

□ 1030

NATION NEEDS AN AIRLINE SECURITY BILL

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is on a wartime footing and this House should be on a wartime schedule. We left this city last Wednesday. We came back and went into session at 6 o'clock on Tuesday. Yesterday morning, we went into session at 10 o'clock a.m. and finished our work by 5 p.m. We are leaving today by 2 o'clock. We have yet to pass an airline security bill.

The American people who get on airplanes today and tomorrow and next week will do so knowing that at least 95 percent of the luggage that is placed in the belly of that airplane will not be screened for explosives. How can we tell the American people to go back to life as normal? How can we encourage people to get on our airplanes and fly as long as this House is negligent and refuses to bring an airline security bill to this floor for honest, open debate and a vote? All we are asking for is the right to have a vote on this airline security bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 70, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-44 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "November 16, 2001".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, October 24, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House this morning is H.J. Res. 70. Its purpose is to extend the current continuing resolution through November 16. We had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that this would not be necessary, but as all of our colleagues know, the House was really not able to function for nearly a week because of the anthrax contamination that was located in some of our areas. In addition to that, some of the House office buildings were closed and we were not able to actually recover the information, the papers and the materials that we needed to carry on some of our appropriations work.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, we actually offered to put on some of those moon suits that the decontaminators were wearing so that we could actually get into the building and recover the files and the information we needed, but, of course, that suggestion was rejected and so we have had a delay. That is the reason why we come to the floor with another continuing resolution, but absent any further delays over which we have no control, we expect to complete our appropriations business by the end of this continuing resolution.

The terms and conditions of the previous CRs remain in effect. All ongoing activities will be continued at current rates under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2001. Last week, Mr. Speaker, we passed two conference reports, Interior and Military Construction. Yesterday, the committee reported out the Defense appropriations bill. We expect to file that bill sometime early next week.

In addition to the CR today, we hope to be appointing conferees on the Foreign Operations bill. We will meet in conference on the Treasury-Postal bill this afternoon and have that conference report on the floor next week. Next week, we also hope to go to conference on the Legislative Branch, the VA-HUD, and the Energy and Water appropriations bills. We also expect to appoint conferees on Agriculture which the Senate hopes to complete today, and also Transportation which they passed in August but we have not yet received a request to go to conference.

Next week, we also plan to put together a package to allocate the funding provided in the emergency supplemental bill to address military, domestic security, humanitarian assistance and recovery requirements related to the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I would explain that in the \$40 billion supplemental that we enacted immediately after the attacks on September 11, \$10 billion of that had no strings attached, the President was able to use it quickly in any legal way that he chose. The second \$10 billion, the President is able to use, after he notifies the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate 15 days prior to releasing the funds. The

last \$20 billion, according to the law, had to go through the regular appropriations process.

Actually, we just received information on the \$20 billion from the White House on Wednesday afternoon last week as this building was being evacuated, and so we have not really had an opportunity to review what they have proposed relative to the \$20 billion. But we will do that very quickly now and hopefully will include it as part of the Defense appropriations bill when it comes to the floor.

We have a lot of work to do, and I appreciate the bipartisan cooperation and spirit that we have had here in the House all of this year and especially since the September 11 terrorist attacks. This Congress has come together. As one Member, it makes me extremely proud of my colleagues in the way that they have responded and joined with the President to assure the perpetrators of that tragedy, that terrible attack, are going to be punished and that we are going to do everything to disrupt their ability to ever do something like that to the United States again.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the hoarseness that overcame me there for a few seconds.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

I would simply observe for the gentleman from Florida that many of my constituents would say that the Republic has never yet been harmed when a Member of Congress has been hoarse, but let me simply make some points about the issue at hand.

Mr. Speaker, this body is an odd mixture of being both a legislative institution and a political institution. Sometimes I believe the fact that the cameras have come into this place have created all kinds of incentives for this place to be much more a political institution than it is a legislative institution, and I regret that.

I also think that we have another problem in the House. Woodrow Wilson wrote in his famous book a long time ago that Congress did its work in committee, and in my view Congress does its best work in committee. And I think there is always a tension in a legislative and political body between efforts of the two parties to get their messages out and to get their will forced through the House, and, on the other hand, the efforts of the committees of the House to do the work of the House on behalf of every Member and on behalf of the country. We have a committee system because none of us can be an expert on everything, and we are, through the committee system, given the opportunity to specialize and develop knowledge in discrete areas of government.

