work that they had done for so many other officers, and indicated as well that the Hero scholarship is probably the most generous scholarship that is given in America and will ensure that the children of Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut will not need to worry about their educational expenses.

But I thank the gentleman for his very appropriate remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily withdraw the bill.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONVENTION CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4237) to amend the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 to revise the revenues and activities covered under such Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4237

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

SECTION 1. REVENUES AND ACTIVITIES COVERED UNDER WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 (DC Code, sec. 47–396.1) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''The fourth sentence of section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (DC Code, sec. 47–304) shall not apply with respect to the expenditure or obligation of any revenues of the Washington Convention Center Authority for any purpose authorized under the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 (D.C. Law 10–188).''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING REVENUE BOND REQUIREMENTS UNDER HOME RULE ACT.—Nothing in the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 may be construed to affect the application of section 490 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to any revenue bonds, notes, or other obligations issued by the Council of the District of Columbia or by any District instrumentality to which the Council delegates its authority to issue revenue bonds, notes or other obligations under such section.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY FINANCING AMENDMENT ACT OF 1998.

Notwithstanding section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, the Washington Convention Center Authority Financing Amendment Act of 1998 (D.C. Act 12–402) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4237, which we have just passed, is a bill that permits the District of Columbia to move forward with a financing plan for the purpose of building a new state-of-the-art convention center in downtown Washington.

This bill authorizes the Washington Convention Center Authority, an independent agency, to issue bonds and waive the 30-day waiting period for the D.C. City Council enactment to go into effect. Its passage this evening is important so they can get immediate Senate consideration and be signed by the President, and we can be in the ground and starting construction the 1st of September.

Our subcommittee has followed the effort to build a new convention center in downtown Washington with great interest. We think this is critical for the city to reestablish a tax base in downtown Washington, and working with the MCI Center, we will build, we think, a revitalization of the downtown area.

Over time it is estimated that the situation only gets worse in terms of attracting tourism if we were to go with the existing center. The District of Columbia's existing Convention Center is now only the 30th largest in the country, and it can accommodate only approximately 55 percent of national conventions and exhibition shows. That is a serious blow to the District's economy. A new convention center will provide much needed jobs for the city, and an increase in locally-generated local tax base revenue. It will boost morale for the entire region.

I want to thank the General Accounting Office and the General Services Administration for their respective roles in analyzing the development of the financing plan for the new Washington Convention Center. Their thorough analysis has reinforced our confidence in permitting the District to move forward with this project.

I also want to thank the District's Financial Control Board for their hard work and oversight on the development of this project. The Control Board is empowered to approve or disapprove all city borrowing, and this sign-off of the financial package I think gives everyone more confidence in its viability.

After reviewing information from both the proponents and opponents of the project, our committee has unanimously approved the project, and the Control Board has, in effect, reported to Congress that all aspects of the project, including borrowing and costs, are compatible with the interests of the District of Columbia. The next step is for Congress to go ahead and pass this bill. Our action this evening is a giant step forward for the District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation that moves the convention center forward for the District of Columbia. Frankly, having a world class convention center in the Washington metropolitan area is something that the entire region needs, and there are suburban jurisdictions that would have loved to have had this center within their jurisdiction. I can say, quite frankly, we had some great sites for it.

But the fact is, it belongs in the center city. Had the business community, the residential community, the political community not gotten their act together they might have lost this, but this is a credit to the fact that there is that kind of symbiotic relationship that is acting in a constructive manner today, particularly the hotel, the restaurant, and the tourism industry.

They deserve this convention center. Most importantly, the people of the District of Columbia deserve this convention center and all the economic benefits it will provide.

I thank the gentleman who chairs the District of Columbia authorizing committee for moving this legislation forward at a rapid pace, and I look forward to the day that we can all go to this convention center and enjoy not only the center itself, but all the economic and social benefits it will bring to this great capital city.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Tracy Cox and Peter Sirh of my staff for the staff work they have done on this.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to amend the D.C. Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 in order to enable the Washington Convention Center Authority (Authority) to finance revenue bonds for the cost of constructing a new convention center in downtown D.C. This legislation moves forward the hope and promise of the 1995 legislation for a sports arena and a convention center, twin centerpieces of economic development and jobs in the city and revitalization of downtown in the District. The quick and efficient construction of the MCI Center and the new jobs and revenue the arena has brought to D.C. residents have encouraged the city to complete its work on a convention center, where the need has long been conceded.

