Gibbons	Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Gilchrest	Linder	Sandlin
Gillmor	LoBiondo	Sanford
Gilman	Lucas (KY)	Saxton
Goode	Lucas (OK)	Schaffer
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Goodling	Mascara	Sessions
Gordon	McCollum	Shadegg
Goss	McCrery	Shaw
Graham	McHugh	Sherwood
Granger	McInnis	Shimkus
Green (WI)	McIntosh	Shows
Greenwood	McIntyre	Shuster
Gutknecht	McKeon	Simpson
Hall (OH)	Metcalf	Sisisky
Hall (TX)	Mica	Skeen
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Smith (MI)
Hayes	Minge	Smith (NJ)
Hayworth	Mollohan	Smith (TX)
Hefley	Moran (KS)	Souder
Herger	Murtha	Spence
Hill (IN)	Myrick	Stearns
Hill (MT)	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Hilleary	Ney	Strickland
Hilliard	Northup	Stump
Hinchey	Norwood	Sununu
Hobson	Nussle	Sweeney
Hoekstra	Ortiz	Talent
Holden	Ose	Tanner
Hostettler	Oxley	Tauzin
Houghton	Packard	Taylor (MS)
Hulshof	Paul	Taylor (NC)
Hunter	Pease	Terry
Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
Hyde	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry
Isakson	Petri	Thune
Istook	Phelps	Thurman
Jenkins	Pickering	Tiahrt
Johnson (CT)	Pickett	Toomey
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Traficant
Jones (NC)	Pombo	Turner
Kanjorski	Portman	Vitter
Kaptur	Pryce (OH)	Walden
Kasich	Quinn	Walsh
Kelly	Radanovich	Wamp
Kind (WI)	Rahall	Watkins
King (NY)	Regula	Watts (OK)
Klink	Reynolds	Weldon (FL)
Knollenberg	Riley	Weldon (PA)
Kolbe	Roemer	Weller
LaHood	Rogers	Whitfield
Lampson	Rohrabacher	Wicker
Largent	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson
Latham	Royce	Wise
LaTourette	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Ryun (KS)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Buyer	Jefferson	Scarborough
Carson	John	Young (AK)
Conyers	Kingston	
Green (TX)	McKinney	

□ 1501

Messrs. PETRI, GREENWOOD, THOMAS, PICKERING, GANSKE, SMITH of Texas, NUSSLE and HILLIARD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. LAZIO, JACKSON of Illinois, FRELINGHUYSEN and VISCLOSKY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3064, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 330 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 330

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 330 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3064, the D.C. appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Additionally, the rule waives all points of order against the bill. House Resolution 330 also provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority of the House.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 330 is a closed rule recognizing the full and fair debate that the House had on similar legislation on July 27, 1999. This rule will assist the House to move forward in the appropriations process.

I regret that it is necessary to bring another appropriations measure to the floor to fund the District of Columbia. As my colleagues know, Congress sent a bill to President Clinton on September 16 of this year that funded the District government at levels above those requested by the President and with almost no changes from the bill he signed a year earlier. Unfortunately, the President used this bill to send an early message to Congress and the American people he would be playing politics with the budget again this year.

The precursor to the underlying legislation, H.R. 2587, appropriated the total of $429 million in Federal funding support for the District, 35 million above the President's request. The bill sent 6.8 billion in District funds back to the people of Washington, $40 million more than was requested by the President. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, this was not enough.

I was very disappointed when the President vetoed the District funding bill, but I was most surprised by the issue cited by the President in his veto message. The President chose to put a bizarre agenda of free needles and legalized drugs over the interests of the citizens of Washington, D.C. He vetoed it because it would not allow the District to distribute needles to drug addicts or legalize marijuana.

The President's intent to allow the District to use Federal dollars to fund needle exchanges is only the latest time he has been on the wrong side of this issue. Last year Secretary Shalala indicated the Clinton administration would lift the ban on Federal funding, but when the drug czar, Barry McCaffrey, denounced the move saying it would sanction drug use, the White House upheld the Federal ban but continues to trumpet the effectiveness of needle exchange programs. This clever triangulation technique saved him from a political debacle; but it exposed his true convictions on this issue.

What kind of message do we send to our kids when our government tells them not to do drugs, but then supplies them with needles? As noted by the Heritage Foundation's Joe Loconte, quote, ''The Clinton administration has tacitly embraced a profoundly misguided notion that we must not confront drug abusers on moral grounds. Instead we should use medical interventions to minimize the harm and the behavior it invites,'' close quotes.

Such a policy ignores that drug addiction is an illness of the soul as much as the body. We, as a Nation, have a responsibility to set moral and legal standards that demand responsible behavior and enabling drug users to engage in illegal behavior does nothing to end their tragic addiction or stop the spread of drugs in America.

Another reason President Clinton vetoed this bill is because he believes the District residents should be allowed to legalize marijuana. Not only does the President want D.C. residents to be able to use marijuana, but he also wants them to be able to grow it for their friends. Once again his own drug czar, General Barry McCaffrey, has said that, quote, ''Smoked marijuana is not medicine. It has no curative impact at all,'' close quotes.

