He is from Sierra Leone. This past year, Moctar had his right hand and his ear cut off by rebel thugs in Sierra Leone. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and I met Moctar at an amputee camp this past December.

At the amputee camp, Moctar introduced us to thousands of people who were lucky to be alive. The people we met were the survivors, those who did not bleed to death as they struggled to flee the rebels who had cut off their arms, their legs, and their ears.

No one was spared the brutal, grotesque, and evil actions of the rebels. Infant babies had their arms and legs cut off. Young men in the prime of their life suddenly had half a leg. Women were raped by rebels and then had their limbs amputated, only to give birth several months later as a result of the rape they suffered.

Why did the rebels of Sierra Leone do it? They did it because of diamonds. Diamonds to profit and control and trade in Sierra Leone. The trade in conflict for blood diamonds must stop.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has a bill, the CARAT Act, H.R. 5147. Pass the bill, stop the flow of blood from conflict diamonds.

URGING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO END NONSENSE AGAINST MICROSOFT

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hopefully Tuesday, September 26, marked the turning point in the misguided antitrust suit against Microsoft when the Supreme Court turned down a Hail-Mary plea by the government to hear Microsoft's appeal.

Two new studies, one from the Institute of Policy Innovation and one from the Association for Competitive Technology calculate the annual economic damages caused to our economy would range between $20 billion and $75 billion a year.

I would like to quote Milton Friedman, the Nobel Laureate Economist who said, ''Silicon Valley is suicidal in calling government in to mediate in the disputes among some of the big companies in the area and Microsoft. The end result will be that an industry that up to now has been able to proceed at a marvelous pace with little or no government regulation is now going to have government all over it. It is going to spend in legal fees over the next 10 or 20 years, money which society would benefit from much more if it were spent in the kind of research and development that has brought us many miracles in the area of Internet, in the area of home computers, industry computers, and all the rest.''

The Berkshire Hathaway vice-chairman, Charles Munger, says ''The Justice Department could hardly have come up with a more harmful set of demands than those it now makes. If it wins, our country will end up hobbling its best-performing high-tech businesses.''

I urge an end to this madness.

WELFARE REFORM SUCCESS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, hearing the Democrats say they reformed welfare is similar to saying all of us in this House won gold in the Olympics. Did we participate in the success at Sydney? No. But did this Nation benefit from the years of practice and experience of these gold medals? Yes.

When we were talking about reforming welfare, the Democrats said welfare reform would fail, and President Clinton vetoed this legislation twice.

□ 1030

Well, failure could not be further from the truth today. Taxpayers are better off than they were 4 years ago due to fiscal responsibility and reforms passed by the Republican Congress. Six years ago welfare checks in the Northeast totaled about $47 million, and this year the costs are about $12 million, nearly $35 million in savings.

Republicans have helped restore incentive to work instead of dooming families to a life of continued dependencies. Our policy should be a hand up, not a hand out.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of Americans listened to the debate last night. A lot of us have been working on Social Security for a long time, certainly our Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), myself, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and many others have been looking at ways to keep this most important program continuing to be solvent. A lot of people depend on it.

I was very upset last night with some of the comments on Social Security. The Vice President has got a plan that I think does not solve the huge problem of keeping Social Security solvent.

Let me just go through this chart briefly. The biggest risk is doing nothing at all. Social Security has a total unfunded liability of over $20 trillion. The Social Security Trust Fund contains nothing but IOUs. That is what the Vice President is suggesting, that we add another giant IOU and somehow come up with the money. How are we going to come up with the money?

The last point. To keep paying program Social Security benefits, the payroll tax will have to be increased to at least 50 percent of total income; 50 percent of total income for our FICA taxes or benefits will have to be cut by one-third.

We cannot continue to go on doing nothing. We have to make some program changes if we are going to keep this important program solvent.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4942, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4942) 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, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 4942 be instructed to recede from disagreement with the amendment of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion, as it was read, would instruct the conferees to accept the Senate version of the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. The reason is that the Senate bill is a superior bill.

The Senate bill is a bill that was supported by virtually all of the Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, will be supported by virtually all of the Democrats and I think a great many Republicans in the House. It is a bill that is supported by the Mayor of the District of Columbia and by the D.C. City Council, the properly elected officials to govern the district. And it is the only bill that the President will sign.

