(2) EVIDENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, evidence regarding compliance or noncompliance with the amendments made by this chapter shall not be admissible as evidence in any proceeding of any court, agency, board, or other entity, except with respect to an action to enforce paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 922(z), or to give effect to paragraph (3) of section 922(z).

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to bar a governmental action to impose a penalty under section 924(p) of title 18, United States Code, for a failure to comply with section 922(z) of that title.

SEC. 404. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 209, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) so that he may yield blocks of time at his own discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) will control 5 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) will control 10 minutes.

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

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute approved by the Committee on Rules be modified in the manner which I have caused to be placed at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. CONYERS to amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 12:

At page 22, line 8, insert after ''person'' the following: '', in or affecting interstate commerce,''.

At page 22, line 17, insert after ''person'' the following: '', in or affecting interstate commerce where the proof of such is an element of the offense,''.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modification to the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

There was no objection.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is modified.

□ 1300

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to allocate an additional 5 minutes per each side for this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I reluctantly am going to object because we have Members who plan to catch their planes. It is very late now. It is 1:00 in the afternoon. I would say to the gentleman from California that we, unfortunately, need to get on with it. I hate to do that. I will cancel my reservation and make an objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 10 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a trying event with this legislation, but this substitute may be able to provide some solace for those of us who want something to take to the American people.

This substitute is the Senate-passed gun safety provisions word for word, which many of us were led to believe at one time that the Speaker and the Chair of the House Committee on the Judiciary supported.

I had hoped that in the wake of Littleton that this body could pass modest gun safety measures, but leave it to the Republicans to tarnish the memory of those children by putting forth a bill that creates scores of new loopholes.

If the bill that is before this body is passed, not only will we have gutted the bill, the gun show provision, and given criminals a virtual license to buy a gun, but we will have actually weakened current law in several important respects, and here is how: Right now, it is illegal to ship weapons across State lines into someone's home. This has been the law ever since Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated President Kennedy. The bill before us repeals that law.

Right now the District of Columbia restricts possession of firearms. This bill allows residents to not only own guns, but carry concealed weapons.

Mr. Chairman, we have one last chance to turn this sorry situation around and restore some sanity to the process. A yes vote on the bill offered by myself and my dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), on this substitute will eliminate all of the loopholes and return us word for word to the Senate-passed gun safety provisions.

The Conyers/Campbell amendment will shut down the gun show loopholes once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment fails, I will be forced to vote against final passage of this legislation. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) deserves more than this sorry bill, and the parents of 13 school children killed by guns every day deserve far more from this House.

I urge a yes on the substitute, a no on final passage.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) will control 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, the substitute that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) offers is flawed for two principal reasons. Number one, it is a revote of the McCarthy amendment from last night that we defeated on the floor, and for anyone who voted against that, I do not wish to completely redebate that, but it is indeed a good reason, and, in fact, a necessary reason, in my judgment, to vote against this substitute.

In case somebody needs to be reminded, this substitute, as would the McCarthy amendment last night, would essentially not specify what type of events fall within the definition of a gun show, so at a community yard sale if one person is selling his firearms collection, which could easily be more than 50 guns, and another neighbor puts one of his firearms on the table, it is a gun show.

Private yard sales, private home sales would be covered. There are all kinds of illustrations that we went over last night where they are talking about two or more persons simply exhibiting firearms. A gun show is designed by nature to be exactly that, where there are a number of vendors, we have in the bill right now 10 or more, who get together to sell firearms at some organization's show or event, not a private sale among two or three individuals. That is really the biggest flaw in the McCarthy and now in the Conyers substitute.

So I want Members to fully understand that we are revoting, by this substitute, the McCarthy proposal.

Secondly, another reason why the Conyers substitute should be voted down, in my judgment, is that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), in his proposal, would amend several sections of the criminal code that would put it in direct conflict with what we passed yesterday in H.R. 1501, the juvenile justice bill.

We all want child safety out here. We also all want to deter violent juvenile behavior and crimes, not just with guns, but in a number of other respects, but because these provisions that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is altering would directly conflict with yesterday's amendments that were adopted in the bill on 1501, I think that this should be defeated.

For example, the Conyers substitute does not contain these punishments passed yesterday: Increased penalties on juveniles who illegally possess a gun with intent to take it to a school or to give it to somebody who will take it to a school; the increased penalty on

adults who illegally give a gun to a juvenile; the mandatory minimum sentence imposed on adults who give illegal firearms to juveniles intending that they take them to a school; and the mandatory minimum penalty imposed on adults who illegally give a gun to a juvenile, knowing that a juvenile will use it to commit a serious felony.

The House, again, has already decided these issues, and the best case scenario, the adoption of this substitute is going to confuse the issue because the provisions would be directly in conflict, albeit in two separate bills.

Lastly, I would like to comment on where we are as we move to final passage. We are about to do that after this substitute, and I would certainly encourage the vote for the final passage of this legislation. It is a piece of legislation which will close loopholes. It is a piece of legislation that without any dispute does four of the five provisions from the Senate legislation, the other body's legislation, that a lot of people have been discussing out here.

The question of banning juvenile possession of assault weapons was adopted and is part of this bill, as it is a part of the other body's. The juvenile Brady provisions with respect to now saying that if someone commits certain violent crimes as a juvenile and are adjudicated in a juvenile court, they are no longer able to own a gun later as an adult, or purchase one, that is part of this bill as it is part of the other body's.

The ban on large magazine clips that were manufactured, or for guns manufactured, before 1994 is a part of this bill, as it is the other body's. The safety lock language that all of us, at least most of us, feel is important with respect to safety of children is also a part of this.

The only debate, again, comes back to the question of the gun shows, and that comes back to the debate last night, again, that is in this substitute over the McCarthy, or in the other body, the Lautenberg proposal.

I would say shame on anybody who does not vote for this, because as we said last night, everybody wants to close the gun show loophole. The legislation we have before us does that, and it does all four of the other things that I mentioned.

This is a major advance in the right direction. Maybe some people did not get all they wanted. That we can revisit on a future date. But this is a vast improvement over the conditions we presently have in current law, and anybody, I would suggest, who votes against this, who really does so because they do not believe it goes far enough in the way of providing more safety in these areas, is doing so and playing politics where they should not be playing politics.

It is a constructive proposal. It may not be, again, what everybody wants, but it is a constructive proposal that does advance the purposes intended, and that is to protect our Nation from violent felons getting access to guns when they should not and protecting children on our streets and the playgrounds in our schools and at home. That is what this legislation is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, there are Republicans who believe in gun control. We are going to hear from them right now. We are hearing from one right now, and we will hear from others. There were 47 of us who voted against the Dingell watering down. I am proud to say that there were eight from California in that group, and today we Republicans who recognize the importance of reasonable gun control and the second amendment both strongly support the Conyers/Campbell substitute.

I am proud to put my name right next to that of my good friend and mentor and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), for whom I have the highest regard. That is point one.

Point two, there is a huge advantage in this version versus the underlying bill. If my colleagues are against semiautomatic assault weapons and large-capacity ammunition feeding devices for minors, there is a flaw in the underlying bill; they did not rectify it under U.S. v. Lopez.