In fact, the drug czar advises against using marijuana for medical purposes, exactly the language used in the D.C. referendum. Still, the President vetoed the D.C. appropriations bill over this issue. This completely undercuts the consistent and responsible ''Just Say No'' message by General McCaffrey and Congress who are working to keep illegal drugs out of our schools and off our streets.

Over the last several months Congress and the President have been debating over the best way to spend the American people's hard-earned tax dollars. We have talked about education, Social Security, and our national defense. We have a lot of differences on these issues, but this is something I had hoped that we could agree on. Spending taxpayer dollars to fuel the habit of drug addicts is not only irresponsible, it is wrong.

There was a time when the President agreed that these provisions made

sense. That time was 1 year ago when the President signed into law a District appropriations bill that contained the same responsible restrictions on Federal funds. This year, though, President Clinton has changed his tune and set aside the war on drugs for a war in Congress. I doubt the American people would consider this move a valuable use of public funds.

Some of my colleagues on the other side are going to use today's rule as an opportunity to harass this Congress and its leadership, but the real lack of leadership here is in the White House. When thousands of police officers work the streets every day to rid our Nation of drugs, they should at least be able to expect that the chief law enforcement officer in the land supports them and the laws that they protect. Congress has worked with the President on some of the objections he raised to the bill, but this Congress will not be moved from its conviction that legalized drugs and enabling drug users sends all the wrong messages to our young people as they wrestle with these issues in our communities back home.

I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) for his admirable work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is going to spend a lot of time today talking about marijuana and needles and drug addicts. I want to make it very clear that I am not in favor of the legalization of marijuana or needle exchange or doing anything that will further the use of illegal drugs in the District of Columbia or anywhere else in this country. But, Mr. Speaker, I also want my Republican colleagues to understand why many Democrats are going to oppose this rule and oppose this bill. We are going to oppose the bill and the rule because the Republican majority does not want to talk about anything else except what they want to talk about. No one else can get a word in edge-wise. We are going to oppose the bill because the Republican majority refuses to sit at the table with the administration, with the delegate from the District of Columbia, or with the Democratic members of the Committee on Appropriations to negotiate on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are now way beyond any one rider in this bill. The administration, the District, and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) have all indicated that they are willing to be flexible on these issues. We oppose this rule and this bill because the Republican majority has closed the process and will not even give the people of the District of Columbia the simple courtesy of listening to their concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity in recent weeks to point out to my Republican colleagues that it seems they support local control only when it suits their purpose. Round two of the District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal year 2000 is another case in point. This bill is no improvement over the last because the Republican majority seems intent on adopting an attitude of Father Knows Best. Following the President's veto of the first D.C. appropriations bill, the Republican majority refused to sit down and talk about what should be done to move this bill. Instead, the Republican majority has chosen to use the D.C. appropriations bill as a political paint brush in an attempt to unfairly paint the administration and congressional Democrats as being soft on drugs.

I want to reiterate that I am not endorsing the legalization of marijuana or making needles available to IV drug users. No, Mr. Speaker, I am endorsing the idea of allowing the District the right that every other jurisdiction in this country now enjoys, the right of self-determination. The Republican majority has denied over a half million people that right by refusing to engage in any discussion about how best to settle this matter. As a consequence, I will join the delegate from the District of Columbia in opposing this bill.

To add insult to injury, the Republican majority is bringing this bill to the floor under a completely closed rule. I think it is a forgone conclusion what the outcome of any vote on any of these issues might be. But the fact that the Republican majority does not want to give the delegate this opportunity to represent her constituents is really unconscionable.

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

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

At this time I would like to point out to my friend from Texas (Mr. FROST) that making this administration look bad on drug policies is the easiest thing we can do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding time.

I think it is important to note that the reason we will discuss certain issues today is not because I, as author of the bill and chairman of the subcommittee, it is not because I have selected some issues to talk about. The reasons we will talk about certain issues today, the reason is that the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, sent to this Congress a veto of the bill that we sent him to fund the District of Columbia; and the President of the United States selected seven reasons in his veto message that he wrote to Congress, that William Jefferson Clinton said are the reasons he vetoed the bill and that people on the other side of the aisle have accepted as their reasons for opposing it.

Now, contrary to what the gentleman has represented, I know personally because I am the one involved, that we have sought endlessly to talk with the Members on the other side of the aisle, with the delegate from the District of Columbia. I have talked personally with the President's representative, Mr. Jack Lew of the Office of Management and Budget; I have offered to sit down with him whenever he was willing to do so. They do not respond, and I will not yield, not at this time. We have offered. They just want to say, ''Oh, the District of Columbia ought to be free to make up its own mind if marijuana is going to be legal here.''

□ 1515

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that we can save $16 billion a year of taxpayers' money if the President and my friends on the other side of the aisle want to go ahead and surrender in the national war against drugs, because that is how much we are spending. And if we say that any part of the country can declare itself a safe haven, a safe haven for marijuana or any other drug, then the result is going to be we no longer have a national policy against drugs, we no longer have a national law, so why are we spending this $16 billion a year.

