

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4380, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 517 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 517

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4380) 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, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XXI or section 306 or 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 41, line 20, through page 42, line 2. Each of the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), 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.

Yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 4380, the Fiscal Year 1999 District of Columbia Appropriations Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XXI, requiring relevant printed hearings and reports to be available for 3 days prior to the consideration of the general appropriations bill; section 306, prohibiting consideration of legislation within the jurisdiction Committee on the Budget, unless reported by the Committee on the Budget; and section 401a of the Congressional Budget Act, prohibiting consideration of legislation, as reported, providing new contract, borrowing or credit authority that is not limited to the amounts provided in appropriation acts.

The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill; and clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations in a general appropriations bill, except as specified by the rule.

The rule provides that amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report.

The rule accords priority in recognition to those amendments that are preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone recorded votes and to reduce to 5 minutes the voting time on any postponed question, provided voting time on the first in any series of questions is not less than 15 minutes.

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

By the way, Mr. Speaker, last night the GPO accidentally omitted the final page of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) from

the committee report, which was filed correctly. I believe that the mistake should have no effect on either the rule or the bill itself. I just thought I should, as a matter of courtesy, call it to the attention of the Members.

This rule was crafted to avoid controversy. It is an open rule. And instead of self-executing legislative provisions, the rule allows for an open debate on four important amendments.

Each of these four amendments is aimed at helping the youth of the District. They would grant scholarships to low-income students; forbid the publicly-funded distribution of drug needles; prohibit adoption by unmarried couples; and restrict the underage possession of tobacco.

Yes, these amendments also produce spirited debate on the House floor. And it is fair that we have these debates.

The Committee on Rules wisely avoided a rule that would self-execute controversial policy amendments.

Meanwhile, H.R. 4380 is a good bill. My colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) has crafted a D.C. Appropriations bill that avoids the legislative battles we have faced in the past. This year, both the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia and the full Committee on Appropriations reported the bill by voice vote.

As we all know, in the mid-1990s the District of Columbia faced a serious financial crisis. Decades of waste and mismanagement had led to chronic budget deficits and a deterioration of city services.

Since that time, under direction of both the D.C. Control Board and Congress, the District of Columbia has turned itself around and now runs a budget surplus. H.R. 4380 reflects these changed circumstances. The annual Federal payment to the District is declining. This year it is \$47 million less than last year.

At the same time, H.R. 4380 provides important support for D.C. school children. The bill provides \$33 million for charter schools, which allows parents to decide where their children attend school, as well as \$200,000 for a program to mentor at-risk youngsters. It provides \$156 million for special education projects, which is nearly twice as much as last year.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation. Both the rule and H.R. 4380 are compromise measures that deserve our support.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleague the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the time.

This rule is an open rule. It will allow consideration of H.R. 4380, which is a bill that makes appropriations for the District of Columbia.

As my colleague from North Carolina described, this rule provides for 1 hour

of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule permits amendments that are in compliance with House rules to be offered under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer amendments.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules made in order four controversial amendments that would otherwise be out of order.

One of these amendments would ban adoptions by unmarried couples. This amendment was considered and rejected by the Committee on Appropriations.

The second allows vouchers for private schools, which is a concept which was rejected by the citizens of Washington in a referendum.

The third would outlaw possession of tobacco products by minors. This amendment denies District residences the opportunity to write their own tobacco laws through their own elected representatives.

The last amendment would cut off government funding from this bill, for any purpose, to any individual or organization that carries out a needle exchange program for drug addicts. This amendment was also considered and rejected by the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill that was reported out of the Committee on Appropriations was adopted by voice vote, with support on both sides of the aisle. It is far from a perfect bill. There is way too much interference in District affairs. Still, it is an acceptable compromise and a lot better than last year's bill.

The four amendments made in order by this rule are very controversial and could sink the bill. Though I am not unsympathetic to the goals of some of the amendments, this is the wrong time and place to deal with these matters.

The President has threatened to veto if some of these amendments are accepted. Why bother going through the bruising battle of attaching these amendments only to have them stripped out later in the process?