What does that mean? In 1995, the Supreme Court said that we could not, as a Federal Government, ban the ownership, the bringing onto school grounds of a handgun, because there was no finding of an effect on commerce. By contrast, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), in his kindness and willingness to accept an accommodation, put that exact finding into this bill. So I repeat, if Members want to take semiautomatic assault-style weapons away from people under 18, only Conyers/Campbell does that. The underlying bill, in my view, is and will be held unconstitutional.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, 200 million guns flood the streets of America. Two hundred million guns arm us like a Nation at war with itself, and this Congress does virtually nothing.

We are accomplices when 13 of our children are gunned down every day. We are accomplices when a child finds the family gun and ends the life of a neighbor. We are accomplices when the leading cause of death among young African American men is homicide by guns.

A teen without a gun cannot massacre his classmates. A toddler without a gun cannot shoot his playmate. The NRA and Charlton Heston are writing our gun laws. Where is the outrage? Congress is playing Russian roulette with the lives of our children. America, where is the outrage? Support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has 6¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I will yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield for a question to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to work in a bipartisan way. I would say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), I just simply ask the question, how many guns would nine gun show vendors have to sell under this bill?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I am not going to get into a debate over the McCarthy issue again today. I have a limited amount of time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am trying to clarify the bill of the gentleman.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I never thought I would be standing in front of this or any other legislative body asking for a vote in favor of a bill that has any type of gun control legislation attached to it, but then I never thought I would be representing a district in which two teenagers would walk into a school and callously, mercilessly, take the lives of 12 of their classmates and 1 of their teachers and wound over 20 other children.

Of course, there are things that happen in individual lives that delineate one section from another. That is what has happened to every one of us who live in Littleton, Colorado. No one will be the same after April 20, 1999. Everybody's life has changed and will be dated from that point on by that event.

I do not mean to suggest that what we are doing here in this bill will have the effect of guaranteeing that we will never have a recurrence of Columbine High School. I know that we cannot make such a guarantee, because there is nothing in this bill actually that can cure the sickness of the soul that afflicts so many, such an unfortunately large segment of the population of this great land.

I do hope that we have addressed that issue to the extent that we are able to address that issue, the underlying issue, the real cause of the problem. I hope we did that yesterday and late last night.

To the extent that we can address the other side of the problem, the more superficial side, and I admit fully well

that I believe that this is relatively superficial, that when we deal with the gun side of this thing it is the superficial side. It is the attention to a sore that appears on one's body and that they apply a Band-Aid to, but that they ignore whatever it is that is causing that sore to appear.

□ 1315

But, nonetheless, we must oftentimes apply that Band-Aid. We have to have it. Even though it is relatively superficial, it needs to be done. We are bleeding. There is no two ways about that. We are bleeding in my district. We are bleeding across this land both literally and figuratively.

So I recognize that there are people on both sides of the aisle who are concerned about the ability for this particular piece of legislation to get the job done, but I will tell my colleagues that I believe that we are far closer to getting it done if we pass this than if we do not.

I fear that, if this fails, first of all, that there will be nothing that comes out of this Congress, nothing that can come out even in a conference committee if the Conyers amendment passes and eventually this bill fails, which I think is exactly what would happen.

We have done a number of things that I think we can be proud of. We have extended Brady. It does now include everyone that walks into the door that wants to purchase a gun in a gun show. If the Dingell bill passes, that is what we have accomplished.

There are things that we have done right, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask for a yes vote on the bill and no vote on the Conyers amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who has worked so hard on this whole subject matter.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, well, I guess my constituents and the parents across this country will sleep a lot better this weekend knowing that Congress is solving youth violence by posting the Ten Commandments in the schools and passing child gun safety laws written by the NRA which substantially weaken current laws.

Do my colleagues know something, if there is anything we should have learned in the last year it is that the American people are a lot smarter than this, and they will not accept the watered-down bill like this.

It is not right to remember the kids at Columbine, to remember the kids across the country this way. Vote yes on Conyers. Vote no on final passage if Conyers fails.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute. Mr. Chairman, more than 8 weeks ago, 12 students and a teacher were killed at Columbine High School. That terrible event shocked this Nation to its core; and all across the country, the American people cried out for action. That cry was heard in Washington. CAROL MCCARTHY heard it. We all heard it, the cry of so many victims, the cry of the children.

A terrible tremor arose from Columbine 8 weeks ago. It spread across the entire Nation. Today we stand on the floor after 2 days of debate and discussion. Let us vote for this bill, the substitute bill. It is a good bill. Let us take action.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and all of our colleagues that have paid very close attention to these debates, these monumental, momentous debates over these last 3 days.

Of course, the headlines today, depending on which paper we read, which tabloid we picked up, places the consequence for what happened last night, the various votes, on one group or another group or one person or another person.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the action that this House took last night, the action that this House took the day before yesterday, the action that this House took this morning, and the action that this House will take in a few moments to pass the McCollum bill, H.R. 2122, is the American people speaking.

Every one of us in this Chamber, and all of our colleagues not here at this moment, represent 600,000 or more American citizens, families, men, women, children, grandparents, aunts, and uncles and friends. They have been in touch with us. They are listening.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because we may disagree on something, my colleagues may say, oh, it is another group that is doing this. Huh-uh. We listen to our constituents the same way they do. Our constituents are telling us they want a comprehensive piece of legislation that protects the Constitution, protects the Second Amendment, strengthens family, strengthens schools, strengthens the right of all Americans, and moves us in the direction of a positive piece of legislation that we can go back to the American people and say, yes, Congress has listened.

Yes, we listen to both the Constitution, the American people, our American educators, our families, and support this piece of legislation. Is it perfect? No. Is it good? Absolutely yes. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill, H.R. 2122.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the modest provisions that we have before us today have sent the gun lobby into a frenzy because it explodes the myth that we are powerless to act only to pass foolish symbolic legislation. We can explode that myth. We can stand up to the gun lobby.

Every day in America we have another Littleton. It is just that the dead children are scattered across America rather than concentrated in one place for the media. I pray that our hearts are not so hardened that all the carnage has to be in one place before we have the courage to act.

Please vote for the Conyers amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has worked indefatigably, and I thank her.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Conyers-Campbell substitute and to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for his leadership and that of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

This legislation is necessary because it will reduce gun violence, save the lives of our children, and protect the safety of our families and communities. We have all heard the statistics, Mr. Chairman, about every day 13 children's lives are lost to gunfire. But did my colleagues also know that, in 1996, gunfire killed 4,643 infants, little children, and teens.

We must take action to protect our children. Support the Conyers-Campbell bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes on behalf of reasonable gun control to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), a reasonable Republican.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conyers substitute and also urge my colleagues to vote no on final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I remember vividly many years ago cradling a 16-year-old Spanish-American, Mexican-American boy in my arms with a gunshot wound to his head and trying to save his life. Mr. Chairman, I remember speaking to his family afterward, his brothers, his sisters, his parents, his grandparents, his cousins, and explaining to them how their son had been killed and died of a gunshot wound to the head.

What was passed last night was not an improvement on current law. Under current law, a retailer has to get a background check and has 3 business days to do it. What was passed last night was a weakening of that law. So that if a retailer goes to a gun show, they only have a 24-hour period. If the agencies are not open, then that person who has not been adequately background checked gets his gun.