I did not pick this fight. The President, the President vetoed the bill for this reason. The delegate for the District of Columbia took the House floor and in conversations has said, oh, let us make up our own minds whether we are going to honor and obey the drug laws that cover the rest of the country. I read an editorial in the paper today that said, the new phrase is probably going to be that D.C. stands for Drug Capital, because of the people that will want to flock here. And for people to use the pretense, the pretense that oh, this is about local control, this is about people able to make their own decisions, is such a red herring. If we want a Federal law, if it is important to have a Federal law on issues, then make it uniform and national. If not, it is no good.

Mr. Speaker, I am reading from the President's veto statement that he sent to this Congress when he vetoed the bill. I am quoting his own words: ''Congress has interfered in local decisions in this bill in a way that it would not have done to any other local jurisdiction in the country,'' which, Mr. Speaker, is frankly absurd, because the drug laws cover every city in the country. He went on: ''The bill would prohibit the District from legislating with respect to certain controlled substances. Of course, he means marijuana.'' That is all the bill talked about. It says the District of Columbia has to follow the same drug laws as the rest of the country, and he objects to that. The President wrote this. He went on to say, ''Congress should not impose such conditions on the District of Columbia.''

Mr. Speaker, if he does not want a national law to combat the terrible scourge and plague of drugs, that is his position; he is entitled to it; and I am entitled to object.

Let me read what the police chief of Washington, D.C. has submitted publicly about this whole effort. This is a statement that was put out by the police chief of Washington, D.C. a year ago when this issue arose, when they had this ballot initiative. I quote Chief Charles Ramsey: ''Legalized marijuana under the guise of medicine is a surefire prescription for more marijuana on the streets of D.C., more trafficking and abuse, and more drug-related crime and violence in our neighborhoods. This measure would provide adequate cover in the name of medicine for offenders whose real purpose is to manufacture, distribute, and abuse marijuana,'' end of quote. These efforts are going on around the country.

The Clinton administration sent its drug policy people here to Capitol Hill to testify long before this bill ever came up, and it was the testimony from the Clinton White House's Drug Czar, General Barry McCaffrey, testimony to this Congress, quote: ''Medical marijuana initiatives present even greater risks to our young people. Referenda that tell our children that marijuana is a medicine sends them the wrong signal about the dangers of illegal drugs, increasing the likelihood that more children will turn to drugs. Permitting the medical use of smoked marijuana,'' and he put medical in quotes, ''will send a false and powerful message to our adolescents that marijuana use is beneficial. If pot is medicine, teenagers, rightfully, will reason, how can it hurt you? We can ill afford to send our children a mixed-up message on marijuana.''

Testimony to this Congress from the White House's own Drug Czar, now contradicted by the President.

And then the Drug Enforcement Agency, part of the Clinton administration's Justice Department, in testimony just this summer to this Congress, told us, and I quote again: ''Medical marijuana is merely the first tactical maneuver in an overall strategy that will lead to the eventual legalization of all drugs,'' end of quote. That is the Clinton administration's own Justice Department.

But now they say, under a pretext, a pretense of local control, let us say it is okay for Washington, D.C., under flimsy guidelines to legalize marijuana.

We have had testimony from the Clinton administration's own antidrug people that we pay through our tax money confirming that smoking marijuana is never medically indicated. It is not necessary to relieve any suffering or health problems. And the Justice Department testified to us that these so-called medical marijuana initiatives are draining their resources, robbing them of time and money and resources, to fight the drug problems, because they have to deal with these spurious attempts to override national drug laws with these local initiatives. That is the administration's point.

This bill expressly, expressly disproves the effort that was put on the ballot in Washington, D.C. to legalize marijuana in the Nation's Capital. If one votes against the bill, one is voting that it is okay to have drugs legalized in Washington, D.C. I do not care how much one claims to the contrary, I do not care how many smoke screens one throws up to us, that is the issue. Hide behind whatever one thinks is big enough to hide behind. But the issue is, are we against drugs? Are we trying to combat drugs before they get ahold of our kids, or are we declaring a truce and a surrender in the war against drugs? We are going to yield back this country one city at a time, one State at a time; go ahead and legalize it here, undercut all the drug laws, we do not care. I do not care what argument one throws up against it. That is the issue.

The President of the United States picked the issue by vetoing this bill and sending the veto message that he did, and no one can escape that.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

To the gentleman from Oklahoma, what I would like to suggest, notwithstanding all of the rhetoric that the gentleman just shared with us, is that if the gentleman would agree to add one word and drop one provision that has nothing to do with drugs, then we would accept this bill, this bill gets signed, and this whole discussion is moot. It will be done. We cannot tell the President what to do, but from this side; not that we would want to disagree with the gentleman's premise, but the reality is that if the gentleman would simply let the District of Columbia use its own funds to review the court cases that are currently involved so that the D.C. Corporation Council can advise the D.C. City Council on what cases are currently pending in court, then we could accept this. That is all we are asking.

