NOT VOTING—13

Conyers
Gonzalez
Goss
Kaptur
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Riggs
Schumer
Smith, Linda
Towns

☐ 1607

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote 441. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, 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. 4300) to support enhanced drug interdiction efforts in the major transit countries and support a comprehensive supply eradication and crop substitution program in source countries, pursuant to House Resolution 537, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 384, noes 39, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

AYES—384

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—39

Bonior
Carson
Chenoweth
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Hamilton
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
McDermott
Miller (CA)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Reyes
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Scott
Skaggs
Stark
Torres
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Woolsey
Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Gonzalez
Goss
Horn
Martinez
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Schumer
Smith, Linda
Towns

☐ 1628

Ms. WOOLSEY changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4300, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1995

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1995.

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

There was no objection.

DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION ACT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 538

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4550) to provide for programs to facilitate a significant reduction in the incidence and prevalence of substance abuse through reducing the demand for illegal drugs and the inappropriate use of legal drugs. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Hastert of Illinois or a designee and a Member opposed to the bill. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed three hours. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by a Member designated in the report. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. After disposition of that amendment, the provisions of the bill as then perfected shall be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1630

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed rule is a modified open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) or a designee of Mr. HASTERT's and a Member opposed to the bill. After general debate, the proposed rule provides for a 3-hour time limit on the amendment process.

House Resolution 538 further provides, prior to the consideration of any other amendment, for the consideration of the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by a Member designated in the report. This amendment shall not be subject to demand for division or to amendment and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent.

Mr. Speaker, finally, the proposed rule provides that should the amendment be adopted, the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The proposed rule provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to Members who preprint their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The proposed rule also allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes on amendments and reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed votes provided voting time on the first in a series of questions is not less than 15 minutes.

Finally, the rule provides 1 motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

This rule was reported out of the Committee on Rules by a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, the Drug Demand Reduction Act of 1998, is intended to intervene and reduce the demand for illegal drugs and the inappropriate use of illegal drugs in this country. The Drug Demand Reduction Act of 1998 complements other anti-drug legislation like H.R. 4300, the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, and seeks to interdict drugs before they reach the United States. This proposed rule will allow ample time for the House to consider this measure, any amendments to it; 1 hour for the proposed rule, 1 hour of general debate and 3 hours on the amendments; a total of 5 hours devoted to the debate regarding H.R. 4550 and the Drug Demand Reduction Act of 1998.

The underlying bill is a recent product of the Drug Task Force headed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). However, the provisions of the underlying bill have been under consideration for the past year. Most of the provisions contained in the bill can be found in our bills, bills that have been thoroughly considered in other committees.

I am not happy to note that illegal and illicit drug use in this country have doubled in the last several years. As a former police officer, Mr. Speaker, as somebody who has been on the street and somebody who understands illegal drugs, as somebody who has dealt with illegal drugs on a firsthand basis in my law enforcement days, I can tell my colleagues that this is a situation that is a serious, serious situation, and the Members ought to support this rule and move on to address the substance of this legislation. And it is my forecast the majority of our colleagues on this House floor will, in fact, support this bill because we share a common thread, and that thread is, cut out the illegal drugs.

I think the Republicans have worked very strongly on this issue, an issue that has been driven in our Republican conference for a long period of time, and finally we are bringing it to some time of fruition.

As Members noted in the earlier debate on the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, for kids 12 to 17, first-time heroin use, which has been proven to kill, surged 875 percent from 1991 to 1996. There is a problem out there, and it is a big problem. We, the Congress, have got to address this drug problem in this country. The Drug Demand Reduction Act of 1998 seeks to address the prevailing attitude towards drugs and shift that attitude.

As a father of three children, actually three teenagers, two now in college and one that is now a junior in high school, I can tell my colleagues firsthand, we deal with lots of issues in our family discussions; but the one that concerns my wife Laurie and I the most is, what about illegal drugs? And constantly we have conversations with our children, as my colleagues do with theirs, about how deadly these things can be, how any kind of enjoyment on them, if it is there, is temporary at best, and the damage is long term. These discussions should be amplified by everybody in this country, and this bill helps our country move towards that War on Drugs. It is critically, critically important.

The Drug Demand Reduction Act of 1998 seeks to intervene and send that message that drug use is not only dangerous, it is wrong, it is illegal, and it is illegal for a purpose. It is illegal because it gets people nowhere.

I like the advertisement on TV with the gentleman who says, ''Intervene any way that you can.'' I will talk about that a little bit later on, but I think that is a message that we should do here. This is one way that we can intervene. As he says, ''Get between your kids and those illegal drugs.'' This bill is a step in that direction. It helps us intervene any way we can.

And we should not spend a lot of time on semantics. We know what it does, this bill is clear. Contents of this bill have been in front of a number of committees. We have put it together as a model, it is ready to go, and I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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