Mr. Chairman, do we want to pass a law in light of Littleton and all the other gun shootings around this country that weakens current law? That is what we would do, Mr. Chairman, if we vote for this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the substitute. There are many of my Republican colleagues who, once they realize that what the Dingell amendment did was weaken current law for retailers, I think would do wise to reconsider their vote. I urge a yes vote on the substitute and a no vote on final passage.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the last speaker a great deal, but with all due respect I disagree. Whatever my colleagues may think of any of the proposals that were here before us last night, and we are now revoting one of them today, the McCarthy one, every one of them closed the loophole with respect to gun shows because every one of them addressed the people who sell guns at gun shows who currently are not required in any way to get an instant check. Those are the individuals who go there.

If my colleagues vote for this bill today, there will be not a person who buys a gun at a gun show who does not have to have their background checked to see it they were a felon, a convicted felon. I think that is extremely important.

Most of the checks do not provide a positive result. When they do, they are arrests only records, and they can quickly be resolved and find out whether the person is convicted.

Last, but not least, I would like to again reiterate that the Conyers proposal does more than simply revote McCarthy. It also undoes some of the work we did in H.R. 1501 yesterday, the juvenile justice bill. My colleagues should vote no on Conyers. If my colleagues believe in closing the gun show loophole and improving our laws, vote yes on final passage. It is not perfect, but it is an improvement of significant.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I support the Conyers-Campbell substitute. Let me just respond to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the subcommittee chairman.

Under current law, and under the underlying bill, individuals will still be able to buy guns at gun shows without the background check because of the time differences and the definition of what is a gun show.

So if we really want to do something, this is our last chance. Let us go along with the other body. We ask for that, many of us, on both sides of the aisle. We can do something for child safety. We can do something for gun safety.

The subcommittee chairman says we will have other opportunities. It does not come along in this Chamber very often. This is our last chance. Let us support the substitute.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the Conyers-Campbell substitute. We very often have to make difficult decisions around here balancing different interests. This is not a very difficult decision at all, because we are balancing the inconvenience of a relative handful of people versus the protection of human life.

I would say we have heard a lot of statistics around here the last few hours about percentages that would be involved and numbers of people that would be involved. In my judgment, the real number is one. If one life is preserved, if one shooting is prevented because of this measure, it is worth it. Support the Conyers-Campbell substitute.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the distinguished former Governor of Delaware, a reasonable Republican for reasonable gun control.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Obviously, I rise in support of the Conyers-Campbell amendment. Let us understand exactly where we are now. The Dingell bill is passed. There is a 24-hour check. Ninety percent of all the people that get the instant background check can buy their guns right away.

We are dealing with the 10 percent of people who have been arrested at some time in their lives. We are trying to find out if they have been convicted. Are they felons, or are they not felons? We need time to do that.

This basic legislation with the Dingell amendment in it now would apply to weekend gun shows. That is when gun shows take place, and they cannot check it in 24 hours because the courthouses simply are not open. It is not a loophole. It is just a wide open highway that a felon can take advantage of to go and buy guns. We are going to be arming felons if we leave this law the way it is.

□ 1330

Why do we not pass the Conyers-Campbell substitute now? It does exactly what the Senate did. It does it correctly. It has been signed off on by virtually every group out there that has looked at the issue of guns, and, in my judgment, in this country it is the way to go.

We do not want to arm felons, we want to prevent them from being armed. Let us pass the substitute.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member over the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) very much.

We can still do something today. We can pass real straightforward gun safety legislation. We can take the millions of guns away from criminals. We can keep the guns out the hands of violent juveniles. We can provide child safety locks, and we can bar large-capacity ammunition.

Here is a letter to the NRA: ''Dear NRA. We are going to turn the lights out on you today and the gun lobby of America, but we are going to shine the light on America's children for safety and saving their lives. We are going to support the Conyers-Campbell substitute.''

Yes, we can beat the gun lobby. We are going to stand up for America.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who is an old friend of mine from Chicago.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have been to the funerals of too many young people who were gunned down by others with semiautomatic weapons. I have been through Schwab Rehabilitation Hospital and Chicago Rehabilitation Hospital. I have seen too many young people paralyzed before they get an opportunity to realize what life is all about. I have seen the agony, the frustration, the pain of people in neighborhoods and communities afraid to come out of their houses at night.

We must do the only sane, sensible thing on this day. We did not do it last night. Do it today, vote for the Conyers substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conyers' Democratic substitute amendment to H.R. 2122, the Mandatory Gun Show Background Check Act.

Today, in this sacred chamber, we have an opportunity to address this Nation's most pressing problem, gun violence, in a meaningful and effective fashion. We have a mandate from the people to take action that stems the tide of violence that is sweeping across our Nation from Washington, DC to Chicago and LA.

The biggest victim of this tide of violence is our children. From Chicago's west side to Colorado and over to Georgia, we have felt the pain of lost precious lives. Now, before we lose another precious life, we must take meaningful action.

Today, we have the opportunity to put in place meaningful gun control legislation, a task that we failed to complete last nite. Let's close the gun show loophole, let's ban the importation of large ammunition clips, let's raise the age to possess a handgun and semi-automatic weapon, lets make sure that every gun is sold with a safety device, lets adopt the Conyers' substitute. Why do we need these

protections. Well I'll tell you why, in Chicago we have a gun problem, our children are shooting children. In 1997 firearms were used in over ¾ of the murders committed in Chicago. What makes this statistic so disturbing is that over half of the persons committing murder were under the age of 21. In 1997 Chicago had 246 murders of people under the age of 21 and there were 290 people under the age of 21 charged with committing murder. Chicago contributes more than its fair share of children to a terrible statistical category: children killed too soon by hand guns, and it must stop. How can we in good conscience let this situation go on. Did you know that since 1969 that firearms are the leading cause of death among African-American youths? For 30 years handguns have been killing African-American youth and we still debate whether or not we need this common sense gun legislation. When will we take this necessary action?

Now is not the time for loopholes in the bill that's trying to close loopholes.

No one here is saying that someone can't own a gun, all they are saying is you have to wait, that your background must be checked out, and that children should not have guns. These are simple, straight forward, common sense proposals. Let's do it and make America safer and better. Let's not fail America's children again, let's take this opportunity to the right thing and pass meaningful gun reform.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for all his hard work and for allowing me this time.

Over 70 percent of Democrats are in favor of what the Senate passed, yet 70 percent of the Republicans are opposed to what the Senate passed.

Everyone knows the Republicans have played games with this process, playing a shell game with the Committee on Rules. This has really been a sham. This bill is going down unless we pass the Conyers-Campbell substitute to save our children from dying from gun violence.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, without the Conyers substitute, nine licensed vendors could sell thousands of guns to felons at a gun show without doing one criminal background check.

Let me repeat. Without the Conyers substitute, nine licensed vendors could sell thousands of guns to felons without doing one criminal background check.

In the wake of the Columbine High tragedies, only the NRA and those who support them could call this progress.

Vote ''yes'' on the Conyers substitute.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), a former member of the judiciary.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I raised it yesterday, I raise it again today. No one has responded to the fact that local communities are not prepared to provide answers to instant check within 24 hours. No one has responded. And the reality of it is they cannot respond because local communities cannot help law enforcement comply with instant check in 24 hours.

