

Over the past 2 weeks, our airline system has been hurt much more by perception than reality. It is our responsibility in this Congress not only to provide cash to the airlines, but also to provide reassurance and security to their passengers.

Airport and airplane safety should now become the domain of the Federal Government. Before September 11, security was provided by the airlines that usually contracted this service to the lowest bidder. Securing the safety of the traveling public should be a basic function of government. We have the Coast Guard to protect boaters, we make sure the State Police monitor our highways, the skill of government-trained air traffic controllers has all but guaranteed the safety of our space. Why should security in airports and airplane cabins be any different?

COMING TOGETHER IN A TIME OF NEED

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a great deal of pride to salute the communities I represent, Palm Beach County, Martin, St. Lucie, Okeechobee, Glades, Hendry, and Highlands, the 16th Congressional District in Florida.

I am so proud because every citizen of our community rallied together for this Nation, supporting those who are in need, helping raise funds, donating blood, doing whatever little bit they could to make not only those in New York and Washington feel better, but unite as a Nation against evil.

I am proud because our community at times during the last election was disparaged for not getting their votes right. Today we prove not only did we send the right person to Washington to lead this Nation, but we are also committed to making certain this terror never rains on America again.

The firefighters, the paramedics, the police, the National Guard, everybody virtually joined hands together to work together to make this Nation stronger. We may have had a difficult day September 11, but out of the ashes comes a greater resolve to make America a more perfect union, under God, protecting liberties, defining the future, and making certain we support our commander-in-chief, the President of the United States, George Bush, who I am proud to call a friend, and particularly proud to call a great leader today in times of adversity. I salute him, I thank him, and God bless his family as we endeavor to protect our country.

A GREAT LEADER

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, times of trouble expose either the greatness or the weakness of a leader. Last week, we saw our President rise to become the chief steward of freedom on planet Earth. It was a sight to behold. It was a defining moment in our country. America has once again stepped up to the plate to rid the world of tyranny.

Osama bin Laden and the world's terrorists are at war with all civilized people. They are trained, barbaric terrorists who will stop at nothing, even the killing of thousands of innocent people, to accomplish their evil goals.

Last week, the President rallied the civilized nations of the world against the world's terrorists and those who harbor them. All nations, Muslim, Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Buddhists, will unite to accomplish this noble goal. There is no fence-sitting this time.

Mr. Speaker, great words have been spoken in this Chamber. Example, "Our Nation, this generation, will lift the dark threat of violence from our people and our future. We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. We will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail."

Mr. Speaker, those were the words of George W. Bush, the 43rd President of the United States. Those are some of the words we heard last week, a rallying cry to freedom-loving people around the world.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2944, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 245

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. 2944) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for the 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 part A of 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 part B of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appro-

priate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment printed in part B of the report 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 and amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for the purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion 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.

□ 1015

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 245 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2944, the Fiscal Year 2002 District of Columbia Appropriations Act. Overall, this bill provides a total of \$7.1 billion in local funding and a \$398 million Federal payment to the District of Columbia. By way of comparison, the final fiscal year 2001 D.C. appropriations bill provided a total of \$6.8 billion in local funds and \$464 million in Federal payment. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 245 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 clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provision in a general appropriations bill) against provisions within H.R. 2944. The rule also provides that the bill be considered for amendment by paragraph.

The rule provides that amendments in part A of the Committee on Rules report accompanying H. Res. 245 shall be considered as adopted.

It also waives points of order against the amendment printed in part B of the Committee on Rules report, which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall

not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority and 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.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule on H.R. 2944, which will allow the House to work its will on the various funding and policy matters contained in this bill. I should note that the bill is the 11th of 13 regular appropriations bills that the House will need to consider and enact in order to complete the fiscal year 2002 discretionary budget.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the customary one-half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking minority member, was consulted throughout the process of developing this legislation, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), who is a fine chairman and a great Member, in the process of developing this legislation, a trend we hope will continue with developing other appropriations measures in the days ahead. I would further note that this version of the D.C. appropriations bill is much improved over past years. In fact, 35 of the 69 riders included by the subcommittee were eliminated at the full committee markup.

