
Capps
Carson (OK)
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Costello
Davis (CA)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeMint
Dingell
Edwards
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ferguson
Forbes
Fossella
Gekas
Gibbons
Goode
Graves
Green (WI)

Hart
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill
Hilleary
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Mascara
Matheson
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Mica
Moore

Napolitano
Northup
Ose
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rehberg
Riley
Rivers
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Schaffer
Schiff
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Tancredo
Terry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey

Turner
Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)
Velazquez

Vitter
Wu

NOT VOTING—11

Hutchinson
Hyde
Lantos
Lewis (CA)

Lipinski
McGovern
Scarborough
Skelton

Snyder
Spence
Young (FL)

□ 1127

Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. HAYES, BERRY, LEWIS of Kentucky, SIMMONS, FORBES, SHUSTER, GIBBONS, KENNEDY of Minnesota, PITTS, SHERWOOD, LEACH, BILIRAKIS, TANCREDO, HILLEARY, POMEROY, STUMP, EVERETT, HILL, MOORE, and Ms. HART changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PASTOR, HILLIARD, FRANK, LAFALCE, and Ms. PELOSI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2620, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002

Mr. HOBSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-159) on the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

□ 1130

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2590, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 206 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2590.

□ 1131

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2590) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present to the House H.R. 2590. This is the fiscal year 2002 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill.

As reported, this bill, of course, is within the agreed-upon balanced budget that has been agreed to by the House with the Senate and the President. The bill, compared to the current fiscal year operations, is \$1.1 billion above the current operations. It is also some \$340 million above the original request from the White House, although that number, Mr. Chairman, was amended somewhat. The supplemental request included funds for the 2002 Winter Olympics, which has been funded through the supplemental and has been reallocated accordingly within this bill.

As reported, Mr. Chairman, the spending allocation enables us to do a number of significant things regarding Federal law enforcement in particular.

Mr. Chairman, realizing that we have been favored with a positive allocation from the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), it is a fair question how we have applied the extra \$1 billion that has been made available. The short answer is we have sought to address some very significant needs, in particular in Federal law enforcement. Some 30 percent of Federal law enforcement is funded through this appropriation measure. We have also sought to address some very compelling needs regarding information technology.

Let me give an example, Mr. Chairman. We are all aware that the IRS has had significant problems dealing with the complexity of the Tax Code and in having a modern information system that will enable taxpayers to have correct information in the hands of the IRS and not be receiving incorrect notices. This allocates significant funding to accelerate the information technology advancement in the IRS.

In particular, within the Customs Service, we have what might be fairly called, Mr. Chairman, a rickety computer system that is utilized for handling some \$8 billion worth of trade each day that goes through ports of entry with the U.S. Customs Service. That system is, frankly, on the verge of collapse; and we do not need to be losing \$8 billion daily in trade because of an antiquated information system in Customs.

Even beyond the pace set by the administration's budget, we have put the funding in for what is called the Automated Commercial Environment, which is the new Customs information technology system that ties together some 50 agencies that are involved in the imports and exports handled by the Customs Service to make sure that this trade that is so vital to the economy of the United States of America can flow unimpeded.

So those areas, law enforcement, trade, drug interdiction as a key component of law enforcement, and the information technology, are the main areas in which we have provided investments through the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government bill.

The bill places, as I mentioned, a priority on counter-drug efforts in law enforcement. Let me mention some the elements by which that is done.

We have the Customs Air and Marine Interdiction Program, which has not had the aircraft or the boats to be able to keep up with the degree of smuggling of illegal drugs into the United States, such as in southern Florida, where I visited recently. They are in sore need of modern equipment to be able to stem the flow of illegal narcotics into America.

We put significant new investments into the effort, the manpower, expanding the manpower where they are overburdened and overworked, and also expanding the equipment available to them to do that.

We have funding for the Integrated Violence Reduction Strategy by Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, which is trying to stem the use of illegal weapons, or legal weapons used illegally, by people in the commission of violent crimes. Both the Youth Crime Interdiction Initiative and the Integrated Violence Reduction Strategy receive significant new funding in this measure.

Also significantly increased is what is known as HIDTA, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program. Some \$231 million in Federal resources is made available in this bill for coordinating the efforts between the State, the local and the Federal law enforcement agencies, which all must work together, especially in the areas where there are significant problems of drug trafficking.

We also have, Mr. Chairman, an effort to try to address the accumulated backlog that is clogging up the court system. Federal courthouses are funded in this bill to the tune of \$326 million