I rise in support of the Conyers substitute bill and ask all of my colleagues to get real. Protect children in this country. Vote against this sham of a legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, gun violence is out of control. This House is in a state of denial. It is time to stop dancing to the music composed by the gun lobby. It is time to face up to the fact of providing for a real instant check and to take guns out of the hands of criminals, out of the hands of the unstable, to stop the gun violence.

Vote for the Conyers substitute, a bill that will go to the Senate, and we will have a bill that will be law. That is why the gun lobby has postponed the consideration of this measure, because they want to kill it. That is why they needed the month to do it.

We should not be the handmaidens of the gun lobby. We should stick up for our constituents. We should stick up for the 600,000 people that sent us here, not the special interests.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of sensible gun safety measures that will prevent criminals from possessing guns.

Last night's votes were not about saving lives or about preventing tragic events like the shooting in Colorado from happening again, but were about inconvenience-waiting three business days to complete a transaction. Ask a parent whose child is dead because of senseless gun violence if they have been inconvenienced by the loss of their child. Or ask the brothers, sisters and friends of these victims if they have been inconvenienced by the death of a loved one. It is so unfortunate the arguments of the 24-hour National Instant Check System (N.I.C.S.) equates the value of a precious life as only a matter of convenience. It's a shame when waiting a couple of days is just too much to put up with. If we can prevent firearms from being placed into the hands of persons that have records of violence or are unstable and stop the gun violence at their hands, only then will we have done our job. At least 27 percent of N.I.C.S. applicants are not processed within 24 hours and approximately 80 percent of those denied the purchase, the individuals we want to screen out, take longer than 24 hours.

Although we may not hear about all the other tragedies that occur on a daily basis we do know that more and more criminals are finding it easier to obtain guns and we must act now to prevent this from occurring and making a mockery of the background check procedure. Our goal has never been to punish a law-abiding citizen who wishes to own guns, but to prevent those individuals who have demonstrated that they will break the law, who do have criminal conduct as part of their history and those who are incompetent from bypassing the screening system and finding other ways to obtain firearms. The fact is that the limitations on such problem actors is a positive reinforcement for gun ownership by the general population. This provides assurance that there are opportunities to responsibly possess firearms for lawful citizens.

I supported the McCarthy amendment because it just made sense. Without creating new, burdensome regulations on firearms collectors and hobbyists it would have brought parity, fairness and accountability to gun show sales by requiring gun show participants to abide by the same laws as the transactions within gun stores. This in fact codifes requirements that currently exist for firearms sales that take place at conventional retail outlets. This difference is an invitation for those who want to avoid a sound background check. Why the law should have two standards defies logic.

We do not have the answers to solve all of the challenging problems that face our nation, but we are able to take preventive steps to ensure that certain tragedies like the ones we've seen all over the country do not continue. The Brady law background check, since enacted, has prevented 400,000 gun purchases by screening out those that are a risk, a violent risk to society. Congress should act to enhance this screening process and close the loophole. Keep the guns, the weapon of choice out of the hands of the violent person, especially youth that are unstable and lack maturity.

Today we have another opportunity to restore workability and integrity to the screening process by adopting the Conyers substitute. Essentially the language and proposals which the Senate passed will close the loopholes in current law. Congress ought to do more, but the reality is that today we are fighting not to backtrack on existing laws, much less voting for new additional common sense measures that are needed. These include limiting the number of guns purchased in a month, prevention of remanufacturing kits for machine gun performance, legal liability and responsibility for the sales stream and for adults, including parents.

All too often this debate on firearm safety and protecting our society from gun violence engenders the same canned arguments, no matter the substance and different proposals. The gun lobby and their supporters have the same script; that assumes the hidden agenda is to take all guns and ban them, supposedly violating the Constitution—plain and simple scare tactics. Well, I own hunting shotguns and I want to keep them and I want others in our society who are responsible to have the same opportunity. In fact, I've heard no proponent of closing the gun show loophole or placing other limits on handguns or assault firearms advocate banning or taking all guns away. But the gun lobby has stampeded the House, ironically the people's House, into a blind canyon. Their arguments reflect an inability to deal with the facts and the gun lobby dictates only cosmetic changes.

Sound regulation of firearms is the best assurance Congress can provide for citizen ownership. As for the second amendment to the Constitution, I am not aware of any decisions that come close to undercutting the laws and proposals on the table. These assertions are

simply bogus rationalizations. The real friend of the sportsman is a policy path that asserts responsibility and sets a standard of common sense and not a Congress that dances to the music composed and conducted by the gun lobby special interests.

Vote for the Conyers substitute. Vote to stop the violence. Vote for responsible firearm safety and ownership. Vote for your constituents, not the special interest. Vote for the Conyers substitute.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Conyers substitute and to protest the majority's restriction on the number of Democratic amendments considered to the Mandatory Gun Show Background Check Act.

Clearly, this decision favors the opponents of gun control and weakens our efforts to combat the proliferation of gun crimes in our Nation. Instead of being a House of the people, we become the water carriers for the NRA.

Mr. Chairman, we are out of step with our colleagues in the Senate, and we are certainly out of step with the majority of the people in the United States.

By restricting our ability to offer meaningful anti-gun violence amendmentsto this legislation, the Republican leadership has clearly let down the children and families of America by putting the interests of the gun lobby above the safety and well-being of all our children.

Therefore I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Conyers substitute which will assure that Congress promptly responds to what the vast majority of Americans want—commonsense laws which are designed to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and children.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), a reasonable Republican for reasonable gun control.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conyers-Campbell substitute, the Senate bill, and I urge Members to vote against final passage if the Conyers-Campbell substitute does not pass.

The bottom line is a 24-hour waiting period is a joke. It is an absolute joke. It makes a mockery of the law. We have a gun show on a Saturday, on a Sunday, the check means nothing. It is a joke.

I hope in my lifetime the marriage between the NRA and my party ends in divorce. It is a bad marriage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I want to thank all of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle that have joined in for the substitute, particularly, of course, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

What is the question? If we want more criminals to get guns from gun shows, vote against Conyers-Campbell. If we do not want criminals to get guns from gun shows then we will vote for Conyers-Campbell. It is as simple as that.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if all time has expired for the others?

The CHAIRMAN. All other time has expired.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HYDE. My colleagues, we have reached the bottom line, and there is only one question that remains. Do we go forward, or do we go backwards?

Nobody gets everything they want in a bill, especially one as contentious as this bill. But if we can pass a bill, we can get it to conference, where the real bill will be written, and we will have a chance to get those things that are near and dear to all our hearts. But if we stop right now, we will not solve anything.

So the question is, are we really serious about doing something about juvenile crime, or would we rather posture; would we rather demonize our opponents and question their motives? Is that too much fun? Or can we keep this process alive and get it into conference where we will all have a voice, and we will try to shape a bill that suits the needs of America?

This is only the first step. It is not the end game. So I ask my colleagues to please not cut the lifeline to this process that we are embarked in, this contentious process.

Everybody here has been voting their district, their community, not voting party line, and we should not vote party line. There is no party line, although the Republican leadership supports this bill.

The substitute of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) would undo all of the things we did yesterday. Some we may think are bad, but some are good. One of the things the gentleman does is denies the increased penalty on adults who illegally give a gun to a juvenile. That is a step backwards.

I suggest we support this bill, we keep the process alive, because we want to do something about juvenile violence. And maybe someday we can elevate our thoughts from things like guns and get into the realm of ideas that have horrible consequences and are filling our children's souls with hate and death and violence. That is the real enemy, not the things.