This should not become a replay of what happened last year when controversial provisions insisted by the House were later removed. This is kind of a good-news/bad-news rule. The good news is that the rule could have been a lot worse. The bad news is that that is all the good news there is about this rule.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of the rule for the District of Columbia

Appropriations bill, and I want to encourage my colleagues to vote for the rule. It is an open rule.

Even though some concern has been stated that this rule would include certain self-enacting provisions related to school vouchers, D.C. needle exchange programs, and joint adoptions, none of these provisions are self-enacting, in the rule. Instead, they are amendments which should be openly debated.

The debate will follow with votes, and I see no reason to vote against this rule because of any self-enacting provisions that are not there. I think that the rule is fair and certainly has protected both sides of these issues.

Now, during the course of our debate, we will hear objections that Congress should not meddle in certain home rule issues. I would just say first that Congress has a constitutional obligation to be involved in the public and financial measures of the District of Columbia.

Time and time again, Congress has decided to set public policy and control financial matters in the District. In fact, in this bill it was the will of the House that there be no residency requirement for District employees.

Now, this happens to override a local government decision. The decision was far from unanimous, and certainly there was dissent. But, nonetheless, it was the will of the committee and, therefore, the House. And once again, it will be confirmed in the House that we will set public policy for the District of Columbia.

Probably the best analogy in government to explain this relationship between Congress and the District of Columbia is the relationship we see with the State government and that of the cities within that State. In my home State of Kansas, it is not uncommon for the State legislature to set public policy for Wichita. In fact, it is common for the legislature to determine tax structures, finances, and other issues, including the setting of public policy.

Likewise, it is not uncommon for Congress to set public policy for the District of Columbia. So when we openly debate the value of a school voucher program, when we openly debate how the poorest of children will be benefitted by such a voucher program in the District; when we openly debate the failures of a needle exchange program, not only in the District of Columbia but around the globe; and when we advocate for the protection of adopted children, we do so with constitutional authority, with a relationship similar to the relationship between State legislatures and cities within that State, and we do so with the idea of establishing good public policy for the District.

This is an open rule that allows for open debate. It has not embodied any controversial issues through a self-enacting clause. And, therefore, I support the rule and I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule.

□ 1515

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is not an outrageous rule as some have been, but I would rise in opposition to this rule. I can understand that the Committee on Rules, the majority in the Committee on Rules felt that it was doing the right thing in making an open rule, and we certainly appreciate the fact that some of these amendments will not self-execute, but we would have to oppose the fact that the amendments that really constitute poison pills to this appropriations act are protected in it from points of order. These amendments are divisive, they will invariably cause a veto, and we would suggest, as we will in the general debate, that they are not in the best interests of the District of Columbia nor are they appropriate for this Congress to be dealing with in terms of the local funds that ought to be at the discretion of the District of Columbia government.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) just talked about his amendment dealing with needle exchanges. It is a controversial issue. It is one that the authorizing committee should deal with. But what is most objectionable about this amendment is that it goes beyond the use of Federal funds. This amendment would say that the District of Columbia cannot even use its own local funds, not Federal funds, its own local funds nor can they use private funds that are contributed to the needle exchange program that the Whitman Walker Clinic operates under contract to the District of Columbia.

Why do they operate this program? Looking at the statistics, they are shocking. In fact, the majority of new growth in HIV infections is women, and those women apparently are primarily infected by dirty needles, and, in fact, one statistic that we brought up in the full committee is that 97 percent of the new HIV infections among African-Americans are occurring because of dirty needles. That is why the Whitman Walker Clinic contracts with the District of Columbia for the use of its own funds and private funds for this, and we think they should have that option if that is what they choose to do with those funds.

We have another amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) dealing with adoptions. It says that couples cannot adopt unless they are in a traditional marriage situation. But by implication it says it is perfectly okay for people who cannot engage in a long-term commitment, whether it be a heterosexual or a homosexual commitment, single people are fully capable of adopting if they want, but not couples, even men and women who have lived together in a monogamous relationship for many years.