I think this is one of those times when the committee system needs to be allowed to work on behalf of the House rather than being frustrated by

other pressures, and that is what drives me to make the comments I want to make today.

This continuing resolution certainly deserves to be supported by every Member. It will allow the committee to begin to produce conferences, conference reports, between the two Houses now that the mini-filibuster is over on the other side of the Capitol, but I think there is a fundamental problem that we face as we go into dealing with each of those conference reports. As Members understand, after the events of September 11, we appropriated a \$40 billion package to the President: \$10 billion was to be used pretty much as he saw fit on an emergency situation; the next \$10 billion is supposed to be spent after serious and involved consultation with the Congress, the President essentially has 15 days during which he is supposed to work out any potential differences with the Congress before he proceeds to spend that money; and then, lastly, we indicated that we would at a later date provide the other \$20 billion that we had agreed to provide at that time. But during that debate, it was made clear many times over by people on both sides of the aisle that that \$40 billion was just a down payment, not a ceiling, it was just a down payment. It was a limitation on how much could be spent immediately until the Congress and the executive branch got its act together and could make a more informed set of judgments about what else we needed to protect the country. And now I think we have to face the question of whether or not we are going to be asked to proceed with these bills under that \$40 billion cap or if we are going to recognize that the world has changed a whole lot since that \$40 billion package was passed.

We will be bringing to the floor next week a defense bill which is essentially a peacetime defense bill. We are no longer at peace. In my view there are significant portions of the Pentagon budget that will need to be augmented above the levels provided in that appropriation bill. But there are a great many other items which I believe are going to cost far more than that \$40 billion that we have so far provided authority for, and I think that money needs to be directed specifically and directly at homeland security issues. And without an understanding that we need to go above that \$40 billion, we will not be able to provide the public or the Nation with the degree of safety that it has a right to expect.

We have heard a lot of comments about airline security this morning. Obviously that has to be the first order of business. I think it is amazing that we have not passed an airline security bill more than a month after the tragic events of September 11. But even if we were to do that today, that is just the tip of the iceberg. There are a great many other security-related items which we need to focus on.

We have had a lot of reference made to the fact that the House went out of

business last week after the anthrax problem was discovered. That afforded me an opportunity to get a series of briefings that I otherwise would not have had time to get at this point in the year, and so I spent the next 4 days when this House was out of session being briefed by the NSA, the CIA, HHS, CDC, FBI, a whole range of agencies that have responsibilities directly related to homeland security.

□ 1045

It is clear to me on the basis of those discussions that we need to move significantly beyond the amounts that the administration has provided in its budget submission of last week if we are to really do the job of securing the home front as well.

We just passed a tax bill yesterday, not with my vote; but we gave large amounts of money to the largest corporations in this country: over \$2 billion to Ford; \$1.6 billion, or \$1.4 billion, I believe, to AT&T; \$600 million to GE, not exactly the most needy clients in the country.

If we can do that, well, I do not think we should have done that. I think we should have instead protected the integrity of the budget process and protected the integrity of the fiscal bottom line by not providing them those outlandish reductions, and instead we should have used that money for security-related items. I do not want to get into a debate about what happened yesterday, but I want to give you some examples of the things I think we need to do that will require us to go far beyond the \$40 billion that we are talking about.

First of all, you cannot talk about the National Security Agency and what it does in public; but I am telling you, seeing what they are doing and seeing the work that they are trying to do to help us track terrorism, there is no doubt in my mind that they are going to need more people above and beyond those being provided right now.

The same with the FBI. If you take a look what they are trying to do, the FBI asked for almost \$1.5 billion in additional funding. They have been provided in the budget request submitted by the administration so far a little more than one-third of that amount.

The Customs Service, we have had everybody talk about the vulnerabilities of this country on the Canadian border. The Customs Service, I am told, requested \$800 million to do something about that. The budget submission provides only \$114 million to meet that problem. I think that action is at great variance with our needs.

We also have a number of other efforts at the CIA which I think need augmenting.

In the area of public health, we have been told by my good friend the Secretary, who was formerly the Governor of Wisconsin, Tommy Thompson, we have been told that they are going to buy 300 million units of smallpox vaccine. I think that is terrific. But it will

not do us much good if we have not strengthened the ability of public health officials down to the local level in every community in this land to actually deliver those vaccines, and, more importantly, to do the detection work and the detective work to make certain that we are not 2 weeks into an epidemic before we realize that we have got an epidemic.

In transportation, I would challenge anyone to show me that we are buying all the bomb detection equipment that can be produced to provide greater security for this country. Rail passengers, how often have you had your bags checked when you get onto a train in this country? Amtrak has requested \$500 million for increased security. That request was cut by \$495 million, or 99 percent.

The Coast Guard, we have a huge number of ports of entry in this country. The Coast Guard is taxed to the limit. They need more resources to protect this country and the security of this country, as far as I am concerned; yet they are not getting, in my view, nearly the resources they need.

Food safety, we inspect less than 2 percent of the food that comes into this country. We desperately need to upgrade FDA, USDA and other agencies' ability to protect the Nation's food supply, both domestically and imported; and they are not getting sufficient resources to do that.

There are many other areas of security-related concern that I could go into. I take this time simply to make the point that we cannot afford "business as usual" in dealing with these appropriation bills. In my view, we are going to have to live up to the words that we uttered on this House floor just a few weeks ago when we approved that initial \$40 billion package. We are going to need to provide additional funds above \$40 billion, in my view, to meet all of these threats.

I want to make clear, I think that it is very likely that many of the requests from agencies that were turned down by OMB were turned down for very justifiable reasons, because we know that agencies will use almost any excuse to put their hand out to get more money. So I do not object to OMB scrubbing those numbers hard, but I do object to us having to live within an artificial dollar ceiling when the home base security of the United States is at stake.

If we are at war, then we indeed ought to heed the words of the Vice President, who correctly said that this may be the first war in this country's history where we suffer more casualties at home than we do abroad. If that is the case, then we need to prepare for it; and we need to make the investments that are necessary.

So I would urge every single Member of this House over the next 3 or 4 days to think through what they have heard from their own constituents and what they have seen as they travel around the United States when it comes to

other areas of security that we need to deal with.

Now, we know each party has our own preferences in terms of economic policy in this country, in terms of tax policy, in terms of spending policy. That is fine. Those differences are healthy, at least most of the time. But today I am not talking about that. There is nothing philosophical, there is nothing ideological, about the idea of spending whatever is necessary and whatever can be usefully spent in order to upgrade the security of our transportation system, of our food supply, of our schools, and every other point of vulnerability in this country.

We are in a new era. We need to think like it, and that means we need to get rid of these artificial ceilings and think more clearly about what is the best use of our time and what are crucial uses of public money.

I have no problem whatsoever stacking up the list of items that I just mentioned and comparing them to some of the tax items that this Congress passed yesterday. If you ask any citizen on the street, including many citizens who benefited the most by those tax cuts yesterday, I would bet you by at least a seven or eight to one ratio, they would say, look, put security first.

That is all I am asking. We have got, in my judgment, about a week for the House to make some concrete judgments, or else all of these decisions are going to be made by the Senate. They may make some good decisions, but I think it would be kind of nice if we participated. I think as the body charged with the responsibility to initiate appropriations, I think that we ought to be dealing from the House document, rather than dealing from the Senate document that they put together at a later date.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have discussed the issues that he has just spoken about numerous times at great length, and I certainly agree with what he said.

I think it is important to note that many of the appropriations bills that the House passed, actually passed prior to the terrorist attack on September 11, and were all peacetime budgets. The defense bill that we marked up yesterday was actually a peacetime budget. It dealt with the issues and the dollars that were available prior to the September 11 terrorist attack.

So the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is exactly correct. We have to move. Except for the \$40 billion supplemental, we have to move into a wartime status here in the Congress, as we have done emotionally, as we have done by statements of support for the President, as we have done by changing some laws to give our law enforcement and our military more ability to move quickly to do what has to be done.

The post-September 11 budget has to be considered real. As for the \$40 billion, I do not think anybody believes that it is going to be enough to do what we have to do. What we have to do, the list is long, includes eliminating and bringing to justice bin Laden, his lieutenants, and the al Qaeda, and to remove them from any position of being able to influence terrorist attacks anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, America is not the only target. Other nations in the world are also targets. In the World Trade Center, for example, on that fateful day of September 11, there were nationals from 68 different countries who lost their lives in that attack on the World Trade Center. At our own Pentagon here, just outside of Washington, D.C., not only were members of our military killed in that attack, but also civilians, who were representing industry and meeting with Pentagon officials, military officials.

So the target is very large, and it is important that we eliminate and disrupt the ability of any terrorist to carry out any additional attack, whether it be airplane bombs or truck bombs or anthrax or bacteria or disease germs, or whatever it might be. It is important that people do not have to live in fear, and they should not. It is important that places in our country are not under attack.

I am satisfied that we are doing everything humanly possible to make sure that does not happen again, but there is a lot that needs to be done. We are prepared, and we have advised the President and our leadership knows that we, the Committee on Appropriations, are prepared to move quickly without any hesitation on addressing whatever the needs are. We are going to provide whatever it takes to keep America and our people secure and free from the terrorists who would try to damage our people and our country.

Mr. Speaker, as we proceed through this appropriations process in the next few days and the next few weeks, we will be addressing the issues that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just discussed. We will be addressing the issues of what the needs really are. We will meet those needs, to the best of our ability; and as the needs arise, if there is something else that needs to be done, we are going to do it. We are going to do whatever it takes to stop the bin Ladens of the world, the Al Quaedas of the world, and those people who would bring terrible tragedy upon this Nation of ours. We are not going to stand for it, and I am committing this Committee to this, Mr. Speaker. We will provide whatever is necessary to make this guarantee and to support our President and our military in this effort.

The Members of our Army, our Navy, our Marine Corps, our Air Force and our Coast Guard, our intelligence agencies, our law enforcement, the FBI, are all doing tremendous work. In briefing after briefing, about none of which we

have revealed anything that is classified, by the way, Mr. Speaker, but after receiving many, many briefings, I am really impressed with how well they have come together, how well they are doing their job, how well they are beginning to disrupt the ability of any terrorist organization attempting to bring additional tragedies upon this great Nation of ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, we remain united in this House, in this Congress, in this government, with the President leading us in this effort. We stand in strong support of all of our military and civilians who are on the frontline in this battle. We are going to do what has to be done; and the terrorists of the world might as well understand that, because we are coming to get them. If we have to get the rats out of the rat hole, we are going to get into the rat hole with them, but we are going to get them out.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida and commend him for the way he and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) have had this discussion this morning, and say in that spirit that there are some things that are a little bit disturbing and puzzling to some of us on this side of the aisle as we not only strive to, but hopefully perform, in 110 percent of support of our President and the bipartisan dedication of the United States in winning the war on terrorism internationally, as well as domestically.

□ 1100

Many of us were puzzled at the bringing of yesterday's tax bill to the floor and the discussion and the debate that ensued around it because, to some of us, it did not fit the spirit of the times and we respectfully disagreed. Why some folks's blood pressure went up as high as it did, I do not know.

But here is my concern, and I say this for the benefit of both sides of the aisle. The day before yesterday, Mitch Daniels, Director of OMB, stressed, "There are very, very few things more important to President Bush than the State of American agriculture. But at the moment, there are at least two things more important. One is concerning international terrorism; the other is protecting Americans here at home. The President deserves the chance to work on those and then he will turn his attention to the other more important issues such as farm policy and a new farm bill."

Now, this request was being made to the Senate, in saying please do not bring the farm bill up now, deal with it

next year. As my colleagues know, we passed the farm bill in the House bipartisally, equal support, 290 to 130 votes, indicating that the will of the House, the wisdom of the House, in the same spirit as the budget that the gentleman from Florida talked about, where the budget numbers came from, it was the budget that passed the House. Well, it seems to me that yesterday, at least in the House and the House leadership, tax policy became more important than winning the war, or certainly more important than passing a farm bill.