But there are too many guns, too many guns available to kids, and those people who responsibly use guns are entitled to their constitutional right. Balance is what we are looking for, protecting constitutional rights, protecting kids.

The gentlewoman from New York last night, and she is a gentlewoman, made a very compelling and moving speech about why she came here. We all came here for the same thing. And I suggest we stop playing politics and we start playing children and start playing juvenile violence and start thinking more deeply about these things and trying to come to grips with solutions.

One thing we can do is pass a bill today. Then it goes to conference, and then we will see if we cannot, through some inspiration, come out with a bill that advances the cause of tranquility and safety and families and kids in this country.

Vote for the bill; vote against the Conyers substitute, which undoes everything we did in the last 2 days, and let us move into conference and see if we cannot continue this process.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, my esteemed colleagues, we have an opportunity before us today to pass bi-partisan, moderate gun safety legislation. We have a chance to make this country a safer place and we cannot afford to let this opportunity slip away.

If this body passes weak and watered down gun safety legislation then we have wasted our time. If we do not pass the moderate gun safety measures, equivalent to those that passed in the Senate, we might as well pass nothing. We have a chance to do something meaningful and we cannot afford to fail!

When it comes to gun safety, the people of this country are not going to settle for lip service. They want safe schools for their children. They want safe streets. They want to live in a country where thousands of people do not die of gun shot wounds every year. They want to live in a country where there are not seven school shootings within a period of two years.

There have been charges from Members on the other side of this issue that those of us who support these gun safety measures are somehow taking political advantage of recent tragedies. Make no mistake. There is only one outside agenda here and that is the agenda of the NRA which has categorically rejected one reasonable proposal after another. The rest of us are attempting to enact smart, sensible gun safety legislation which many of us have been working on throughout our legislative careers. And every school massacre, drive-by shooting and accidental death of a child playing with guns further proves that this is the right thing to do.

Sensible gun control is not about chipping away at the Second Amendment. It is not about taking away the right of ordinary citizens to own a gun. Those who tell you otherwise are not being straight with you because this is not about infringing upon the rights of ordinary citizens. This is about keeping guns out of the hands of those who should not have them.

Tightening restrictions on the ability of criminals to purchase weapons of mass destruction does not impede on the Bill of Rights. Making guns safer and keeping them out of the hands of kids does not undermine our constitution.

We live in an era of automatic weapons and an increasingly violent culture. Tackling the problems with guns should not preclude the need to address our cultural problems. But to deny that easy access to certain guns is a part of the problem is, quite literally, a deadly mistake. A disturbed person is dangerous. A disturbed person with a gun is deadly.

We have before us an opportunity to do right by our constituents. If this House can't pass a meaningful gun safety bill we should be ashamed to go home and face the men, women and children we represent.

Vote for the Conyers substitute.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the democratic alternative to the Child Safety Act, offered by Mr. CONYERS of Michigan. In particular, I urge my colleagues to support the funding for crisis prevention counselors and anti-violence initiatives in our local schools.

Early intervention has been shown to greatly reduce incidences of violence in schools. Children who need help should be able to get help right away. There should be caring adults in the schools who can identify children who might be struggling with a problem or with anger before it is too late. We cannot cut corners when it comes to our children.

The other body had the opportunity to adopt a true ban on juvenile possession of semi-automatic assault weapons, but instead they adopted a weak amendment that allows juveniles to possess semi-automatic assault weapons with parental consent. There is no legitimate reason for a teenager to possess a Street Sweeper or an Uzi. Juvenile possession of these weapons should be banned. This provision is an invitation for dangerous juveniles to manipulate or pressure a permissive or irresponsible parent into allow the teenager to have a deadly weapon. We have an opportunity to adopt a strong bill that will prioritize youth safety. Then we can advocate for this strong language when the bill is in conference.

I hope that this Congress will prioritize school safety. I hope that we will make a commitment to our children to make their schools safer and more conducive to learning. I also hope that we will make a commitment to examine what our children are learning and to ask if they are receiving a quality education that prepares them to be responsible citizens in a democracy—to make good, informed choices; to live in peace with their neighbors and coworkers; and to enjoy life to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, a bright and shining moment to better protect our children from gun violence was within our reach and we failed to grasp the brass ring.

We failed to enact modest gun safety measures that many of our states have already enacted.

In my own state of California we have a 10 day waiting period to purchase any firearm.

19 states have enacted their own waiting periods to purchase a handgun or a permit to purchase a firearm.

Why are we afraid to be as bold as our own state legislators.

Two months ago, following the Columbine High School shooting in Colorado, the California General Assembly passed a one-gun-month law for California, and the California Senate is expected to approve it.

If California approves the measure, it will become the fourth and largest state to curb gun trafficking through this common sense measure.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute—a common sense measure—to protect our children from gun violence.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conyers-Campbell substitute. Last night, I believe this House failed to address a gaping loophole in the law as it relates to the transfer of guns to criminals.

I fully appreciate the emotion felt by all members with regard to gun control and gun safety laws. I grew up around guns and have enjoyed shooting and hunting since I was a young child. I defy anyone to call me anti-gun or to imply that I favor banning guns or prohibiting gun ownership. I do not agree with those who seek to ban ownership of guns by law abiding citizens. I support the second amendment, but we must remember we are a nation of laws, not a nation of men. In our 212 years of experience with the Constitution, our nation and our freedom has survived with order. I do not believe the Brady Bill and the instant background check have denied any law abiding citizen the right to purchase and possess a gun. And it is an undeniable fact that the Brady Bill has stopped hundreds of thousands of people whom all of us believe should not have guns from getting guns. But the fact remains that sellers at gun shows who are not federally licensed gun dealers are able to sell guns outside the confines of the background check. Not only does this open a loophole for the transfer of guns to people whom we all believe should not have access to them, namely criminals, or people with criminal backgrounds, but this is also creates an unfair advantage for non-licensed dealers. Why should Congress treat one class of gun sellers differently than others? Unfortunately, current law allows this unequal treatment as does the Dingell amendment, which I believe is unfair.

I opposed the amendment by my good friend Mr. DINGELL, with whom I have enjoyed many hours freezing in a duck blind, because I do not believe it closes the loophole that is allowing criminals access to guns. I supported the McCarthy amendment because it would have closed this gun show loophole without placing any new restrictions on law abiding citizens right to own and purchase a gun. No where in the bill did it restrict that right. And, it eliminated the commercial inequity that currently exists between licensed gun dealers and non-licensed gun dealers.