Then we have another amendment that makes it a crime for a minor to be

in possession of tobacco. I do not know that we would fight that amendment, but it is strange that this bill had the ability to enable the District of Columbia to file suit against the tobacco companies with the other State attorneys general and yet this bill does not allow them to do that. That would have enabled D.C. to recover millions of dollars of Medicaid funds attributable to the loss of life due to tobacco products.

We have an education voucher bill that has been protected. It is very controversial. I will not address the merits of it. I do think there is some merit to it. But the fact is if it were to be added to this bill, it kills this bill. This bill will be vetoed. Period. And so why do it if we know that it would kill the bill?

We have another provision in this bill that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) will raise and we think that amendment is in order. After all, the gentlewoman is the one true representative of the District of Columbia and she will suggest that funds should be able to be used if these are local funds, not Federal funds, for women who choose to exercise their constitutional rights to terminate a pregnancy.

We have a number of controversial issues here, more than we need to have. The Committee on Rules could have enabled us just to talk about amendments that were only appropriate to an appropriations bill. It chose not to do that. For that reason, we would urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we feel this is a very fair and open rule and none of the amendments are self-enacting. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time. I have very mixed feelings about a rule like this. This is always one of the more difficult appropriation bills to come before the House. I would just add a few things to what has been said. If we take a look at what has happened over the last four years in the District of Columbia, it has been a great success story. We took a city four years ago that had no bond rating, could not sell their bonds on the marketplace, they were running hundreds of millions of dollars in debt, they had no way to try to control their expenditures, they had a rising crime rate, schools that had not opened on time in several years and we take a look at where they are today, they are running surpluses in the hundreds of millions of dollars, not just last year but this year and into the future. So they are financially stable. They are out in the bond markets once again.

In enacting the D.C. Control Board bill, I think it was our vision that we

would try to get a discussion between the Control Board, the Mayor and the Council to learn financial restraint, to learn to control expenditures and to come forward after discussions to Congress with a united budget. I am happy to say that with a few exceptions but for the most part this appropriation bill does that. This rule allows some extraneous things to enter into it but it allows the House a free vote on it, so I have very mixed feelings about the rule.

I sympathize with my friends in the Committee on Rules who get torn from different constituency groups within the Congress in terms of how they are going to deal with it, but I look forward to a wide open debate on a number of issues and would just say to my friends, I think we can take pride in what we have accomplished in working with the city, with the Control Board, with the Council together over the last four years in hopes that whatever the outcome of this debate today, we can continue to look forward and work together in the years to come to make this the greatest city in the country.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON).

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

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule, too. But before I do, I would like to associate myself with the remarks from the gentleman from Virginia, for I feel that Dr. Brimmer, Steve Harlan, Dr. Joyce Ladner, Constance Newman and Edward Singletary have done an excellent job. They have not pleased all of us all the time. But their charge was to straighten out the finances of the District of Columbia, and I think they can hold their heads high that they have done that. We have had two years of a balanced budget. In the next two years I hope that they will continue that. These gentlemen and these ladies were uncompensated for this activity. Although there may be some isolated incident where we were not satisfied with their performance, they have done their job well and they should be proud of that and they have given an outstanding service to the District of Columbia.

From my point of view, Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill with a bad rule. It waives points of order on legislation that should not be waived. But I think it is a sad day when the Committee on Rules and the gentlewoman from North Carolina comes to us and says, "Well, it could have been worse. We could have self-executed these amendments so when you adopted the rule you adopted these amendments."

These amendments were defeated in the committee of jurisdiction. And so I do not think it is any big favor to come and say the amendments that were defeated on a bipartisan basis in the full Committee on Appropriations, we did

not put those in the Committee on Rules in the bill.

But let me talk about some of these amendments. The needle exchange program. Needle exchange is quite controversial. I think many of us feel that in the appropriate community they work and in other communities they do not work. But the point here that this amendment that will be offered will not only prohibit Federal money, that is fair, we are the Congress, as a national policy we say no Federal money, it will prohibit, as has been pointed out, the money of the District of Columbia, and any organization that receives money from the District of Columbia. We are going to get into a discussion about the merits of the needle program, and I want to just say to Members that most of the merits, after careful review, are on the sides of having those programs, and so there are going to be some statistics cited here and we are going to cite some statistics and the authors of the studies which the proponents of this amendment will quote.

The second amendment deals with, let us face it, homosexual adoptions. It seems to me that we should not be interfering with the courts of the District of Columbia when they have decided in the appropriate cases that a gay couple or a lesbian couple can adopt. The court has not said that each one of these couples can automatically adopt. They say they have to look at the circumstances.

□ 1530

This amendment is ridiculous. It says the only way to have a joint adoption is if they are married or if they are blood related to the person with a joint adoption. That means that two nuns could not adopt anyone. That means that myself or the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), if we wanted to share the custody of some young person and we were otherwise qualified, we could not do it because we are not married nor blood related. And this is not the appropriate forum to discuss what happens with adoptions in the District of Columbia.

Then we have the novel idea that we are fighting the use of tobacco by saying there will be a civil penalty if, in fact, a person under the age of 18 is caught with a package of cigarettes. I guess probable cause to search him is the fact that he may be holding one. And it goes further to suggest that kids in the District would have \$50 to pay for the first time they are caught, \$100 to pay for the second time they are caught, and it assumes the fact that they have a driver's license and probably a Rolls Royce because their license would be suspended on the third time.

Get real. This is not going to do anything to curb young teenagers from smoking, but rather a person should be referred to the juvenile court, and they should do what is in their best interests.

Then we have fought and fought over the vouchers program time and time again, and we will have that fight again. I suspect that it is not as important to get a voucher program here in the District but, to those who support it, to send a signal to their constituents that they are still with them on this issue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have never voted in the 18 years I have been here against the District bill. I believe most times that the process should move forward and these things should be worked out in the conference. But this was a bad bill coming out of committee, and we will talk about that. The rule makes it worse. And the adoption of any of these amendments makes it hideous.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleague that this is a fair rule, and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) does have additional amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will be debated, and there may be others as well that we do not know about, and I would like to remind my colleagues that we will have very fair and open debate on this rule. So I would urge again that they support the rule.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I will be offering an amendment to this bill relative to the development of a private for-profit prison that exists, a contract between the District of Columbia and the City of Youngstown, in which six prisoners had recently escaped, four of them being murderers, and one murderer still on the street. The amendment would basically prohibit the use of funds in this bill to be used for transferring or confining inmates in the Youngstown facility that are above a medium security level risk. That is what the contract calls for.

There is some concern that people have about home rule. I am worried about home disruption here. My community is at risk. It is not draconian language, and I am hoping that the language in which it is crafted will be allowed to be brought to this floor for a vote.

The only other option that I have would be a pure limitation of restricting any and all funds in this bill to be used to transfer or confine prisoners in Youngstown. Then we would have one big fight, and if it passed, the District could only use other non-Federal revenue for this, and I do not want to hurt the city.

My community is in danger. There needs to be some element of under-

standing here, and there has to be a pretty good understanding of Congress, with the proliferation of all these new private for-profit prisons, that they should have adequate training and meet at least minimum standards that reflect the Bureau of Prisons' ability to both inspect them and to ensure the respective communities that they shall be safe.

So I do not want to close that prison, and I do not want to hurt the District. I just want to make sure that we ensure we are not going to be allowing prisoners such as murderers to escape. If they are to be medium security risks, let us make sure they are.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time to me.

I rise in opposition to this rule as the neighbor of the District of Columbia. I represent the 4th District of Maryland. We are indeed neighbors, and I believe good neighbors, and we realize that this is an atrocious rule. It continues a pattern of interference in the management of the District of Columbia that is reminiscent of colonial days. It continues a pattern of unwarranted interference, it continues a pattern of experimentation, if my colleagues will, into the affairs of the District of Columbia that is only being exercised not because it is right, but because those folks on the other side can do it arbitrarily and capriciously.