This bill provides $34 million more in Federal funds to enable the District to undertake important economic development, environmental restoration and educational opportunity activities. It fully funds the Federal commitment to build the New York Avenue metro station; and, in fact, it represents only a third of the cost, given the fact that if

we provide this money; the private sector will provide another third; another third will come from local funds.

The Senate bill also enables the Poplar Point remediation project to begin. It provides tuition assistance for D.C. students to be able to take advantage of the ability to attend college outside of the District of Columbia. Without these funds, that program cannot be fully implemented. And it will enable the D.C. courts to see their first pay increase in more than 5 years.

The Senate bill also refrains from imposing new social policies on the District, policies that we would never try to impose on our own constituents in our own congressional districts, and policies that have been rejected by the citizens of the District of Columbia and that, in fact, are intended to negate actions, programs, and initiatives that are working within the District of Columbia and that we ought to support not only because they are working, but, most importantly, because they are the way that the citizens of the District of Columbia choose to spend their own money.

In addition to eliminating the more controversial social riders that were added anew to this bill, it goes a long way in honoring and giving more respect to the District and its reform-minded elected officers by reducing by more than 30 the number of general provisions in the bill that are no longer necessary.

That is why the Senate bill is a superior bill, why in the very last days of this session we ought to recede to the Senate and get this bill passed.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to oppose the motion to instruct made by the gentleman from Virginia.

I recognize the gentleman is concerned about the differences between the House-passed and Senate-passed bills and he is willing to take what the Senate has done, but I would certainly disagree with some of the things he wants to accomplish because I think he would defeat his whole purpose if we were to adopt the Senate bill.

If we were to adopt the Senate bill, for example, we would create a hole of $61 million in the District's own budget. We would put it out of balance. Why? Because there is language that the Senate does not have that we are poised to put in the conference agreement for what they call the ''tobacco securitization.'' These are proceeds from the tobacco settlement that allows the District a revenue stream to issue securities to be able to use that money in their budget. They need the language provisions that we are working on in the conference report, or they are going to have a hole in their budget.

So if we just took the gentleman's recommendation, and he says he is concerned with the finances of the District, we are going to knock a big hole in their budget by doing so.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Is my recollection incorrect that that is not in the House bill either?

Mr. ISTOOK. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, that is why it is to be added in conference. The District has been working on the language, which they have submitted to us, knowing that it needs to be inserted in the conference report. It is a part of the District's budget. They are relying upon these funds.

But without having the conference so that we can insert that language, all other issues aside, the gentleman would blow a greater hole in the District's budget than the gentleman is trying to get them in additional Federal money. Because, as the gentleman points out, the additional Federal money that the Senate bill has that is not in the House bill is about $30 million or $35 million, only half of the hole that we would blow in the District's budget if we did not go to conference.

And, of course, as the gentleman is aware, the Federal funds in the House bill, it is kind of like having a checking account or a savings account and drawing against it. We had an allocation for what we could do regarding the District; the Senate had the larger account, and that is the reason they provided a higher level of funding. We have all along expected that more funds would be made available to the House so that we could, for example, provide more Federal funding for the New York Avenue metro station in particular. That has been the plan all along, and it is proceeding accordingly.

In addition, of course, to the financial problems that we would cause for the District were we to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Virginia, we would, of course, take out some other things. We would take out several million dollars of the drug testing and treatment program for persons on probation and parole who are required to stay drug free as a condition of remaining free on the streets.

The House has the larger amount of money to make sure that we not only have the drug testing to get people locked right back up if they violate that condition of their probation or their parole, but also to provide the drug counseling and treatment that is necessary to try to help people not only to be drug free now but to be that way for the rest of their lives, even after the term of their probation or parole expires.

If we adopted the gentleman's language, we would also be taking out $1 million in a public-private housing partnership that is being put together by the Washington Interfaith Network, where the Washington religious community is providing a lot of resources and effort to improve a particular housing project that we have some matching Federal money to work with the private effort that they are putting forth there.