I am not comfortable with everything in Conyers-Campbell amendment, but I do believe we must close the gun show loophole to prevent criminals from having such easy access to guns, just as has been done at gun stores, and we should restore commercial equity between federally licensed and non-licensed gun sellers to the public. We can do so without restricting the right to gun ownership by the law abiding public. To say otherwise is simply not correct and fearmongering. As a gun owner, hunter and former NRA marksman, I believe the gun show loophole for criminals is one which we law abiding gun-owning citizens can live without while protecting our Second Amendment right to own guns.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 242, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—184

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—242

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John

Johnson, Sam	Oberstar	Smith (MI)
Jones (NC)	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Kasich	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Kelly	Packard	Souder
Kind (WI)	Paul	Spence
King (NY)	Pease	Stearns
Kingston	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Strickland
Kolbe	Petri	Stump
LaHood	Phelps	Sununu
Lampson	Pickering	Sweeney
Largent	Pickett	Talent
Latham	Pitts	Tancredo
LaTourette	Pombo	Tanner
Lazio	Portman	Tauzin
Lewis (KY)	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (MS)
Linder	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
LoBiondo	Rahall	Terry
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Thornberry
Lucas (OK)	Reynolds	Thune
Maloney (CT)	Riley	Thurman
Manzullo	Rogers	Tiahrt
Mascara	Rohrabacher	Toomey
McCollum	Royce	Traficant
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	Turner
McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Upton
McInnis	Sandlin	Vitter
McIntosh	Sanford	Walden
McIntyre	Saxton	Walsh
McKeon	Scarborough	Wamp
Metcalf	Schaffer	Watkins
Mica	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Miller (FL)	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Miller, Gary	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Mollohan	Shaw	Weller
Moran (KS)	Sherwood	Whitfield
Murtha	Shimkus	Wicker
Myrick	Shows	Wilson
Nethercutt	Shuster	Wise
Ney	Simpson	Wolf
Northup	Sisisky	Young (AK)
Norwood	Skeen	Young (FL)
Nussle	Skelton	

NOT VOTING—8

Bonilla	Lewis (CA)	Salmon
Brown (CA)	Minge	Thomas
Hilliard	Pascrell	

□ 1402

Messrs. WALSH, LUCAS of Oklahoma and PEASE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my good friend for giving me the time to express my strong opposition to H.R. 2122. In lieu of recent events—more specifically, the tragedy in Littleton, Colorado—I share the concern and fear for the future of our great nation—especially for our children. Such tragic occurrences demand serious reflection by all of us—parents, children, educators and legislators alike. I pray that such reflection will create serious dialogue between parents and their children, for I believe that the true solution to such tragedies lies within the family unit.

We are united in our compassion for those involved in these recent tragedies, but we must be careful not to confuse the issues surrounding these terrible events. It seems that every time there is a drive-by shooting—or every time some mal-contented, misguided, or incorrigible youth decides to obtain guns in order to kill innocent people—there is a rush to jump on the bandwagon to take away our Second Amendment rights. These tragedies ought, instead, to spawn a resurgence of the effort to put God back in our schools and in the hearts of every student. Such tragedies should also spawn a resurgence in parents' commitment to raise their children to respect the sanctity of life and to be responsible, law-abiding citizens. We need to focus our efforts where we know the problem lies—on the number of broken families in our country, on our over-sized classrooms, on the amount of sex and violence in our children's music, movies and games, and on the drugs and drug dealers that are infiltrating our inner cities. The root of the problem is the absence of God in our homes and in our schools—not the presence of guns in our society.

Despite the hundreds of gun laws that exist today, none prevented such horrifying events. And none ever will. In Washington, D.C., it is a felony to possess a handgun in your home—yet this has had little effect on the crime rate in our nation's capital. We must not punish the majority of our law-abiding citizens by making it harder on them to—legally—pursue a constitutional right. Instead, we must empower our law enforcement agencies and judicial system to track down and convict those who choose to use guns illegally—regardless of their age.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we need to focus our efforts on strengthening our juvenile justice system. We need to instill values and build character in our children at home, in our schools and in our churches. We need to advocate more parental control—not more gun control. I urge colleagues to vote against H.R. 2122.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conyers amendment to H.R. 2122, the Mandatory Gun Show Background Check Act. This amendment takes reasonable steps to reduce gun violence, while preserving personal freedoms.

I believe strongly that law-abiding citizens have a constitutionally protected right to purchase and responsibly use firearms. The federal government does not and should not have the power to prevent its citizens from enjoying recreational activities that involve firearms, such as hunting and target shooting. Neither does the federal government have the power to restrict our ability to defend ourselves by banning the possession of hand guns. My constituents in North Dakota, and all American citizens, have the right to use firearms in recreation, just as they have the right to use firearms to defend themselves and their families. The full strength of the Second Amendment to the Constitution is behind that right.

However, I also believe that the moderate gun safety measures included in the Conyers amendment uphold constitutional rights while helping to prevent the gun violence that threatens public safety and shatters families. The gun safety measures in this amendment are identical to those passed last month by the Senate, and offer a common-sense approach to gun safety. Specifically, the expansion of the National Instant Check System to include background checks at gun shows will help keep firearms out of the hands of violent criminals. The National Instant Check System (NICS) set up by the Brady bill has proven to be highly successful at preventing convicted criminals from accessing firearms. In the last six months, the NICS has prevented over 90,000 illegal gun transactions, many of which would have armed violent criminals.

I do recognize that concerns exist regarding the impact of gun show background checks on citizens' rights to purchase firearms. However, the NICS system has proven effective at deterring criminals without placing an undue burden on law-abiding gun buyers. Nearly ninety-five percent of all background checks are resolved within two hours; a full seventy-three percent are completed instantly. The handful of background checks that take longer than two hours are usually due to an arrest record that needs to be investigated further. Law-abiding gun owners in this country will not be burdened by this provision, but instituting background checks at gun shows will help keep guns out of the wrong hands.

I also support the Senate-passed provision included in this amendment that would require safety locks or secure storage devices on every newly purchased handgun. This provision would help parents safeguard their children from the epidemic of accidental shootings that has infected this country. This amendment does not mandate that the gun owner take advantage of the safety device; the gun owner may remove the device immediately upon purchase of the weapon. This proposal would only aid efforts to avoid preventable deaths.

Mr. Chairman, the Conyers amendment to H.R. 2122 does not tamper with our nation's strong tradition of the protection of the right to bear arms. This amendment provides a common-sense approach to gun safety, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I have to commend our leader in this battle, Mrs. MCCARTHY. I have worked very closely with her, followed her outstanding leadership and been so truly inspired by her commitment and bravery.

None of us can understand the trauma Mrs. MCCARTHY has endured since December 7, 1993, the day Colin Ferguson, armed with an illegal gun, opened fire inside a crowded Long Island Railroad passenger car, killing six and injuring 19. Her husband, Dennis, who was innocently returning home from a hard day at the office, was among those killed. Her son, Kevin, was wounded and severely disabled.

This horrible tragedy instantly shattered Mrs. MCCARTHY's quiet life as a licensed practical nurse, wife and mother. She could have stayed at home, absorbed with her grief. Instead, she has gathered strength from trauma and grief, and chosen to make a contribution and bring something positive out of this tragedy. She is now a leader in the efforts to end this terrible cycle of gun violence that is plaguing our nation. Speaking at events across the country, crusading to spread the message of gun violence and working to pass gun safety legislation here in Congress, she is striving to make our streets safe for our children, families and neighbors.

Mrs. MCCARTHY has shown incredible courage and strength throughout this legislative process. She is an inspiration for all of us who have lost a loved one to an untimely death and is proof that life can go on.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, as the juvenile crime bill has worked its way to the House floor, we have lost sight of something crucial. Following the tragic armed assault by two troubled students on classmates at Columbine High School, the citizens of this nation cried out for policy to stop the killing, a policy that will protect our children from gun violence.