Now, I hope I am wrong on that, because I do believe that it is still critically important to us and our food policy that we deal with this issue this year. But it is a little bit puzzling when we have messages that seem to contradict each other being sent at the same time most of us, if not all of us, and I would say all of us, bipartisally are sincerely interested in doing everything we can to back our President in his excellent conduct of this terrible situation we find ourselves in. But somehow, we have to find a way to communicate on domestic policy and seemingly, right now, we have a mixed message going on concerning agriculture that bothers some of us greatly. I hope in our discussions we will be able to plug that back in and get back on track.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this is an important step today to keep this thing going. We are operating under somewhat duress and unusual circumstances, but I am glad to see that the Committee on Appropriations, on a bipartisan basis, is keeping the ball rolling. I hope that the other body, sometimes known as the United States Senate, which we are not allowed to refer to by name, would also move as quickly as we have been moving. We have passed the DOD bill, which is pending only because of a paperwork snafu in the Rayburn Building, we cannot actually get to the physical bill, but we will have passed 13 out of 13 appropriations bills, and I hope that the folks in the other body will move quickly so that we can get this thing resolved and we can get to the war on terrorism and focus all of our energies on that and stimulating the economy.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 70, a continuing resolution which extends temporary funding for all Federal Government agencies until November 16, 2001. This resolution provides further continuing appropriation for FY 2002 by extending a previous continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, since September 11, 2001, the legislative work of both bodies of the Congress has been significantly hampered for a number of reasons which required our imme-

diate attention. As a result, we have not been able to complete all of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 2002. Nevertheless, we must make sure that essential services of the Federal Government continue uninterrupted without any diminution in Federal services to the American public.

In this time of national unity and pride, we must keep our museums and monuments open to the public to show the world that America will continue to enjoy its rich heritage and civil liberties. Also, we must provide continued funding for Federal law enforcement, transportation and health care agencies so that our country may respond effectively to unforeseen emergencies.

I support this resolution, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, October 24, 2001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on House Joint Resolution 70 will be followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on approving the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brown (OH)	Gutknecht	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Ackerman	Berman	Brown (SC)	Hall (OH)	McGovern	Serrano
Aderholt	Berry	Bryant	Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sessions
Akin	Biggert	Burr	Hansen	McInnis	Shadegg
Allen	Bilirakis	Burton	Harman	McIntyre	Shaw
Andrews	Bishop	Buyer	Hart	McKeon	Shays
Armey	Blagojevich	Calvert	Hastings (FL)	McKinney	Sherman
Baca	Blumenauer	Camp	Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Sherwood
Bachus	Blunt	Cannon	Hayes	Meehan	Shimkus
Baird	Boehlert	Cantor	Hayworth	Meek (FL)	Shows
Baker	Boehner	Capito	Hefley	Meeks (NY)	Shuster
Baldacci	Bonilla	Capps	Herger	Menendez	Simmons
Baldwin	Bonior	Capuano	Hill	Mica	Simpson
Barcia	Bono	Cardin	Hilleary	Millender-	Skeen
Barrett	Borski	Carson (IN)	Hilliard	McDonald	Skelton
Bartlett	Boswell	Carson (OK)	Hinchey	Miller, Dan	Slaughter
Barton	Boucher	Castle	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Smith (MI)
Bass	Boyd	Chabot	Hobson	Miller, Jeff	Smith (NJ)
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Chambliss	Hoekstra	Mink	Smith (TX)
Bentsen	Brady (TX)	Clay	Holden	Mollohan	Smith (WA)
Bereuter	Brown (FL)	Clayton			