Specifically I turn to the prohibition against the needle exchange program. We need to understand one reality. We are losing the War on Drugs. Some folks would even go as far as to say it is a joke. But let me just say this:

We need to allow the District of Columbia to try innovative approaches. If the citizens of the District of Columbia believe that a needle exchange will reduce AIDS, they ought to be able to try that, and Congress ought not interfere. If they believe that clean needles in exchange for dirty needles will reduce the spread of a deadly disease, they ought to be able to try that, and I have yet to hear the rationale for denying the citizens of the District of Columbia the opportunity to do that.

Second, once again the Republicans have trotted out their old voucher plan, and they claim this is the solution to education problems in our country. They are experimenting on the District of Columbia. They want to take money out of public schools and send it to private schools. They want to allow 2,000 students to go to private schools while 75,000 students languish in sub-par public schools.

Yes, there are problems in the District of Columbia. There are infrastructure problems, there is a need for technological upgrades, and we ought to help the District of Columbia do that. But instead they want to implement a

program that will basically benefit a few students, leaving the majority behind.

What my colleagues have to realize about the voucher plan is private schools do not have to accept all students. They do not have to accept handicapped students, they do not have to accept unruly students, they do not have to accept students that bring baggage, social baggage, to school. Those students still have to be educated, and the District of Columbia will not be in as good a position to educate them because the Republicans want to conduct some sort of experiment.

We need a serious approach to education. What we need to do for the District of Columbia and all schools in this country is provide more Federal assistance for the repair and maintenance of schools, for the technological upgrading of school systems to enable them to have access to the Internet. We need to pay teachers more money, we need to hire more teachers, we need to train teachers better so they can deal with our young people. We need to provide sophisticated curricula that can deal with the new global economy.

There is a lot we can and should do for schools across this country. But certainly this so-called model of a voucher system is not the answer because it does not provide real assistance to the folks who need it.

I strongly urge the rejection of this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I would just simply say before I yield back the balance of my time, as I understand, the District of Columbia appropriation bill as it came out of that committee was in decent shape. It had very good bipartisan support. And last night in the Committee on Rules we made in order four very restrictive amendments and, in some cases, very controversial.

Many of us on the Rules Committee, at least on the Democratic side, feel that this will probably draw a veto from the President of the United States, and there is really no sense in it because this bill has a chance to pass by itself, on its own, probably for the first time in a long time. Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "no" vote on the rule.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the 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 (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. 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 220, nays 204, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Gibbons	Paxon
Archer	Gilchrest	Pease
Army	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Gilman	Petri
Baker	Gingrich	Pickering
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Pitts
Barr	Goodling	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Porter
Bartlett	Graham	Portman
Barton	Granger	Pryce (OH)
Bass	Greenwood	Quinn
Bateman	Gutknecht	Radanovich
Bereuter	Hansen	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hastert	Redmond
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bliley	Hayworth	Riggs
Blunt	Hefley	Riley
Boehlert	Herger	Rogan
Boehner	Hill	Rogers
Bonilla	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Bono	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Roukema
Bryant	Horn	Ryun
Bunning	Hostettler	Salmon
Burr	Hulshof	Sanford
Burton	Hutchinson	Saxton
Buyer	Hyde	Scarborough
Callahan	Istook	Schaefer, Dan
Calvert	Jenkins	Schaffer, Bob
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Jones	Sessions
Canady	Kasich	Shadegg
Cannon	Kelly	Shaw
Castle	Kim	Shays
Chabot	King (NY)	Shimkus
Chambliss	Kingston	Shuster
Chenoweth	Klug	Skeen
Christensen	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Coble	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	LaHood	Smith (OR)
Collins	Largent	Smith (TX)
Combest	Latham	Smith, Linda
Cook	LaTourette	Snowbarger
Cooksey	Lazio	Solomon
Cox	Leach	Souder
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Davis (VA)	Linder	Sununu
Deal	Livingston	Talent
DeLay	LoBiondo	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	McCollum	Thomas
Dreier	McCrery	Thornberry
Duncan	McDade	Thune
Dunn	McHugh	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McInnis	Trafficant
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Upton
Emerson	McKeon	Walsh
English	Metcalfe	Wamp
Ensign	Mica	Watkins
Everett	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Ewing	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	Myrick	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Nethercutt	Weller
Forbes	Neumann	White
Fossella	Ney	Whitfield
Fowler	Northup	Wicker
Fox	Norwood	Wilson
Franks (NJ)	Nussle	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Oxley	Young (AK)
Galleghy	Pappas	Young (FL)
Ganske	Parker	
Gekas	Paul	