We are not fighting on this drug issue. We may disagree; we may feel that D.C. has the right to determine what is in its own interests. We may feel that it is appropriate to allow private funds to be used for legal purposes. But we also recognize we have a responsibility for the District of Columbia government to be able to function; and the fact is, this is a decent appropriations bill if it were not for all of these ideological riders.

The gentleman will recall that in the full Committee on Appropriations, we got some compromises. We did not ask for a lot. We got a compromise where the majority of the committee, bipartisan, agreed we will just put in with the use of public funds for any needle program. Forget the fact that it is used so that they can provide drug treatment and counseling and so on. Go ahead and ban the use of public funds, but do not try, through a Federal appropriations bill, to say private people cannot contribute money for private purposes. It is a nonprofit private organization. That is all we asked.

So there was a compromise, and we went to this floor in a spirit of compromise. And if the gentleman will recall, that bill passed overwhelmingly. It was a good appropriations bill. It was a right thing for the District of Columbia. We go into conference and there is virtually nothing that happens. We lose that spirit of compromise.

Now we are here on the floor. I would not want to suggest that the only reason we are here is so that we can make some charges against the Clinton administration and the Democrats, charges that are clearly unfounded, charges that are clearly not right. In fact, the Clinton administration came out strongly against the medicinal use of marijuana even, came out strongly against any of the programs that the gentleman is suggesting. The gentleman has already quoted Clinton administration officials, but what they want to preserve is the right of the citizens of the District of Columbia to run their own affairs. That is the issue here.

All that the gentleman would have to do is to add one word, and that is ''Federal,'' simply add that with regard to voting rights. That is all that we are talking about. And then, D.C. City Council can use public money, local, tax revenue so that its D.C. Corporation Council can advise it on bills that directly affect the D.C. government that are in the court.

Right now, the gentleman says D.C. government cannot use its own local funds to even advise the D.C. council on the status of the voting rights legislation. That is not fair. Prohibit Federal funds; do not prohibit D.C. local funds. Make that adjustment; we will find a way to get this bill over to the President's desk; and we will recommend signature. And we will have fulfilled our responsibility.

So for all of the protestations, for all of the rhetoric, here we have a negotiation. It is a reasonable offer. It has nothing to do with drugs, nothing to do with the social riders that the gentleman has been talking about. Accept it, we will move forward. We will fight these other issues maybe in another year, or on another appropriations bill, but let us do the right thing by the D.C. government, by the D.C. citizens. Let us keep this out of some omnibus bill where they lose control of the ultimate fate of this bill. It is a small bill. Let us do the right thing on this.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

This is new, it has not been discussed before, and I would suggest that the gentleman from Virginia get together with the chairman of the committee, because this is not what we are hearing from the administration. The administration is saying we have some real problems with local control. We want them to go ahead and put in the provisions to legalize marijuana for medical purposes.

So I think we ought to just look at the provisions that the President is supporting, because I have with me the legislative text for the medical marijuana provisions and it says some very interesting things. It says, medical patients who use and their primary caregivers who use marijuana can avoid any of the District of Columbia drug laws; and they can designate who their primary caregivers are.

Let us just see, who are these primary caregivers that can completely avoid the drug laws that we have here in America. They can designate, and by the way, this is based on a recommendation from a physician which can be oral, it does not have to be in writing, it can be oral. This is the oral recommendation that one can use medical marijuana, and then one can designate this primary caregiver. A medical patient may designate or appoint a licensed health care practitioner, sibling, so one could have their brother be the primary caregiver; a child, someone below the age of 18, a child can be the primary caregiver; or other relative, domestic partner, case management worker or best friend; they can be your primary caregiver, and this designation does not need to be in writing, it can be verbal too.

□ 1530

So that says if you get some oral recommendation from a physician that you can use marijuana, you can say, I am not going to get it myself. I can designate somebody to go get it for me. I want my child to go get it, my 6-year-old kid, my eight-year-old kid. Send them down to the playground or wherever they are selling marijuana in the District of Columbia, they can possess that marijuana and take it back to the person to do drugs, to do the medical marijuana, a child. A child can be put in that position.

I have seen from personal experience children going to school with lunch money, and the bully of the school, of the play yard, said, give me a quarter or you can't come in. I want a quarter of your lunch money. The child says, okay, here is a quarter. Now it changes the whole scope of things. Here is a child in legal possession of marijuana. What is the bully going to ask for this time? Do Members think this will not proliferate drugs in the District of Columbia?

We want to make this a shining jewel of this Nation, one of the best cities in the Nation, something we can all be proud of; a safe place, not a drug haven, not the drug capital, our Nation's Capital. That is what we are leaning for here, and that is what the President is fighting for.

It is not over the budget. We have accepted the District of Columbia's budget, what was passed by their city council, what was approved by their Mayor. It is in this bill. The difference is the drug policy. That is what the President has narrowed this down to, the drug policy.