If we adopt the language of the gentleman from Virginia, we also would be giving a blank check to the Public Benefit Corporation. Well, what is the Public Benefit Corporation? That is the entity that runs D.C. General Hospital that, in addition to the $45 million subsidy that they receive from the District of Columbia, has been running additional deficits of over $100 million total over these last 3 years. We have language in the House bill that brings the PBC under control, to try to get its finances straightened up. The Senate bill does not have that language. By adopting the Senate bill we would perpetuate the abuse and the misuse, the illegal, I believe, management of funds at the D.C. General Hospital, which right now the Mayor, the Council, and the new members on the PBC board are trying to get a handle on the situation and change the structure of the D.C. General Hospital.

If we do not have the incentive in this bill to say to them that they can no longer just take money that was not even budgeted and pour it into D.C. General Hospital, ignoring the law, as the General Accounting Office has made clear is what they have been doing, we will not get the D.C. General Hospital situation under control. We most certainly will not if we just adopt the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

There are a number of things that are either in the House bill or that we have been working to make sure are put into the conference report between the House and the Senate that would be destroyed by the motion of the gentleman. I do not think we want to adopt that motion.

I could talk about other things. We could talk about the drug-free zones that would be wiped out; I could talk about the youth tobacco program, trying to keep kids away from tobacco, that the gentleman's motion would wipe out; but I think I have said enough to make the point.

I urge Members to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

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

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

First off, the Mayor and the Public Benefits Corporation seem to be working out their problems. Although I know language would be beneficial, we have not seen this particular language to which the chairman refers.

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

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

Mr. ISTOOK. I am referring to the language that is in the House bill, although the gentleman correctly notes that we are working on possible revisions of that to put it in its best form.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Well, reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, those subsequent revisions we have not seen.

Now, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, who is the proper representative of the citizens of the District of Columbia, feels that the highest priority is to get this bill funded, notwithstanding issues with regard to the securitization of tobacco revenue and things like that. She is looking to the priorities of the Mayor, the city council and its citizens, and feels that this motion is in the best interest of those citizens, which I find to be a compelling argument to accept the Senate version.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I appreciate his comments.

First, let me indicate that what I am going to say now has the sign-off of the Mayor and the Chair of the city council, who want us to support the motion to instruct so that D.C. can get its money and we can recede to the Senate bill.

D.C. General Hospital has been taken care of in the Senate bill. There is some money that can be moved, if necessary, to assist the transition, with very severe limits on it; and D.C., of course, can no longer fund the hospital above and beyond the appropriated amount. That has been fully taken care of in the House.

The Senate budget as to securitization of the tobacco settlement, D.C. would have desired that.

□ 1045

But the necessity to get this bill done is overriding, and the mayor and the City Council are asking our colleagues on both sides to support the motion to instruct.

The Senate bill is tough on the District, tougher than necessary, but it is a fair bill. It forces me to swallow hard. There are major attachments on that bill reflecting the views of this House as well as the Senate. There is a major violation of home rule right in our face.

Congressional review of the Chief Financial Officer before that nomination becomes effective even after hearings and confirmation by the Council, a totally unnecessary, horrible violation of home rule. And if the mayor and the City Council are willing to let that go without a fight and a veto, I think it says a lot about the urgency of passing this bill because I am going to have something to say about what the specific injury is to the District in holding this bill longer.

The Senate bill requires the District to pay back in 1 year amounts taken from its emergency reserves for emergencies, and that becomes very difficult for us because it is a city recovering from insolvency. If we take an amount from the reserves, the District asks that we have 3 years to pay it back. We are not able to get that in the Senate bill. That is the kind of tough language the District would have to absorb through the Senate bill.

But the Senate bill would, at least, make this small appropriation go away. And then what would we have? Would it be one down and eight to go? I have lost count. But they have got a lot to do before they get out of here. If they want to spend their time in October and November fighting over the D.C. bill, be my guest. Because we are not going to give up without a fight.

If in fact we do not adopt the Senate version, what we are headed for is a veto and a protracted fight over the smallest appropriation consisting almost entirely of locally raised revenue. This would be an absurd fight this late in the year because it would be a fight over D.C.'s balanced budget with a surplus.

The Senate version, of course, has riders we deplore but it bears us a fight over controversial language that are the pet concerns of this Member and that Member who in the House cannot wait for the D.C. appropriation because it allows them to undemocratically micromanage their views into the appropriation of a local jurisdiction, going against all of the philosophy of devolution that is spouted by the other side daily on this floor.

Is it worth the fight to get their little curlicue in their budget and then have it vetoed by the President? I do not think so.

Usually funds have not held up the D.C. appropriations since most of the money comes from D.C. and D.C. submits balanced budgets. Not this time. This appropriation is being held up largely because of a $35 million dispute in a $2 trillion budget. That is what this House is all about.

Now, understand that this dispute involves priorities that were funded in the President's budget and that the District cannot do without. So that means a fight, too. They have a fight on their hands. Do they want a fight? Do they want to stick around and fight? They are going to get their fight. Because we have got to get that Metro station.

D.C. has come up with a third of the money. As far as the Metro station, one of our business people has written an extraordinary piece in the Washington Post saying he simply cannot believe that, with the millions of dollars he is pouring into the District, that the Congress would not let this Metro station go. It is key to the revitalization of the entire northeast quadrant of the city, to the city's economy itself, which is just rebounding from insolvency.

We cannot put any more of our money into it. The control board has certified that it does not have more of its money to put into it. That is going to hold this bill up. We are not going to give up without that Metro stop. If my colleagues want to hang around and fight over it, they got themselves a fight.

Members have always supported such infrastructure support. They did so when we were building the Convention Center because they knew that we were going to make millions of dollars for ourselves every year. And so the Congress funded an expansion of the Metro stop near the Convention Center when the President put the money in his budget, as he has now.

This body, in one of the great moments frankly for bipartisan support for the Nation's capital, passed the College Access Act. There was strong bipartisan support in the Senate and the House because the House understood that we are the only jurisdiction in the United States that does not have a State college system, a State university system. So that now our youngsters can go to State colleges for low in-state college tuition fees.

Why underfund in the second year, the upcoming year, when we have received such an outpouring of young people taking advantage, more than 3,000 youngsters going all over the United States? It is mean spirited to underfund that, especially since the money for it is there in the President's budget.

It is time to acknowledge the giant steps that the District has taken with its new reform mayor, Tony Williams, and its completely revitalized City Council that does tough oversight all the time. They did their homework. We found no fault with their budget.

The delay into the fiscal year has already hurt the City's priorities. As I speak, 175 police cannot be hired. As I speak, we cannot put money into an after-school program to take our kids off the street during the high crime hours between 3 and 6. And the only reason is because this body has decided to hold our budget up, our balanced budget, and we cannot move ahead on anything new until they let our budget go.

Is it worth it to put their own signature on somebody else's budget when they have done their homework? Let the District budget go.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me, as part of my response to some things that have been claimed, take issue with this idea that supposedly the bill consists almost entirely of local funds.

In this bill, of the total of about $5.5 billion in operating expenses in the bill, about $3 billion of it is raised locally, about $2 billion of it is different Federal grant programs that comes from the Federal Government; and then over $400 million of it is direct appropriation of Federal funds to the District of Columbia.

I do not consider $2.5 billion of Federal money or $400 million of appropriated money—and of course it exceeds that $400 million—I do not consider that to be small potatoes. I consider that to be a lot of taxpayers' money.

We do not have that kind of direct appropriation to my hometown. It does

not go to Oklahoma City. It does not go to Sacramento. It does not go to Minneapolis or St. Paul or even Chicago. It goes to Washington, D.C., as the Nation's Capital because we have a unique constitutional perspective and mandate regarding the Nation's Capital. Otherwise, we would not have this bill, we would not have a District appropriation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I want the gentleman to know that, of the $2 billion that the gentleman has referenced, only $400 million of that is for direct Federal funding, but most of it is for the kind of grants they do not appropriate for anybody else in the first place.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is not accurate. The $2 billion in grants and such is in addition to the $414 million that the House appropriated. So the total of those is approximately $2.5 billion. And then we have the local funds of about $3 billion.

This is significant taxpayers' money. Whether the figure is $2.5 billion, $2 billion, or $400 million, I do not think any of us should say to the taxpayer with a straight face that that is not much money and this Congress should not be concerned about it and just let it go. We should be concerned.

Now, the Senate bill has more than the $414 million. They have $448 million. And that is what we have been working to reconcile.

Now, I think a false illusion, and it has been fascinating in this process, Mr. Speaker, to see efforts to create a false illusion as though the House were not trying to work, for example, on this New York Avenue Metro station project. The problem is, we do not get money from the President's budget.