Far too often, Congress takes it upon itself to micromanage the citizens of the District to advance an agenda that few of its residents share. Every year, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), my friend, has made eloquent pleas to this body, asking it to refrain from making social policy in the city that she represents. But it is not to be.

While this is a much-improved bill, it is still flawed. The measure includes controversial prohibitions against using local funds, not a dime of Federal money, for abortion services and the needle exchange programs. Moreover, the Committee on Rules took it upon itself to make in order an amendment that prohibits Federal as well as local funds from being used for the implementation of the District of Columbia Domestic Partnership Act which was passed in 1992 and never implemented because the House of Representatives does not like it. This amendment was defeated in the full committee on a bipartisan vote. But a gift from the Committee on Rules puts it before us today.

I look forward to the day when Congress gives the Mayor and the council of the city an opportunity to govern and make the kind of decisions with their own money that other governments are allowed to make without interference by the House and by the Congress.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I begin by thanking the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member, for their very hard work on this bill, the best bill in some time for the District of Columbia.

I must say that there was a very good chance that for once we might be able to support a rule, especially since the Committee on Appropriations, to its credit, made substantial progress on the infamous social riders by voting to eliminate one that had long plagued this bill, a rider that provides for health care benefits if paid for by a partner who may be a grandmother or mother, or may be a gay person. So the Committee on Appropriations decided that wherever they stood on gay rights, it was not worth taking down everybody at a time when health care is so important and when this body has not done its job to make sure that everybody has health care.

This, I say to my colleagues, is no time to make hay or to make politics over the local budget of a city. A city where Congress time and again has shown it has no expertise to get into its local budget, who could expect Congress to? I do not have any expertise on the D.C. budget. We have limited interest, and the District of Columbia respects that interest, because of the Federal presence here.

My side has tried to respond to the crisis we are in. We agreed to a limited time for general debate, for example. We have agreed to limited time for amendments. Otherwise, of course, we would not be acting in the national interest. If, in fact, what we do is to crowd this bill with the usual riders, we will not only look silly, this year we would look careless and insensitive to the suffering and the felt needs of the American people.

At the very least, in recognition of the uniquely serious crisis we are in, I am asking Members to forebear attachments and amendments, even if protected, which they know are opposed by D.C. law. I thank the Committee on Appropriations for, in fact, not including, not including a domestic partners rider in this bill. I ask my colleagues to respect what the Committee on Appropriations did when its position is put before us here today. After all, we are defending democratic values more than rhetorically this session. At a

time when the world is watching, this body must not be seen as engaging in patently undemocratic actions such as overturning local laws against the democratic will of the people of the District of Columbia.

I was prepared, absent actions taken on social riders, to support a rule this time, even with some serious imperfections; and let me say what has happened to those imperfections, because there was a puzzling decision made to delete completely noncontroversial budget provisions which had never been bothered before in the history of home rule. I brought this to the attention of the chairman and the ranking member, and I must say I am deeply appreciative for the way both have worked with me to make substantial progress. As they have had the time to study these provisions, we have made many of them consistent with the will of the Mayor and the city council of the District of Columbia. Moreover, the chairman has promised me that he will continue to work with me, even into conference, if necessary.

What he has done shows very substantial good faith. He has, in his manager's amendment, included provisions that went before the Committee on Appropriations. We made very substantial progress on the remaining deletions, and the chairman had already removed 35 redundant and duplicative amendments and provisions beforehand. In other words, the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member, and I have tried to behave like grown-up Members of Congress, not able to get all we wanted, understanding that we had some disagreements, each reciprocating; and I was prepared not to object to moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this rule must be opposed. I hope that if this bill does, in fact, make it to general debate, we will respect the chairman's call. He made it known as soon as he became chairman that he would like no attachments on his bill. I recognize some have been made in order. I hope that my colleagues who have such attachments will reconsider, in light of the chairman's call. He simply wants to get his bill through. He wants to be an appropriator. If my colleagues have other matters, I am willing to take them to the D.C. City Council or to take them to the authorizing committee.

Matters such as domestic partners, abortions, other matters of controversial local concern do not belong on this bill. Let us get this bill done; let us make this a banner year for D.C. We are off to a bad start on the rule. I ask my colleagues to oppose the rule. If my colleagues vote for the rule, I certainly ask my colleagues to be mindful of the fact that this is a local appropriation and to follow the lead of the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the council when it comes to how to respond to

any attachments that may come forward.

Once again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for very important progress and for the respect they have shown the people and the government of the District of Columbia.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying legislation, and I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the majority chairman, and the staff for their hard work on this legislation.

However, even as I rise to support the underlying legislation, I have difficulty with this rule, for it seems to lack any respect for the work product of the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations and wants to reverse a bipartisan vote in the full committee. I think that that is unwise and inappropriate. I particularly feel that, at this particular hour, there would be other uses of all of our time than to get into the micromanaging of the District's affairs. But nonetheless, I oppose the rule, but I support the bill; and I hope that we can move beyond this at some point to the underlying legislation.

I think that the chairman has done a remarkable job in terms of building a consensus around how we should move forward in terms of the District of Columbia, the capital city; and I would hope that we will be able to get there from here, but I think that there has to be respect for the committee's position. I think that the rule is one that should be revisited and, therefore, I oppose it.

□ 1030

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I have not thought of myself as naive in a long time, but I guess I am. I have heard and read and even participated in saluting unity, in arguing that divisive issues ought to be deferred at this time; indeed, while I continue to think spending billions on missile defense is a diversion from the real defense needs of this country and a waste, and destabilizing at a time when the world does not need that, I understand the decision not to press that at this time.

So I was deeply shocked to be told yesterday that the Republican leadership has chosen to use this bill to make an assault on millions of gay and lesbian Americans in general, and on those who live in the District of Columbia, in particular.

Not only are they launching this assault, but they are going to extraor-

dinary lengths to do it. A nongermane amendment has been protected by the Committee on Rules so that a decision of the Committee on Appropriations, recognizing the right of people in the District of Columbia to make their own choices about how their money will be spent, can be overruled.

The District of Columbia, by its small "d" democratic processes, decided to say that if two men or two women were in love and were prepared to commit themselves to each other legally and financially, as well as emotionally, the District of Columbia, if they work for the District of Columbia, they would honor that.

For reasons I do not understand, that willingness to accept a mutual declaration of responsibility from two people in love deeply offends some of my colleagues.

On a personal level, it does not matter to me what they think. They are entitled to their opinions, prejudicial as I might think they are. But to tell the 550,000 people of the District, who have voted through their democratic processes, that they may not use money raised in the District by taxation voted by the District on residents of the District, that they may not use that money to carry out a policy that recognizes that love, shame on those who perpetrate it, and particularly now.

Everybody in America is concerned about the people who died, and gay and lesbian and bisexual and transgendered people are no different than others. In addition to the general mourning, there is discussion of those in that particular community, of which I am a member, who died.

Indeed, we have the military announcing what we call a "stop loss" policy, which says that gay and lesbian Americans in the military who are, I think, wholly unfairly and incorrectly and unwisely subject to being thrown out, may not be thrown out now. In other words, at this time of terrible crisis, when we are going to ask Americans to go and risk their lives for the defense of freedom, overwhelmingly supported here, we are going to make an exception in some cases to the policy of excluding gays and lesbians. Gay and lesbian people who have been asking for the right are going to get it. They are going to be allowed to die for their country.

But according to some, we are just not allowed to live here freely, because this bill says that we will violate what some have said is a philosophical principle that local people at the local level ought to be able to decide how to spend local money.

We are not talking formally about States' rights. The District of Columbia is not a State, it is a self-governing group of Americans who have voted through an open and democratic process, through a public policy, which they are prepared to support with their money. And the Republican leadership says, no, no, we cannot let them do

that. We cannot let them do that, because if two women are allowed to express their love for each other and one of them works for the District of Columbia and wants to extend health benefits to her partner, we cannot allow that. That somehow is going to undo the great fabric of this Nation.

And we will even violate the normal rules of the House, because it is the one amendment that is nongermane. In our technical terms, it is legislating in an appropriations bill.

And by the way, how seriously do they take this terrible assault on the dignity and freedom and emotions of gay and lesbian Americans? They give us 10 minutes to talk about it. There will be 5 minutes in which those of us who are appalled by this intrusive, divisive assault on so many millions of their fellow citizens, because those of us who do not live in the District on a legal basis, share the pain of those in the District who will be penalized by this punitive amendment, and they give us 5 minutes to talk about it.

I do not see how anyone who has talked about not being divisive, who has talked about unity at this time, can agree to dealing with this amendment at this time, and certainly not to a 5-minute debate on each side, where people's fundamental rights, the right of the District to self-governance, that is to be disposed of in 5 minutes? Have people so little concern for the rights and feelings of others? I hope the rule is voted down.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in yielding time to me to speak briefly to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, like the previous Member, I am deeply concerned that, in a time when we should be coming together as a Congress, lifting up our eyes to deal with big issues and finding ways to bring Americans together, that this Congress sees fit to, sadly, divide people by playing with the budget for the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that responsible businesses across the country and a number of local governments, some of which I represent, have seen fit to extend in a reasonable fashion insurance coverage to their employees and their domestic associates, people that they have an insurable interest, people that they care about. This is something that is reasonable.

I had an opportunity in my prior life to help craft provisions like this. It was good for our employees, it was the right thing to do.

For the last 8 years, the District of Columbia's government has chosen to do this with their own resources. Yet, Congress, in its wisdom, has intervened, seen fit to deny them the right to do what is being done by progressive people across the country. It is wrong. It is particularly wrong to do it now.

We do not need to have these gratuitous efforts at bringing forth unnecessary political battles. This ought to be one time that we can move beyond it.

Mr. Speaker, I was also embarrassed that the Congress of the United States saw fit, in dealing with needed resources for emergency planning, that we were going to micromanage the District of Columbia and withhold some of its funds in dealing with the \$16 million in special Federal payments for emergency security planning.

I find that particularly ironic, Mr. Speaker, when I consider that the events of the last 2 weeks demonstrated that the Federal Government did not have its act together regarding the District of Columbia; and further, that if the standard for preparedness is what we as Members of this House have done in terms of preparing our offices and our employees for these emergencies, that bar is very low.

Every man and woman who serves in this Chamber knows that we were not ready, and has doubts about whether we are ready today. Yet, for the committee to therefore overlook our shortcomings and try to manage the District of Columbia by withholding funds, I find egregious and embarrassing. I hope we will reject the rule and reject the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call for a no vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule so we can get on with the debate on the important appropriations bills.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 236, nays 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

YEAS—236

Aderholt	Biggart	Burr
Akin	Bilirakis	Burton
Armey	Bishop	Buyer
Bachus	Blunt	Callahan
Baker	Boehlert	Calvert
Ballenger	Boehner	Camp
Barr	Bonilla	Cannon
Bartlett	Bono	Cantor
Barton	Boyd	Capito
Bass	Brady (TX)	Castle
Bereuter	Brown (SC)	Chabot
Berry	Bryant	Chambliss

Coble	Hulshof	Radanovich
Collins	Hunter	Ramstad
Combest	Hyde	Regula
Cooksey	Isakson	Rehberg
Costello	Issa	Reynolds
Cox	Istook	Riley
Cramer	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Crane	John	Rogers (MI)
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Ross
Cunningham	Keller	Roukema
Davis, Jo Ann	Kelly	Royce
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Deal	Kerns	Ryun (KS)
DeLay	King (NY)	Saxton
DeMint	Kingston	Schaffer
Diaz-Balart	Kirk	Schrock
Doolittle	Kleczka	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Knollenberg	Sessions
Duncan	LaHood	Shadegg
Dunn	Largent	Shays
Ehlers	Latham	Sherwood
Ehrlich	LaTourrette	Shimkus
Emerson	Leach	Shows
English	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Simmmons
Ferguson	Linder	Simpson
Flake	Lipinski	Skeen
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Smith (MI)
Foley	Lucas (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	Lucas (OK)	Smith (TX)
Fossella	Manzullo	Souder
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Stearns
Gallegly	McHugh	Stenholm
Ganske	McInnis	Stump
Gekas	McIntyre	Sununu
Gibbons	McKeon	Sweeney
Gilchrest	Mica	Tancredo
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Tanner
Gilman	Miller, Gary	Tauzin
Goode	Moran (KS)	Taylor (MS)
Goodlatte	Morella	Taylor (NC)
Goss	Myrick	Terry
Graham	Nethercutt	Thomas
Granger	Ney	Thornberry
Graves	Northup	Thune
Green (WI)	Norwood	Tiahrt
Greenwood	Nussle	Tiberi
Grucci	Ortiz	Toomey
Gutknecht	Osborne	Trafigant
Hall (OH)	Ose	Upton
Hall (TX)	Otter	Vitter
Hansen	Oxley	Walden
Hart	Paul	Walsh
Hastings (WA)	Pence	Wamp
Hayes	Peterson (PA)	Petri
Hayworth		Watkins (OK)
Hefley		Watts (OK)
Herger		Weldon (FL)
Hilleary		Weldon (PA)
Hobson		Weller
Hoekstra		Whitfield
Holden		Wicker
Horn		Wilson
Hostettler		Wolf
Houghton		

NAYS—183

Abercrombie	Clement	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Clyburn	Gordon
Allen	Condit	Green (TX)
Andrews	Coyne	Gutierrez
Baca	Crowley	Harman
Baird	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Baldacci	Davis (CA)	Hill
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Hilliard
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hinchee
Barrett	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Becerra	DeGette	Hoefl
Bentsen	Delahunt	Holt
Berkley	DeLauro	Honda
Berman	Deutsch	Hooley
Blagojevich	Dicks	Inslee
Blumenauer	Dingell	Israel
Bonior	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Borski	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Boswell	Doyle	(TX)
Boucher	Edwards	Jefferson
Brady (PA)	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Capps	Evans	Kanjorski
Capuano	Fattah	Kaptur
Cardin	Filner	Kennedy (RI)
Carson (IN)	Ford	Kildee
Carson (OK)	Frank	Kilpatrick
Clay	Frost	Kind (WI)
Clayton	Gephardt	Kolbe

Kucinich	Miller, George	Schakowsky
LaFalce	Mink	Schiff
Lampson	Mollohan	Scott
Langevin	Moore	Sherman
Lantos	Moran (VA)	Skelton
Larsen (WA)	Murtha	Sllaughter
Larson (CT)	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Lee	Napolitano	Snyder
Levin	Neal	Solis
Lewis (GA)	Oberstar	Spratt
Lofgren	Obey	Stark
Lowey	Oliver	Strickland
Luther	Pallone	Stupak
Maloney (CT)	Pascarell	Tauscher
Maloney (NY)	Pastor	Thompson (CA)
Markey	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Mascara	Pelosi	Thurman
Matheson	Pomeroy	Tierney
Matsui	Price (NC)	Turner
McCarthy (MO)	Rahall	Udall (CO)
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Udall (NM)
McCollum	Reyes	Visclosky
McDermott	Rivers	Waters
McGovern	Rodriguez	Watt (NC)
McKinney	Roemer	Waxman
McNulty	Rothman	Weiner
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Wexler
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Woolsey
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez	Wu
Menendez	Sanders	Wynn
Millender	Sandlin	Young (FL)
McDonald	Sawyer	

NOT VOTING—11

Conyers	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
Farr	Rush	Watson (CA)
Hoyer	Serrano	Young (AK)
Owens	Towns	

□ 1103

Ms. MCKINNEY, Messrs. SMITH of Washington, KUCINICH, DAVIS of Illinois, ROEMER, DOGGETT, MOLLOHAN, RAHALL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the voted was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening a tornado ripped through several towns and I was in Maryland surveying the damage.

I would like the RECORD to reflect that had I been present I would have voted “no” on rollcall 351.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2944) making appropriation for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.