The gentleman from Virginia has aptly pointed out that he cannot speak for the administration. The administration has other ideas. This is one of them. This is one of the things that we are so worried about. I just would urge my colleagues to avoid any changes and to support this bill. This is a good bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my wife is a medical social worker. She has worked at D.C. General, she has worked at Georgetown Hospital. She has seen crack babies. Nobody has to lecture me or her or anybody else on that side of the aisle on the idiocy and stupidity of drugs. I hate them. I hate all drugs.

But we have a difference of opinion here. We have a difference of opinion about whether we will really save lives by guaranteeing clean needle exchanges for people who are crazy enough or hooked enough to continue the drug habit. We have a difference of opinion on whether we will save lives or not.

I also do not happen to agree with the referendum that passed D.C. about the medical uses of marijuana, but I do believe that the District government ought to have the power to work out a rational compromise that does close the door to pain without opening the door to drug abuse.

But that is not what is at issue here today, because I recognize that the majority would rather have ''Beat Up on Bill Clinton Day'' than to sit down and negotiate in a rational way to work out agreements on these two issues. So recognizing the hardheaded reality on that side of the aisle, I would also say hardhearted, but it would be against the House rules if I said that, so I will simply say, put those issues aside.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has just indicated we may disagree with the gentleman on those issues, but we think the string has been run out on that. So what we do stand here today asking that side to do is this: Recognize the fundamental right of taxpayers in any locality in this country to use their own dollars any blessed way they want in order to defend their own interests in a democratic society, when it comes to the question of whether or not they are going to be able to exercise the most precious right that any individual citizen has in a democracy, the simple right to vote and have that vote count. That is all we are asking at this point: put aside the differences on the drug issues and simply say, okay, you win.

And now let us get to the question of democracy. All we have to do, as the gentleman from Virginia said, is to add one word, the word ''Federal,'' so it makes clear that the D.C. government cannot spend Federal money to pursue the right of representation in a democratic system, but that they can spend their own money. What on God's green Earth is wrong with that?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the gentleman what is wrong with it. What is wrong with it is it completely abrogates the responsibility of the Congress of the United States of America, representing the people of the country, to exercise exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia, which the Constitution provides. Members on that side have not mentioned it and there is a reason they have not, because they do not want to deal with it.

The fact of the matter is that our Founding Fathers placed full and complete plenary legislative authority over the District of Columbia in the hands of the Congress. If Members want to walk away from that and say the District of Columbia Council should have that authority, then fine, go ahead and propose a constitutional amendment. But those of us on this side have higher regard for our Constitution than to be a party to that.

We are not going to walk away from our responsibility reflecting the will of the people of the country by a large majority who do not want drugs legally flowing through the streets of the District of Columbia. They are already concerned enough about how many drugs are here, and the high murder rate. We are sure as heck not going to make it legal to do drugs in the District of Columbia. That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely what the District of Columbia wants to do.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma said, they can couch it in whatever flowery language they want to, and they can get down here with this self-righteous mantle of, do not lecture us about this or that, and people work in hospitals, and so forth. It is not hardhearted, it is not uncompassionate, to say no to drugs.

What does the President want to do? The President wants to allow drugs, marijuana specifically, as a gateway drug, in the District of Columbia. We on this side of the aisle say no.

Let me answer the question posed to us earlier by the gentleman from Virginia in his proposal, his so-called compromise: No, N-O. I do not know whether they misunderstand those two letters, but we are not interested in the sham of saying, they can do it with this money, but not this money.

Either we stand up against drugs in our Nation's Capital, or we cave in to it. We want to stand tall on this side.

We want to stand firm here and say, pursuant to our authorities under the Constitution of the United States of America, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, that we do have a responsibility here.

Our responsibility goes beyond simply the funding. It goes beyond simply dollars and cents. It goes to the fundamental issue of whether or not in our Nation's Capital we shall continue to fight against mind-altering drugs, or whether we shall surrender to it. The President wants to surrender, and we on this side of the aisle do not.

I appreciate the gentleman's offer. It is not a new one. They have tried it before. We argued last year about this. We argued this year about it. Apparently we are going to have to argue about it today. The answer is no.

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's point, but we have a misunderstanding as to the issue. I am not talking about the Federal use of funds for marijuana or for needles. This is only voting rights.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my response to the gentleman from Georgia who just spoke is simply this. Of course the Congress has the constitutional authority to use its power to shove the District around, but the Constitution does not require that mature people in every instance use the full power that they have when another course is more fair and more rational and more just.

Just because we have the muscle does not mean it is always right to exercise it. Once in a while it pays to have a little sense of balance. That is what we are asking you to show for a change today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. Speaker, very frankly, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, his side of the aisle is so intent on making the political point, and a point with which I agree with reference to the use of marijuana, that it is not listening to what the gentleman from Virginia said. So intent are they on the politicization of this debate that they are ignoring the substance of this debate.