Snyder	Thompson (MS)	Watkins (OK)	Deal	Kerns	Radanovich	Crane	Lipinski	Strickland
Solis	Thornberry	Watson (CA)	DeGette	Kildee	Rangel	DeFazio	LoBiondo	Stupak
Souder	Thune	Watt (NC)	Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Regula	English	McDermott	Sweeney
Spratt	Thurman	Watts (OK)	DeLaurio	Kind (WI)	Rehberg	Etheridge	McNulty	Tanner
Stark	Tiahrt	Waxman	DeLay	King (NY)	Reyes	Filner	Miller, George	Taylor (MS)
Stearns	Tiberi	Weiner	DeMint	Kingston	Reynolds	Ford	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Stenholm	Tierney	Weldon (FL)	Deutsch	Kirk	Riley	Gillmor	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Strickland	Toomey	Weldon (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Kleczka	Rivers	Gutknecht	Olver	Thurman
Stump	Towns	Weller	Dicks	Knollenberg	Rodriguez	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Stupak	Traficant	Wexler	Dingell	Kolbe	Roemer	Hefley	Rahall	Waters
Sununu	Turner	Whitfield	Doggett	LaFalce	Rogers (KY)	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad	Watt (NC)
Sweeney	Udall (CO)	Wicker	Dooley	LaHood	Rogers (MI)	(TX)	Sabo	Weller
Tancredo	Udall (NM)	Wilson	Doolittle	Lampson	Rohrabacher	Kucinich	Schaffer	Whitfield
Tanner	Upton	Wolf	Doyle	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen	Larsen (WA)	Scott	Wicker
Tauscher	Velazquez	Woolsey	Dreier	Lantos	Ross	Lee	Slaughter	Wu
Tauzin	Visclosky	Wu	Duncan	Largent	Rothman	Lewis (GA)	Stenholm	
Taylor (MS)	Vitter	Wynn	Dunn	Larson (CT)	Roukema			
Taylor (NC)	Walden	Young (AK)	Edwards	Latham	Royal-Allard			
Terry	Walsh	Young (FL)	Ehlers	LaTourette	Royce			
Thomas	Wamp	Young	Engel	Leach	Rush			
Thompson (CA)	Waters		Emerson	Levin	Ryan (WI)			

NOT VOTING—13

Ballenger	Everett	Hoefel	Evans	Lowey	Sanders	Gallagly	Jones (OH)
Barr	Fattah	Istoak	Farr	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin	Callahan	Gonzalez
Callahan	Gallegly	Miller, Gary	Ferguson	Lucas (OK)	Sawyer	Cooksey	Gordon
Cubin	Gonzalez		Flake	Luther	Saxton	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Cummings	Gordon		Fletcher	Maloney (CT)	Shakowsky	Cummings	Lynch
			Foley	Maloney (NY)	Schiff	Everett	Hoeffel
			Fossella	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
			Frank	Markey	Serrano		
			Frelinghuysen	Mascara	Sessions		
			Frost	Matheson	Shadegg		
			Ganske	McCarthy (MO)	Shaw		
			Gekas	McCarthy (NY)	Shays		
			Gephardt	McCollum	Sherman		
			Gibbons	McCrary	Sherwood		
			Gilcrest	McGovern	Shimkus		
			Gilman	McHugh	Shows		
			Goode	McInnis	Shuster		
			Goodlatte	McIntyre	Simmons		
			Goss	McKeon	Simpson		
			Graham	McKinney	Skeen		
			Granger	Meehan	Skelton		
			Graves	Meek (FL)	Smith (MI)		
			Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NJ)		
			Green (WI)	Menendez	Smith (TX)		
			Greenwood	Mica	Smith (WA)		
			Grucci	Millender	Snyder		
			Gutierrez	McDonald	Solis		
			Hall (OH)	Miller, Dan	Souder		
			Hall (TX)	Miller, Jeff	Spratt		
			Hansen	Mink	Stark		
			Harman	Mollohan	Stearns		
			Hart	Moore	Stump		
			Hayes	Moran (VA)	Sununu		
			Hayworth	Morella	Tancredo		
			Herger	Murtha	Tauscher		
			Hill	Myrick	Tauzin		
			Hilleary	Nadler	Taylor (NC)		
			Hilliard	Napolitano	Terry		
			Hinchey	Neal	Thomas		
			Hinojosa	Nethercutt	Thornberry		
			Hobson	Ney	Thune		
			Hoekstra	Northup	Tiahrt		
			Holden	Norwood	Tiberi		
			Holt	Nussle	Tierney		
			Honda	Obey	Toomey		
			Hooley	Ortiz	Towns		
			Horn	Osborne	Traficant		
			Hostettler	Ose	Turner		
			Houghton	Otter	Udall (CO)		
			Hoyer	Owens	Udall (NM)		
			Hulshof	Oxley	Upton		
			Hunter	Pallone	Velazquez		
			Hyde	Pascarella	Vitter		
			Inslee	Pastor	Walden		
			Isakson	Paul	Walsh		
			Israel	Payne	Wamp		
			Jackson (IL)	Issa	Watkins (OK)		
			Jefferson	Pence	Watson (CA)		
			Jenkins	Peterson (PA)	Watts (OK)		
			John	Petri	Waxman		
			Johnson (CT)	Phelps	Weiner		
			Johnson (IL)	Pickering	Weldon (FL)		
			Johnson, E. B.	Pitts	Weldon (PA)		
			Platts	Wexler			
			Pombo	Wilson			
			Pomeroy	Wolf			
			Portman	Woolsey			
			Kaptur				
			Keller	Price (NC)	Wynn		
			Kelly	Pryce (OH)	Young (AK)		
			Kennedy (MN)	Putnam	Young (FL)		
			Kennedy (RI)	Quinn			