There are many concerns that need to be addressed. We need to take action on media violence, to develop programs that build children's confidence and self-esteem, to help parents develop the tools they need to better raise their children. But before our work in any of these areas can be effective, we must face

one irrefutable fact: our young people are able to act on their anger and frustration and rage because it is so easy for them to get their hands on a gun. As a result of this—and the ease with which criminals can buy guns—we are losing on average 13 children and teenagers every single day.

The vast majority of Americans understand this. In a CNN-Gallup poll taken just this week, 87 percent of Americans said they support legislation to close the loopholes in the law that put guns in the hands of children and criminals.

Americans favor laws that: Close the loophole that allows people to buy guns at gun shows and flea markets without background checks; close the loophole that fails to hold gun owners responsible for keeping loaded firearms out of the reach of children; close the loophole that allows children of any age to purchase or possess assault weapons; close the loophole that allows the import of ammunition clips holding more than 10 rounds; and close the loophole that allows juveniles under 21 to purchase handguns.

This is the bare bones legislation that Americans are demanding. The bill passed last month by the Senate would close most of these loopholes. Now it is up to us to approve the Senate gun package as written or to strengthen it. We must seize the opportunity to close loopholes in the law and save children and their families from the horror and pain of gun violence.

But what are we doing instead? We are ignoring the American public and playing games with the lives of our children. The bills we have before us this week not only water down the Senate's proposal, but they actually create new loopholes, like a new definition for gun shows and changing the time allotted for background checks. These bills were not designed to quell the understandable fears of American parents. They were designed to satisfy a small, vocal minority in this country—the gun lobby.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues today to stop playing politics with the lives of our children. You'll never satisfy the gun lobby. They care more about their guns and winning the argument than they do about protecting the lives of our precious children.

I am not suggesting that closing these loopholes will stop all gun violence. What I am saying is that this is a small, but significant, first step to reigning in the violence that is killing our children and destroying our families. I ask that you join me in a vote for the future of America. Please reject the weak measures before you and vote for meaningful laws that will restrict access to guns and keep our children safe.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hunter amendment. As a homeowner in the District of Columbia, I find it offensive that DC gun laws prevent me from protecting my family and home.

We all know that the criminals in this city have guns, yet innocent, law-abiding citizens are routinely denied a basic constitutional right of protection.

Mr. Chairman, this defies all common sense. Let's punish criminals, not law-abiding citizens. Pass the Hunter amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, like every American, I am deeply disturbed by the growing epidemic of violent juvenile crime. The recent tragedy at Columbine High School has dramatically heightened concerns about the safety of our children, and left parents across the nation searching for answers.

The sad fact is, our society is now permeated with violence. Graphic depictions of violent acts can be found all over television, in films and music, and on the Internet. By the age of 18, the average American child has witnessed over 200,000 acts of violence on television alone, including some 16,000 murders. Sadly, the average child under the age of eleven watches more than twenty hours of television a week—yet spends less than one hour in meaningful conversation with parents. America is now in a cultural state of emergency. As parents and leaders in our communities, we must reclaim control over our children's lives and education.

Mr. Chairman, I wish we could forever end violent crimes in our schools by a simple act of Congress. Unfortunately, no success can ever compensate for failure in the home. No new law will repair the damage done by the repeated glorification of violence in our society—and no new regulation will ever do the job of a caring and attentive parent. If we hope to reduce violence in our schools and instill a healthy appreciation of life in our children, we must begin by strengthening our efforts in the home. If we fail at home as parents, our children will have little chance of ever succeeding—or feeling safe—at our nation's schools.

As a strong supporter of the Constitution, I will not support unreasonable restrictions on the ability of citizens to exercise their Second Amendment right. While I agree that we must do everything possible to prevent more violent school tragedies, simply blaming guns ignores the root causes of violence among our youth. Strictly enforcing the 20,000 existing gun laws already on the books should be our first immediate step. The restoration of discipline and accountability in our homes, our schools, and in society will help reduce violent juvenile crimes—compromising the rights of every free, law-abiding American will not.

Mr. Chairman, there are plenty of people here in Washington who believe that we can ''legislate'' a solution to the problem of school violence. I wish it were that easy. But the truth is, this is a job for parents, not politicians—and the most important thing we can do for our children won't happen on the floor of Congress, but within the walls of our own homes.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the McCarthy amendment because I believe this amendment will close a loophole left open in the Brady Law passed in 1994. Closing this loophole does not create new laws, and I believe, creates very little additional burdens for law abiding citizens. However, it will present criminals from getting guns and it will save lives.

I also support this amendment at the request of the law enforcement community in my district who have signaled to me that closing the gun show loophole is one of their top priorities. They have told me that the McCarthy amendment will best help them keep guns out of the hands of criminals and prevent violent crime throughout the fifth district and the State of Oregon.

This amendment is a common sense approach to keeping guns out of the hands of criminals and is supported by law enforcement and members of both parties. I look forward to seeing this amendment passed this evening.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this dangerous and irresponsible bill. A bill that would weaken the Brady Law and put lethal weapons into the hands of criminals.

During the past five years, the Brady Instant Check System has prevented illegal gun purchases by more than 400,000 fugitives, convicted felons, drug addicts, and others who cannot lawfully possess a firearm.

But if we pass this bill, we will be handing them a loaded weapon and inviting them to pull the trigger.

That's because the bill denies the FBI the three days it needs to complete its background check on the very people most likely to have a criminal history.

Like the convicted rapist who traveled from Virginia to North Carolina last month—for the purpose of buying a gun.

Or the man convicted of armed robbery and burglary in Georgia who drove to Missouri last March—for the purpose of buying a gun.

Or the murderer in Texas.

Or the arsonist in New Jersey, who went all the way to Mississippi last April—for the purpose of buying a gun.

These are just a few of the thousands of criminals who tried to purchase handguns in the last six months and were stopped—because a three-day background check revealed their criminal history before the sale could go through.

But if this bill had been the law of the land six months ago, the FBI estimates that 9,000 of these people would have been walking the streets with a license to kill. If this bill passes in its present form, those 9,000 will try again. And this time, they'll get away with it.

I ask my colleagues to think about that before they vote. Think about the lives that will be destroyed because one of those 9,000 criminals got hold of a weapon and pulled the trigger. Think about what we will say to the families of the victims who are killed if we vote tonight to weaken the Brady Law.

Or we can step back from the precipice, Mr. Speaker, as the Senate did a few short weeks ago. Tonight the provisions passed by the Senate will be offered as an amendment by Congresswoman MCCARTHY—who knows more about what handguns have cost the families of America than anyone in this chamber.

The McCarthy amendment would preserve the Brady Instant Check System and extend it to the gun shows where criminals go to buy their weapons.

It is time for us to stand with her. It is time for us to stand up to the NRA.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, in the aftermath of the tragedy in Littleton, Colorado, there has been a need to find something concrete to be culpable for this horrible event. While many have blamed the parents, society, movies or video games, most of the condemnation has pointed to firearms. As a result, a call for more gun control legislation swept across this country to Washington.

I share many of my colleagues' concerns about the violence that has plagued our society and I, too, am particularly concerned about the children who have used violence to address a situation rather than using other means. However, I do not believe that putting more restrictions on guns is the solution to this blame game.

As many of my colleagues have expressed, there are thousands of guns laws on the

books today and none of them prevented the tragedy in Colorado. Furthermore, the proposals here today would not prevent this kind of tragedy from happening again.