What the gentleman from Virginia said, they have seven riders on this bill. He said with respect to one rider, to which I am vigorously opposed and believe is exactly contrary to what the Founding Fathers had in mind, and that is the restriction on the District of Columbia to press its rights in the courts of this land by refusing it the opportunity to use its corporate funds, that is, tax dollars paid in by its citizens to its government, for the purposes of saying, we are being denied our rights under the Constitution of the United States, that is what my friend is trying to preclude the District of Columbia citizens from doing. But he is so intent on making his political point that it is the drugs issue that he wants to focus on, solely.

The gentleman from Virginia said nothing about that provision. What he said was that we would agree to this bill if that side added one word to the provision that prohibits 600,000 American citizens from pursuing their rights in the courts of this land, corporately.

The gentleman is the chairman of this committee said what I was saying was hogwash the last time we had this debate. One could make their own analysis of the substance of that kind of debate. But the fact of the matter is that he does prohibit in this bill the use of funds to pursue constitutional relief.

All the gentleman from Virginia is saying is, add ''Federal funds.'' I think that is wrong, but add ''Federal funds.'' Just because we have the power to do so, I would say that parents have the power to do things they ought not to do, and the State has the power to do things that it ought not to do. The fact of the matter is that we ought not to preclude Federal funds.

Let us assume that their side of the aisle, which has the majority votes, wants to preclude the District of Columbia from pursuing its constitutional relief by saying that they cannot use Federal funds. All the gentleman from Virginia is saying is, all right, let them use their own locally-raised funds to ask the Supreme Court or the circuit courts or the District court for relief.

If that is added, just that one word, what the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is offering is that we will support this bill and let it go; not because we agree with the other six, we do not necessarily agree with the other six, although I tend to agree with the gentleman's provision with reference to the provision that he is so offended by, but because we believe that this is the single most egregious provision I think we have included in any piece of legislation since I have been here, to say to 600,000 American citizens, we are not even going to allow you to use your corporately-raised funds for the purposes of redressing your constitutional grievances and protecting your constitutional rights.

Surely the gentleman from Georgia, who has talked about the Constitution, cannot support that provision.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, for Members, this may be a typical appropriation exercise. That is not what it is for me. It is my city Members are talking about. I have come forward on this rule not for the usual reasons. For me, I want to be clear that this is well beyond any particular provision of this bill.

The demagoguing that is done on the other side about drugs falls like a lead balloon. There is nobody in the United States, even those who detest Bill Clinton, that believes he wants to legalize drugs in the District of Columbia. I am going to let that one fall.

The problem identified by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is entirely correct. That is why I had indicated that the way to address that is to send the matter to the city council, which has the power to change it or obliterate the whole matter. Nobody thinks in the United States of America that drugs are at issue here.

For me, this matter is well beyond any particular provision of this bill. For me, this matter is about something that has never happened in this House since I have been here, and I have asked all the old-timers if they have ever seen it happen.

For me, this is about bringing a bill to the floor for a vote after a veto without a single word of discussion with the man who must sign the bill or his agent, the President of the United States. It has never been done so long as anybody knows in the history of this House.

□ 1545

Thus, I do not oppose this rule for the usual reason, that it is a closed rule. I oppose this rule because we have before us a unilateral document where no discussions have occurred with the White House, in spite of the fact that the White House on several occasions has come forward and asked for a discussion.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I certainly will not yield. I certainly will not yield, sir. I will not yield a single moment, sir. Not only am I not going to yield, I may ask for some more time to discuss what is happening to my city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) still has the time.

Ms. NORTON. No, I am not going to yield. I have yielded too much. I let this bill go on this floor to conference, when many on my side said it should not. I yielded then, and the gentleman promised me that he would move on the matter that has been brought up here by several Members on voting rights for the people of my city, to have their corporation counsel look at the papers that had been prepared by a private law firm to see whether or not they were in order. I yielded. I am not going to yield this time.

For me, this is a new low in this House to proceed after a veto, stonewalling the President who comes forward and says I think we can work this out, let us have a discussion. That is all this is about.

I was so concerned that I marched over, just a couple of hours ago, to see the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) because I believe he is a fair

man. I must say he saw me right on the spot. I marched over because I could not believe that he was part and parcel of not even having a word of discussion before we unilaterally brought a bill to the floor, inviting a veto. I am supposed to get up here and say to Democrats, vote no. You are supposed to get up here and say to Republicans, vote yes. Big exercise. Big ritual for you. Serious business for the more than half million people I represent. I was trying to break through it.

I am pleased the Speaker saw me. He said, ''Eleanor, we do intend to have negotiations after this vote.''

I said, ''Fine. Let us have it before so that there is no posturing on the floor about drugs, so that I do not have to get up and talk about home rule.''

Do it the way it is always done. Let us sit back and talk about it now. The administration is ready. I have talked with them.''

The Speaker listened. His staff listened. He said that he would take it under advisement. There was a postponement. I thought maybe we were getting somewhere. Obviously people have been talking back and forth, but then we were told that the bill was in order.

All that is left, since the President of the United States must agree on this bill, all that is left is for me to ask for a no vote on this rule in order to begin discussions. And, my friends, I want you to hear my words, ''begin.'' Discussions did not collapse. They have never begun.

When there is a veto, the only way to settle the matter is indeed to sit down with the adversary to see whether things can be straightened out. That is the way I have done business for my city ever since the first day I walked into this House in 1991. That is the way I intend always to do business for my city, and I ask for the respect that I think that I am due, to have you sit down with the agents of the President of the United States, so that Members of the House and the Senate can talk with them about whether we can get somewhere and, if we cannot then let us come back, have this vote and go the next step. That courtesy has not been given to me. I think I am entitled at least to that.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, there are other things that I will want to say before we conclude this debate, but in response to the, frankly, incredible statements just made by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), having spent many hours talking with people, having told the White House just yesterday talking with their designated person on this that I would meet with them, I would change my schedule any, and they just do not get back to me. We keep trying. We have talked with them. I have done it personally.

I have talked with the gentlewoman. I have talked with other people. Ma'am, I take huge offense at your false representation that we have not been trying to work with people.

I would further submit, if the gentlewoman and other people would publicly call on the President to renounce his veto message, where he vetoed this over the marijuana laws in D.C., we would make great progress.

Why cannot the other side get this marijuana issue beside us by calling on the President to retract his veto message that the other side defends instead?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a veto SAP over here. The only reason there is a veto SAP over here is that instead of sitting down in a room with the administration, you have insisted upon unilaterally coming to the floor and you know good and well that the administration, Jack Lew himself called you personally and said to you that he was willing to negotiate any time; that you give one story, the Senate people give another story.

Instead of doing what you have done on every bill, which is everybody get in the room or get on a conference call and see what you can agree to, instead you get one person saying something that is exactly the opposite of another person, no agreement; and you do not get everybody sitting together trying to work out the bill the way you did on HUD/VA, the way you did on every bill; and that is the kind of respect that I think we are entitled to and you have not given us and you have not given the President of the United States.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

First of all, let me say to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), in defense of what my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), said we have two issues, as the gentleman knows, that could resolve this entire debate.

One is voting rights, which we have offered, and it simply says, as the gentleman from Maryland so eloquently expressed, just prohibit Federal funds. That is all.

The other is an issue that in a bipartisan way we discussed at length in the full Committee on Appropriations. We brought out all the scientific studies. We explained that this needle program is really for the purpose of bringing drug addicts in, enabling Whitman-Walker Clinic to provide drug treatment for them. It is access to people in desperate need of help.

We are not trying to use any Federal funds. The use of all public funds can be prohibited. Just let them use private funds; and that is what the bipartisan, full Committee on Appropriations agreed to, bar the use of public funds. Let Whitman-Walker conduct its own affairs, though, with private funds.

If those two provisions were accepted, the White House told the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), it could accept this bill; it could accept this bill. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) told the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) he would work out the Voting Rights Act in conference. It was not done. That is why the gentlewoman is so upset. The gentleman said he would do it, and it did not get done. The gentleman can say he tried, but it did not happen.

With regard to needles, we are just saying bar the use of public funds, and that is what Members of the gentleman's side of the aisle agreed.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude the point that I was making. This side is not being intransigent. This side feels very strongly about all of the issues in the veto message, but this side wants to make an agreement.

This side wants to move forward. This side wants to find some bipartisan commonality. We are not asking for anything that has not been accepted by the majority of this body, really. Voting rights, and the amendment that was accepted in a bipartisan way on barring the use of public funds, this is not unreasonable.

All we have to do, and that is what the White House has suggested, buy into those, we will fight the issues another day. That is what we should do.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me see if we can maybe narrow down the scope of our disagreement. My concern is with section 167 of this piece of legislation, specifically section 167(a) which says, ''None of the funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative,'' and section 167(b) which states, ''The Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1998, also known as Initiative 59, approved by the electors of the District of Columbia on November 3, 1998, shall not take effect.''

Now, is it my understanding that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is willing to accept that language? Is he stating that he has no problem with either section 167(a) or 167(b)?

I would yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) to answer that.

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I would say to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR), we have lots of problems with the language. What we want is to reach a compromise and get this appropriations bill.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I thought that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) previously was saying that we needed to insert the word ''Federal,'' and then I understand from the gentleman from Maryland he was talking about a different section; but I implied from that, apparently erroneously, that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has no problem with section 167(a) or (b), but apparently he does.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. We have lots of problems, but we would like to work out a compromise.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I thought maybe we had narrowed down the areas of disagreement so the other side does disagree with the prohibition in this bill that would stop the District of Columbia from moving forward with legalization of marijuana. This again clarifies the issue. I really thought we had reached an agreement on 167(a) and (b), but the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) informs me that we have not.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I recognize this is unusual. I appreciate how much people are trying to find some common ground and agreement here. There has been so much movement on the floor, so much more, I must say, than has taken place in any discussions, that I would ask that instead of going forward with the bill now that we go off this floor now and see if we can reach some kind of agreement on this bill.

I think everybody who has spoken has moved this forward. I cannot say what we have agreed to, but I can say that I think that the very process of talking back and forth for the first time has been a good process, and we ought to continue it rather than march down the line so we have hardened lines again and have to start all over again.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Is the gentlewoman willing to say publicly that she will accept the provision that does not permit the legalization of marijuana, Proposition 59, in the District of Columbia? Will the gentlewoman say that?

Ms. NORTON. My own position on the legalization of marijuana is well known. I oppose the legalization of drugs.

What I would like to move us ahead on is what we can do with the particular provisions in the bill. We have recognized all along that some of these provisions are going to be changed; that we have differences here but we have never been able to get down in a room and see what, in fact, can be done.

All I am saying is I am willing to do that right now and believe that the way to move this bill forward is to, in fact, take hold of the discussions that have begun here and try to come to agreement.

□ 1600

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hansen). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would only ask the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), the manager of the rule, whether he is willing to entertain the suggestion by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the rule be temporarily withdrawn from the floor so that the possibility of compromise can be pursued.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia would like to inform the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) that, as soon as he uses up his 3½ minutes, I intend to move the previous question.

Mr. FROST. So the answer to my question is no.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very interesting debate on this bill. It is unfortunate that we cannot reach a compromise. It is clear the other side is unwilling to pursue a compromise at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close by saying this is a fair rule, considering the fact that this entire bill was debated openly and at great length on July 27 or 28, that we have keen knowledge of what is in this bill from both sides.

I urge the House to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 202, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

YEAS—217

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel

Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—14

Boucher
Buyer
Carson
Clay
Conyers
Cooksey
Dooley
Green (TX)
Jefferson
John
Kingston
McNulty
Scarborough
Young (AK)

□ 1625

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. BERMAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 2, DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT OF 1999, AND H.R. 2300, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL ACT

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, today a Dear Colleague letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next week to grant a rule for the consideration of H.R. 2, the ''dollars to the classroom act of 1999.''

The Committee on Rules may grant a rule which would require that amendments to H.R. 2 be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this case, amendments must be preprinted prior to their consideration on the floor. Amendments should be drafted to the version of the bill reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

A second Dear Colleague letter was also sent to all Members today informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2300, the ''academic achievement for all act.''

The Committee on Education and the Workforce ordered H.R. 2300 reported on October 13 and is expected to file its committee report on Monday, October 18.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H–312 of the Capitol by 2 p.m. on Tuesday, October 19. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Copies of the bill may be obtained from that committee.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments to both bills are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, during the debate surrounding H.R. 2436, the ''unborn victims of violence act,'' I was present on the House floor. When the yeas and nays were recorded for roll call votes 463 and 464, the electronic voting device correctly recorded my vote as ''no'' and ''aye'' respectively.

However, on roll call vote 465, the voting device failed to properly record my vote due to what was later determined to be a malfunctioning voting card. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I was present and did note ''no'' on roll call 465. However, due to a defective voting card, my vote was not recorded.

Mr. Speaker, I could not be present for roll call votes 466 through 469. Had I been present for roll call vote 466, I would have voted ''aye.'' For roll call vote 467, I would have voted ''aye.'' For roll call vote 468, I would have voted ''no.'' And on roll call vote 469, I would have voted ''aye.''

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 330, I call up the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 3064 is as follows:

H.R. 3064

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—FISCAL YEAR 2000 APPROPRIATIONS

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR RESIDENT TUITION SUPPORT

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for a program to be administered by the Mayor for District of Columbia resident tuition support, subject to the enactment of authorizing legislation for such program by Congress, $17,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such funds may be used on behalf of eligible District of Columbia residents to pay an amount based upon the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public institutions of higher education, usable at both public and private institutions of higher education: *Provided further,* That the awarding of such funds may be prioritized on the basis of a resident's academic merit and such other factors as may be authorized: *Provided further,* That if the authorized program is a nationwide program, the Mayor may expend up to $17,000,000: *Provided further,* That if the authorized program is for a limited number of states, the Mayor may expend up to $11,000,000: *Provided further,* That the District of Columbia may expend funds other than the funds provided under this heading, including local tax revenues and contributions, to support such program.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR INCENTIVES FOR ADOPTION OF CHILDREN

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia to create incentives to promote the adoption of children in the District of Columbia foster care system, $5,000,000: *Provided,* That such funds shall remain available until September 30, 2001 and shall be used in accordance with a program established by the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further,* That funds provided under this heading may be used to cover the costs to the District of Columbia of providing tax credits to offset the costs incurred by individuals in adopting children in the District of Columbia foster care system and in providing for the health care needs of such children, in accordance with legislation enacted by the District of Columbia government.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE CITIZEN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for administrative expenses of the Citizen Complaint Review Board, $500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

For a Federal payment to the Department of Human Services for a mentoring program and for hotline services, $250,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORRECTIONS TRUSTEE OPERATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee, $176,000,000 for the administration and operation of correctional facilities and for the administrative operating costs of the Office of the Corrections Trustee, as authorized by section 11202 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–33; 111 Stat. 712): *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia Corrections