NOES—52

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 361, noes 52, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—361

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Cardin	Deal	Kerns	Radanovich	Crane	Lipinski	Strickland
Ackerman	Bishop	Carson (OK)	DeGette	Kildee	Rangel	DeFazio	LoBiondo	Stupak
Aderholt	Blagojevich	Castle	Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Regula	English	McDermott	Sweeney
Akin	Blumenauer	Chabot	DeLaurio	Kind (WI)	Rehberg	Etheridge	McNulty	Tanner
Allen	Blunt	Chambliss	DeLay	King (NY)	Reyes	Filner	Miller, George	Taylor (MS)
Andrews	Boehlert	Clay	Deutsch	Kingston	Reynolds	Ford	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Armey	Boehner	Clayton	Dicks	Kirk	Riley	Gillmor	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Baca	Bonilla	Clement	Dingell	Kleczka	Rivers	Gutknecht	Olver	Thurman
Bachus	Bonior	Clyburn	Dobie	Knollenberg	Rodriguez	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Baird	Bono	Coble	Dobson	Kolbe	Roemer	Hastings (FL)	Callahan	Stupak
Baker	Boucher	Collins	Dobson	LaFalce	Rogers (KY)	Jackson-Lee	Roemer	Sweeney
Baldacci	Boyd	Combest	Dobson	LaHood	Rogers (MI)	Jackson-Lee	Rahall	Waters
Baldwin	Brady (TX)	Condit	Dobson	Lampson	Rohrabacher	Kucinich	Ramstad	Watt (NC)
Ballenger	Brown (FL)	Conyers	Dobson	Lampson	Rothman	Larsen (WA)	Sabo	Weller
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Cox	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema	Lee	Slaughter	Whitfield
Barrett	Brown (SC)	Coyne	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema	Lewis (GA)	Stenholm	
Bartlett	Bryant	Cramer	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Barton	Burr	Crenshaw	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Bass	Burton	Crowley	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Becerra	Buyer	Culberson	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Bentsen	Calvert	Cunningham	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Bereuter	Camp	Davis (CA)	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Berkley	Cannon	Davis (FL)	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Berman	Cantor	Davis (IL)	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Berry	Capito	Davis, Jo Ann	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			
Biggert	Capps	Davis, Tom	Dobson	Lampson	Roukema			

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of October 24, 2001, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) amending title 36, United States Code, to designate September 11 as Patriot Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

NOT VOTING—19

Barr	Evans	Lowey	Sanders	Gallagly	Jones (OH)			
Battah	Istoak	Farr	Sandlin	Callahan	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)		
Callahan	Miller, Gary	Ferguson	Sawyer	Cooksey	Gordon	Linder		
Cubin	Gonzalez	Flake	Saxton	Cubin	Hastings (WA)	Lynch		
Cummings	Gordon	Fletcher	Shakowsky	Cummings	Hoeffel			
		Foley	Schiff	Everett	Istoak			
		Forbes	Schrock	Fattah	Johnson, Sam			

□ 1139

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, OCTOBER 26, 2001, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2590, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight October 26, 2001, to file a conference report on 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

APPLYING SPECIAL ORDERS OF OCTOBER 24, 2001 RELATING TO "UNITED WE STAND REMEMBRANCE DAY" TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 71

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders of the House of October 24, 2001, relating to the United We Stand Remembrance Day be applied to House Joint Resolution 71.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 11 AS PATRIOT DAY

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of October 24, 2001, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) amending title 36, United States Code, to designate September 11 as Patriot Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.