In every other city in the United States, this matter would not come before any but the local city council. Unfortunately, unlike every other city, the District does not have legislative

and budget autonomy and therefore cannot spend its own funds unless authorized by Congress.

Extensive hearings in the D.C. City Council have been held on the underlying issues, with an informed and vigorous debate by members of the City Council. On June 16, the City Council approved legislation to finance the new convention center, and on July 7, the City Council passed a bond inducement resolution to approve the Authority's proposal for the issuance of dedicated tax revenue bonds to finance construction of the convention center. On July 13, the D.C. Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (Control Board) gave its final approval to the financing plan for the project, leaving only congressional authorization, which is necessary for the District to proceed to the bond market.

On July 15, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia heard testimony from Mayor Marion Barry, City Council Chair Linda Cropp, City Council Member Charlene Drew Jarvis, Control Board Chair Andrew Brimmer, Authority President Terry Golden, and representatives of the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the General Services Administration (GSA) on the financial aspects of the project. After hearing this testimony, I am satisfied that the Authority is ready to proceed with the issuance of bonds to secure financing, allowing the Authority to begin to break ground possibly as early as September. Considering the many years' delay and the millions in lost revenue to the District, ground breaking cannot come too soon.

Although the GAO testified that the cost of constructing the new convention center would be $708 million, $58 million more than the $650 million estimate, this $58 million is not attributable to the cost of the center but to certain costs that should be borne by entities other than the Authority. For example, vendors who will operate in the facility are anticipated to contribute $17.7 million in equipment costs; the District government will provide $10 million for utility relocation from expected Department of Housing and Urban Development grants; and the President has requested $25 million in his budget to expand the Mount Vernon Square Metro station.

The GSA testified that the agency had worked closely with the Authority to keep the costs of the project down. With the GSA's assistance, the Authority secured a contract with a construction manager for a ''Guaranteed Maximum Price,'' whereby the private contractor is given incentives to keep costs down and assumes the risk for any cost overruns.

Mayor Marion Barry testified, among other things, regarding the promise of additional jobs for District residents. He said that the new convention center would create nearly 1,000 new construction jobs, and that once the facility is completed, it would generate nearly 10,000 jobs in the hospitality and tourism industries. He testified that, using some of the approaches that were successful with the MCI Center, special training and goals for jobs for D.C. residents would be met.

The District of Columbia Subcommittee hearing was not a reprise of the lengthy D.C. City Council hearings, and, on home rule grounds, did not attempt to repeat issues of local concern. However, since the issues of financing and bonding before the Congress implicate other areas, the Subcommittee asked extensive questions and received testimony concerning many issues, including location, size, and job creation, in addition to the strictly financial issues.

This convention center has an unusual financial base, which I believe other cities might do well to emulate. The financing arises from a proposal by the hotel and restaurant industry for taxes on their own industry that would not have been available to the city for any other purpose. The proposal was made at a time when the city's need for revenue and jobs has been especially pressing. For many years, the District had been unable to attract large conventions. Not only has the District lost billions as a result; the local hotel and restaurant industry has suffered from the absence of a large convention center. It is estimated that the inadequacy of the current facility led to the loss of $300 million in revenue from lost conventions in 1997 alone. My legislation will enable the District to compete for its market share in the convention industry for the first time in many years.

The delay in building an adequate convention center has been very costly to the District. In a town dominated by tax exempt property, especially government buildings, a convention center is one of the few projects that can bring significant revenues. To that end, the District intends to break ground this September. I ask for expeditious passage on this bill.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4194. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4328. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4194) ''An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAIG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4328) ''An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BYRD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. INOUYE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

□ 2145

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2183.

□ 2150

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mr. BLUNT (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 22, and ask the House to consider amendment No. 23, at the Chairman's desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF GEORGIA TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 23 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows: