

vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 514, I inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 514, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I was in my district today. However, I wish to be recorded as a "yea" vote on rollcalls 509, 510, 512, 513 and 514 and a "nay" vote on rollcall 511.

#### CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-146)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect for 1 year beyond October 21, 1999.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and by depriving them of access to the United States market and financial system.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 19, 1999.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2, DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 2.

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

There was no objection.

#### AGREEING TO CONFERENCE REQUESTED BY SENATE ON 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 333 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 333

*Resolved*, That the House disagrees to the Senate amendment to 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 agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose 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 333 provides that the House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3064, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000, and agrees to a conference with the Senate on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is intended to move the appropriations process forward. H.R. 3064 was not reported by the Committee on Appropriations, therefore no motion to go to conference could be authorized by the committee. Usually these motions are approved by unanimous consent; however, as their latest attempt to obstruct our ability to pass responsible appropriations measures and save the Social Security surplus, the minority refused to grant such a request yesterday.

Normally, motions to go to conference require an hour of debate on the floor. By calling up this resolution, we have ensured that the motion will receive a full and fair debate and the same vote that could be requested under regular order. The resolution also does not preclude the right of Members to be recognized for another hour of debate on a motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, to date, the President has vetoed or threatened to veto 4 of the 13 appropriations bills representing \$133 billion in Federal spending. The reason of him vetoing the bills is that they do not spend enough. Of course, on the same day, the President regularly gives himself credit for the surplus and challenges Congress to preserve the Social Security Trust Fund that he himself is trying to spend.

□ 1815

Rather than issue the daily veto threats to our fiscally responsible appropriations bills, we believe the President should help Congress preserve Social Security and maintain our balanced budget. I hope that this conference will be the first step toward a cooperative budget process that will result in a balanced budget and a secure future for America's seniors. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to oppose this rule, since it merely enables the House to send the District of Columbia appropriations bill to conference. We are well into the fiscal year, and it is time to get on with funding the District. However, I do want to express my concern that there might be a plan to attach the Labor-HHS appropriations to the D.C. bill in conference.

I want to state unequivocally that the Democratic Members of this House will oppose such a move. The District has been held hostage on other issues; and now, just as we are getting to the point where there might be a bill the President can sign, the Republican majority may be increasing the ransom demand. That is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, as well as grossly unfair to the residents of this city.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am distressed to read in the papers that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations has said that the conference on his bill is all but finished. I have to ask how can the conference be all but finished when the House has never even considered the bill? I appreciate the fact that the subcommittee chairman is attempting to move his bill, but might I suggest that regular order might be preferable, albeit far more difficult, than this back-room wheeling and dealing now taking place.

It is time to get on with a real appropriations process, Mr. Speaker, and to stop playing games. I support moving the District appropriations bill to conference, but I will not support any attempt to hold it hostage with an appropriations bill the Republican majority will not even try to pass on its own in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any of the