NAYS—204

Abercrombie	Becerra	Borski
Ackerman	Bentsen	Boswell
Allen	Berman	Boucher
Andrews	Berry	Boyd
Baesler	Bishop	Brady (PA)
Baldacci	Blagojevich	Brown (CA)
Barcia	Blumenauer	Brown (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Brown (OH)

Capps	John	Pascrell
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Carson	Johnson (WI)	Payne
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Clement	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Clyburn	Kaptur	Pickett
Condit	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Poshard
Costello	Kennelly	Price (NC)
Coyne	Kildee	Rahall
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Reyes
Danner	Klecza	Rivers
Davis (FL)	Klink	Rodriguez
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Roemer
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rothman
DeGette	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Delahunt	Lantos	Rush
DeLauro	Lee	Sabo
Deutsch	Levin	Sanchez
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dixon	Lipinski	Sandlin
Doggett	Lofgren	Sawyer
Dooley	Lowey	Schumer
Doyle	Luther	Scott
Edwards	Maloney (CT)	Serrano
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Eshoo	Markey	Sisisky
Etheridge	Martinez	Skaggs
Evans	Mascara	Skelton
Farr	Matsui	Slaughter
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Smith, Adam
Fazio	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Filner	McDermott	Spratt
Ford	McGovern	Stabenow
Frank (MA)	McHale	Stark
Frost	McIntyre	Stenholm
Furse	McKinney	Stokes
Gedensson	McNulty	Strickland
Gephardt	Meehan	Stupak
Goode	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Tauscher
Green	Menendez	Thompson
Gutierrez	Millender	Thurman
Hall (OH)	McDonald	Tierney
Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)	Torres
Hamilton	Minge	Towns
Harman	Mink	Turner
Hastings (FL)	Moakley	Velazquez
Hefner	Mollohan	Vento
Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Hinchey	Morella	Waters
Hinojosa	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Holden	Nadler	Waxman
Hoolley	Neal	Wexler
Houghton	Oberstar	Weygand
Hoyer	Obey	Wise
Jackson (IL)	Olver	Woolsey
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Wynn
(TX)	Owens	Yates
Jefferson	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—11

Clay	Gonzalez	Packard
Crapo	Hunter	Royce
Cunningham	Inglis	Stearns
Dingell	Manton	

□ 1602

Ms. DEGETTE changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier on I made a mistake on rollcall vote No. 384, and inadvertently voted “no” when I meant to vote “aye”.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4380, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 517 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4380.

□ 1604

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 4380) 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, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, we are here to present the fiscal 1999 budget for the District of Columbia. Make no mistake, this committee and this Congress takes seriously Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution, and I quote, “. . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of government of the United States.”

We appreciate the work of the city in recommending a spending plan for the National Capital. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON) for his support and guidance, and all the Members of the subcommittee who have worked on this bill and, of course, the subcommittee staff.

Mr. Chairman, last year the House passed a D.C. bill which created a debt relief fund, and if that fund had been in place today, the District would be in much better financial shape.

Mr. Chairman, we are recommending that we create a fund today. We are recommending the fund would have \$250 million to replace the need for the District's seasonal borrowing, and then it would pay \$43 million that the District owes the Water and Sewer Authority. Finally, it would retire any part of the \$3.7 billion bonded debt that the surplus might be available for.

There is no new authorization language in this bill. We have been besieged with requests for authorizing language from a variety of sources, frequently by some of the most ardent and vocal supporters of the “home rule