

Members' time, but I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this conference is going to take long. We have had a very good meeting, and we are reaching agreement; and basically they are suggestions that we discussed the last time we visited this issue on the floor of the House.

I do hope that that bizarre idea of adding the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill to the D.C. appropriations bill is a stillborn idea. Obviously, that would seriously complicate things. But as long as that does not occur, I think we can dispatch the D.C. appropriations bill in very quick order and bring it back to the floor and find the kind of agreement, in fact, hopefully unanimous consensus, that it is a bill that we can all live with and that the White House can sign.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the District of Columbia Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000. This legislation funds the operations of the federal share for the D.C. government and its 600,000 residents, including city government, its social service agencies and fire and police departments.

Unfortunately, the conference reports passed by the Congress the last several weeks have been flawed. While they do include several provisions I support—prohibiting the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes, and the implementation of a needle exchange program for illegal drug addicts—they did not contain the level of oversight I believe is necessary for the Congress to safeguard the taxpayers money. While I disagreed with the Administration's veto for different reasons, in particular its support of the needle exchange and marijuana programs, I believe it gives us a new opportunity to include more accountability for the District's programs.

The District oversees billions of dollars in housing, education, health care and law enforcement programs administered to its residents. While improvements have been made in past years, in particular with a new police chief and law enforcement operations, problems continue to plague its housing and educational facilities. The District's new mayor, Anthony Williams, has begun to take steps to put the right people in place to make the changes necessary to provide full accountability for the federal funds administered by its government, and changes are needed. However, until those changes are in place and reform has begun, it is incumbent on this Congress to continue in its oversight role.

We know the difficulties that have plagued the District government for years—mismanaged housing programs that have resulted in dilapidated structures for its public housing residents, and schools that have not opened on time because of faulty roof construction, leaving thousands of public school students without a place to go during the day. We must continue to provide support and oversight to see that these long-term problems affecting the District's residents are resolved.

I urge my colleagues to reject any report that does not have sufficient oversight so that we can work with the City Government to achieve the goals of the new Mayor while providing the nation's taxpayers with some assurance their funds are being used to give a new direction to their nation's capital city.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will appoint conferees on H.R. 3064 later.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UPTON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 102 of the Senate amendment (relating to repeal of automated entry-exit control system).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) is opposed to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) opposed to the motion?

Mr. LAFALCE. I AM STRONGLY IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION, MR. SPEAKER.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in that case, pursuant to clause 7(b) under rule XXII, I rise to claim a third of the time since I am in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will divide the time 20 minutes for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), 20 minutes for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and 20 minutes for the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion. There is no one in this body who represents more territory along a border of the United States bordering another country than I do. I have almost 800 miles of the Texas-Mexico border in my congressional district. It is a wonderful area.

The section that we are discussing today, known as section 110, was put into law sometime ago by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), my dear friend, with very good intentions. However, as he knows, and other Members of this body know, there are many communities along the Mexican border and the Canadian border that are terrified that the implementation of this program will cause greater congestion at the border than we even see today.

If any of my colleagues were to visit any of the communities along the Texas-Mexico border, Laredo, Texas, for example, Eagle Pass, Del Rio, El Paso, they will see long lines of traffic and pedestrians clogging the border at points of entry. In some cases, in the heat of summer, traffic is backed up several hours. It is extremely difficult to move traffic, to move commerce back and forth in the spirit of free trade that we have, today for example, with Mexico and Canada.

The chambers of commerce and the people, the good entrepreneurs, the small business people, those that are trying to move goods and products and services, and shoppers going back and forth across the border have enough to deal with now and would greatly be concerned about a new system that would be implemented.

I know that the process that is being discussed and proposed into law right now is designed to facilitate traffic. I realize that is the intention. But in all practicality, those of us who live along the border and know the border communities understand that unless this process is refined tremendously, we are greatly concerned that it would impede traffic even more than we are seeing now at these ports of entry. That is why I strongly support this motion by the gentleman from Michigan, who is greatly concerned as well about traffic along the Canadian border.

Again, this is something that even communities that are not right on the border, communities that are in existence a few miles inland from the northern border with Canada and from the Mexican border on the southwest are greatly concerned that this will have a ripple effect with communities that would feel the brunt of the additional traffic jams and the problems with pedestrians crossing at these checkpoints.

So I commend the gentleman from Michigan for offering this motion. I know that this is probably going to be a motion that will perhaps not see the light of day in this session, because the conference report, my understanding