The right to keep and bear arms as guaranteed in our Constitution should not be restricted, but be restored to our law-abiding citizens. The way to fight crime is to punish the criminals, not victims, for the crimes they commit by imposing harsh punishments and longer sentences. It is also important to give the police the resources and authority they need to catch and punish criminals without penalizing or restricting the rights of law-abiding citizens.

If we want to find someone to blame for the crime in our society, we should blame ourselves for not spending the time with our children and helping them to grow into productive and well-adjusted adults. I urge everyone who is a parent or grandparent to try to put more time aside and really listen to our children and grandchildren. If there are problems, we should be able to address them in a nonviolent fashion. Our children, the future leaders of this great country, are calling out to us. Listen to them and react to their needs.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, today we debate more than guns, we debate how to get a handle on violence. Everyone in this House admits, and the majority of Americans recognize, that there are a multitude of factors that led to the tragic school shootings this spring in Littleton, Colorado, and Conyers, Georgia.

If we are serious about ending this kind of violence, we have to address all the factors that led to it. We must deal with the denigration of religion in society, for religion is the foundation of personal morality, the greatest of all protections against violence. As George Washington stated in his farewell address in 1796:

''Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.''

We must also deal with ensuring a zero-tolerance for any weapons in our schools. We must deal with the smut on the Internet and throughout our society. We must deal with juvenile crime, and the fact that we too often coddle teenagers who engage in murder, rape, and robbery.

These are the real solutions to Littleton and Conyers, not more gun control laws. Let's be honest and quit dealing with just the edges of the problems. Let's quit giving the easy political-out answers.

Let's take a hard, cold look at what kind of nation we've become, what we've allowed to develop in this nation, and not shy away from the tough actions needed to change our course.

If anyone commits a violent crime with a gun, they should never again be allowed to own one. If an adult illegally provides a weapon to a child, they should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and we should increase the penalties to the harshest possible. Children should not have access to guns.

Children should also not be allowed to have access to the filth and graphic violence that permeates the Internet, airwaves, cable television, electronic games, and record shops.

Most of our young people manage to maintain morality in spite of this smut. A very few, those on the edge, cannot. It only took three of those young people to created the havoc that brings us to this debate. Unless we deal with these societal problems, we will be doomed to repeat the tragedies of Littleton and Conyers.

Let's rebuild the guardrails of our society that will keep the less fortunate or the emotionally-disturbed from going off the side of the mountain—and taking the innocents with them.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments in order under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2122) to require background checks at gun shows, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 209, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill 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 bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 280, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

AYES—147

Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Bryant
Burton
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Clement
Coble
Cook
Cox
Crane
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Reynolds
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Spence
Stearns
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Toomey
Traficant
Walden
Walsh
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—280

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin

Sanford	Spratt	Udall (NM)
Sawyer	Stabenow	Upton
Scarborough	Stark	Velazquez
Schaffer	Stenholm	Vento
Schakowsky	Strickland	Visclosky
Scott	Stump	Vitter
Serrano	Stupak	Wamp
Shadegg	Tauscher	Waters
Shays	Thompson (CA)	Watt (NC)
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Sherwood	Thornberry	Weiner
Shimkus	Thune	Wexler
Shows	Thurman	Weygand
Skelton	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Slaughter	Tierney	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Wu
Snyder	Turner	Wynn
Souder	Udall (CO)	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Berman	Lewis (CA)	Salmon
Bonilla	Minge	Thomas
Brown (CA)	Pascrell	

☐ 1421

Ms. SANCHEZ and Messrs. COSTELLO, HAYES, MOLLOHAN and SHADEGG changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 244, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on final passage of H.R. 2122 because I had to catch the last available plane to Los Angeles to attend my daughter's graduation ceremony at 6:00 p.m. Pacific time. However, had I been present I would have voted "no."

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1501, CONSEQUENCES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACT OF 1999

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1501, the Clerk be authorized to make changes in the placement of the table of contents, combine duplicative sections, correct section numbers, punctuation and cross references and to make other such technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

TITLE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1501, CONSEQUENCES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the title of H.R. 1501 proposed in amendment No. 36 in Part A of House Report 106–186 is adopted.

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment to the title is as follows:

A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders; to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide quality prevention programs and accountability programs relating to juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring from the distinguished Majority Leader the schedule for today and next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce we have concluded legislative business for the week.

The House will not be in session on Monday, June 21.

The House will next meet on Tuesday, June 22, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members should note that we expect recorded votes after 2 p.m. on Tuesday, June 22. On Tuesday we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, and H.R. 659, the Patriotic Act, under an open rule.

On Wednesday, June 23, and the balance of the week the House will consider the following legislation, all of which will be subject to rules:

H.R. 2084, the Department of Transportation Appropriation Act;

H.R. 1658, Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform;

H.J. Res. 33, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Authorizing the Congress to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the Flag of the United States; and

H.R. 1802, Foster Care and Dependents Act of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, we expect to conclude legislative business by 2 o'clock p.m. on Friday, June 25, and I thank the gentleman for having yielded me the time.

Mr. BONIOR. If I could ask the gentleman from Texas: Do we expect any late nights next week, any anticipated late evenings?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman.

We do have a fairly full legislative schedule, but it seems to me given that most of the work is considered under the rules and not very controversial we should not expect a flood of amendments, and we should be able to manage ourselves into relatively reasonable working hours.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague.

Let me ask him a further question and inquiry:

When are we going to take up campaign finance reform? I understand that the Committee on House Administration is going to have a series of hearings, and I would just implore my friend from Texas and my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the majority that the time has come for us to have this bill on the floor where we can have an open debate on an issue in which we debated for weeks and weeks and months on end in the last Congress. I think the country is ready, we are tired of waiting, and I hope the gentleman can give us some indication of when that bill will be before this body.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me again remind the gentleman the summers belong to the appropriations process. The Speaker and the leadership have correctly, I think, in terms of the management of the year's flow of business placed that priority on the process, and yet the Speaker has given assurance, and I would second the assurances that he has given, that we should be able to address this matter of campaign finance reform on the floor before the end of September.

Mr. BONIOR. Before the end of September.

Mr. Speaker, I regret hearing that once again. I understand that was the Speaker's assurance and the gentleman's assurance, but that seems awfully late in terms of making sure that we have something that can change the law of this country to clean up our campaign finance.

I yield for a comment to my friend and leader on this issue, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished whip for yielding, and I will say to my friend, the Majority Leader, I quoted him yesterday in hearings that we had in the Committee on House Administration saying that he hoped initially that this would be on the floor in July, campaign finance reform. I also quoted the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), who indicated that if we delayed until September he was fearful that it would kill campaign finance reform.

As the distinguished Majority Leader knows, we had over 50 hours of debate on the Shays-Meehan bill last Congress and we had 252 Members vote in favor of passing that bill, and frankly with all due respect the hearing that we had yesterday, three good Members of Congress, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), came and testified, but very frankly, Mr. Leader, they testified on bills they have had in it for at least two congresses. Very little change in their testimony. They indicated to me it was essentially no different than it was before. So I fear that the hearings will simply delay us and will be a device to kill rather than pass campaign finance reform.

I would hope that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) would consult with his leadership and see if we could accelerate that so we could bring Shays-Meehan to the floor as quickly as possible, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr.