Tierney	Walden	Wexler
Toomey	Walsh	Whitfield
Traficant	Wamp	Wilson
Turner	Waters	Wolf
Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	Woolsey
Udall (NM)	Watts (OK)	Wu
Upton	Waxman	Wynn
Visclosky	Weiner	Young (FL)
Vitter	Weller	

NAYS—88

Akin	Green (TX)	Platts
Armey	Green (WI)	Riley
Barr	Hall (TX)	Roemer
Bartlett	Hansen	Royce
Berry	Hart	Ryan (WI)
Blunt	Hayes	Ryun (KS)
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Schaffer
Bryant	Hefley	Schrock
Burton	Herger	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Hilleary	Sessions
Chabot	Hunter	Shadegg
Coble	Jenkins	Shimkus
Collins	Johnson (IL)	Shows
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Skelton
Cox	Jones (NC)	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Stearns
Davis, Jo Ann	Kerns	Stenholm
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Strickland
DeMint	Lucas (KY)	Stump
Duncan	Manzullo	Tancredo
Everett	McInnis	Taylor (MS)
Flake	Moran (KS)	Thornberry
Forbes	Ney	Tiahrt
Fossella	Norwood	Tiberi
Goode	Otter	Watkins (OK)
Goodlatte	Paul	Weldon (FL)
Gordon	Pence	Wicker
Goss	Petri	Young (AK)
Graham	Pickering	
Graves	Pitts	

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—14

Dunn	Rangel	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Rush	Velazquez
Meeks (NY)	Serrano	Watson (CA)
Owens	Shuster	Weldon (PA)
Peterson (MN)	Smith (MI)	

□ 1423

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. FOSSELLA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 355 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2944, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and other conforming changes in the engrossment of H.R. 2944 to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2001 TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 2883, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence may have until midnight tomorrow night, September 26, 2001, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2510) to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 2, strike out all after line 8 down to and including line 14 and insert ''2002''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 711(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161(b)) is amended by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2002''.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate amendment is agreed to, and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2510, the legislation just passed, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON H.R. 2510, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous action of the House on H.R. 2510 will be vacated.

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2510) to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 2, strike out all after line 8 down to and including line 14 and insert ''2002''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 711(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161(b)) is amended by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2002''.

The Clerk read the House amendment to the Senate amendment, as follows:

House amendment to Senate amendment:

Line 3, strike ''2002'' and insert ''2003''.

Line 7, strike ''2002'' and insert ''2003''.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for the reauthorization of the Defense Production Act and the amendment that will be adopted by the House today. As you are aware, the Defense Production Act gives the President important emergency powers to ensure that industry produces needed material during times of military or civil emergencies.

Unfortunately, with the events of September 11, we find ourselves in the midst of both. The President's authority under the DPA expires on Sunday, and it is important that we renew these powers during this critical period in our Nation's history.

The House passed a clean 3-year reauthorization on September 5. The Senate returned the bill to us late Friday night, limiting the President's authority to only one year. With the clock ticking, we don't want to be back in this same position next year. Therefore, in the best spirit of compromise, we are amending the Senate bill and splitting the difference—extending the DPA for 2 years. I know that some of my colleagues in the other body have some concerns about the powers granted to the President under the DPA, and particularly in how they have been used in the past. They have my assurance that we will look closely at those concerns in the interim, and make changes where they are necessary.

I want to thank Chairman KING, and ranking members LAFALCE and MALONEY for their help in moving this bipartisan legislation forward. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and this amendment.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for the extension of the Defense Production Act for a two-year period. I also want to commend the Chairman of the Financial Services Committee, as well as the Chairman and Ranking Member of the subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, for their vigilance and bi-partisanship in ensuring that these statutes are extended prior to expiration.

Clearly, this body would have preferred a 3-year extension of the Act, as reflected in the earlier legislation already passed in the House. However, it is also clear that a 2-year

extension is the most prudent course of action in order to ensure that reauthorization of the Act is signed into law within the next few days.

As I have argued repeatedly during the past two weeks, the Act contains Presidential powers that may well be needed to be called upon in the aftermath of the terrorist attack. In fact, we already have indications that the DPA will be invoked in the coming weeks. One news report from this morning states, ''[The DPA] is one of an array of statutes likely to be used frequently in the coming weeks as DOD seeks to expedite procurements—especially in the information technology and telecommunications sectors.''

With today's action in this body, I am confident that we will have an extension of the DPA signed into law prior to its expiration on September 30, and I want to thank my colleagues again for demonstrating the wisdom and flexibility that has been necessary to make that happen.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I once again ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2510, the legislation just passed, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE COORDINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2199) to amend the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 to permit any Federal law enforcement agency to enter into a cooperative agreement with the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia to assist the Department in carrying out crime prevention and law enforcement activities in the District of Columbia if deemed appropriate by the Chief of the Department and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2199

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia Police Coordination Amendment Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. PERMITTING ADDITIONAL FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO ENTER INTO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Section 11712(d) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–192(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(33) Any other law enforcement agency of the Federal government that the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia deem appropriate to enter into an agreement pursuant to this section.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2199.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

Our colleague the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) introduced this bill, H.R. 2199, on June 14 of this year. It was referred to the House Committee on Government Reform and was then referred to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia on June 19. The subcommittee considered and marked up the legislation on June 26, forwarded it to the full committee by unanimous consent, and the committee considered and marked up H.R. 2199 on July 25 and ordered it to be reported.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2199 amends the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 to permit any Federal law enforcement agency to enter into an agreement with the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department in order to assist the Metropolitan Police Department with local law enforcement in the District.

□ 1330

The original 1997 legislation provided great assistance to the District of Columbia by enabling Federal law enforcement agencies to enforce local laws on or near their jurisdictional boundaries.

The 1997 legislation specified certain law enforcement agencies, inadvertently leaving out some agencies. H.R. 2199 cures this restriction by allowing other law enforcement agencies to enter into cooperative agreements with the Metropolitan Police Department if the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia deem it appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, for her leadership in expanding the provisions of the existing law to improve public safety and reduce crime in the Nation's capital.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), for his interest in District of Columbia issues and for his guidance in bringing this bill to the floor, and of course to the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 2199, the District of Columbia Police Coordination Amendment Act of 2001.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill to amend P.L. 105–33, legislation that has done much to cure our coordinated efforts of Federal and local law enforcement officials in the Nation's capital. I want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia (Mrs. MORELLA) for her leadership and her work in bringing this bill to the floor today and moving so quickly to facilitate this important bill.

H.R. 2199, the District of Columbia Police Coordination Act of 2001, amends the Police Coordination Act I introduced in 1997, signed that year, by allowing those agencies not named in the original legislation to assist the Metropolitan Police Department with local law enforcement in the district. Inadvertently, P.L. 105–33 failed to make the language sufficiently open-ended to include agencies not mentioned in the original bill.

Prior to the Police Coordination Act, Federal agencies often were confined to agency premises and were not able to enforce local laws on or near their premises. Instead, for example, Federal officers sometimes called 911, taking hard-pressed D.C. police officers from urgent work in neighborhoods experiencing serious crime. Federal officers were trained and willing to do the job, but lacked the authority to do so before the passage of the Police Coordination Act. When our country has been attacked, this flexibility provided to Federal police officers to pursue suspects beyond their desks is both timely and necessary.

Five agencies have already signed agreements with the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia enabling them