I realize that Members of his own party can stand up here and say, ''Oh, my goodness, they are not doing what the President's budget says.'' Well, if all we need is the President's budget, we do not need a House of Representatives and we do not need a Senate; just let the President call all the shots and act accordingly.

The President does not give us money. The money comes from the taxpayers. And we have budgets within the House and within the Senate. We do not say we can spend as much money as the President says we can spend. We are only allowed to spend as much money as the House says can be spent if it should be spent.

And this nonsense about saying, ''Oh, they have not done what the President's budget says;'' we do not always agree with the President. That may be a surprise to some people. Maybe they always do. But I do not always agree, and I try in good faith to work with everyone and work these differences out.

As we have said throughout the process, it is really sad to see this effort to try to say to the business community and others in Washington that Congress is not helping with the New York Avenue Metro station. That is balderdash.

Number one, we funded to the full extent that we were able to do within the amount of money that had been allocated in our budget. And secondly, we have said from the beginning that we expected when we got to the conference with the Senate that the Senate would have a higher number that would enable us to add the extra money for the New York Avenue Metro station, which is exactly what is happening.

I really think it is sad to see this effort to demagogue and say, ''Oh, they are not trying to help on this significant project,'' because we have from day one and that has been the plan all along that the extra money would be received in an allocation when we got to conference so that we would be able to do that.

Also a false argument has been made saying, ''Oh, they are not taking care of the college tuition program.'' My goodness, we established that program in this bill last year with bipartisan support, as the gentlewoman mentions, and we have funded every penny that the program required plus a cushion of about 15 percent.

I recognize some people want to expand the program and, therefore, they want more money or they want the amount that was originally projected to be needed until they found out how many students were actually participating and we knew then what the actual number was rather than going with an estimate that was done a year or more in advance. We funded the need and then some. But some people say, ''Oh, they have got to give us more than that because we created a number in advance that we projected would be necessary and we are wearing blinders as to what the actual needs of the program are.''

Nevertheless, because the funds that go into that college tuition program remain available for future years and cannot be used for any other purpose we are going to increase the funding for that program. I think what we will end up doing is provide funding in advance for some of the college tuition that will not be spent until more than a year from now.

That has been the situation all along. Yet some people try to create an illusion that there has been a different approach toward the college tuition or towards the New York Avenue Metro station.

□ 1100

The bill that we have before us should be resolved very soon. We have been working with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), we have been working with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), we have been working with the administration, and we certainly have been working with the Senate. We expect that we are going to have this conference completed very quickly and the bill right back out to this Floor so that we can take care of the situation, the timing concern that the gentlewoman from the District mentions. We are sensitive to that. We are trying to move as quickly as we can. But the Senate did not pass its bill until last week, until last Thursday night. The House acted long before that. We have been waiting on the Senate. Now that the Senate has acted, we are able to go to conference, and finish up these details and get it right back here to the House floor. We expect to have this done quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to instruct conferees. As I said in my earlier statement, it is going to blow holes in the District's budget. It is going to create a lot more problems than it might ever solve. I oppose the motion to instruct and ask Members to oppose the motion.

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

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

Let me just elaborate on a few of the comments that the gentlewoman who represents the District of Columbia made. First of all, we have an opportunity to get the District of Columbia appropriations bill passed. We have only got two out of 13 appropriation bills done now. Finally we would get a third, with 10 to go.

The second point she made is we are only asking for $34 million more. Now, we just passed an energy and water appropriations bill that was $880 million over the budget request. I would not want to suggest that a lot of that is pork, but I would suggest to the people who are watching this that they may want to look at some of the composition of that bill. We passed a defense appropriations bill. It was $1.4 billion less for military readiness that the President requested, yet there is $9 billion more for weapons programs, primarily manufactured in majority Members' districts.

We are going to go through a number of appropriation bills in the last few days of this term, and all of them are going to see major increases, increases that make this D.C. bill dwarf by comparison. I mean, when we are talking about the District of Columbia bill compared to other bills, these numbers would get lost in the rounding. We are asking for $34 million is all, and that just brings it up to the budget request.

Let me make a third point that the gentlewoman did not discuss and, that is, with regard to the prerogatives that we assume for our own congressional district. We have been adding programs that benefit our district. That is part of our job. Whether they fit within the original budget resolution or not, we are going to do the best we can for our district. But in addition to that, we jealously guard our district from letting any other Members mess around

with it because we know our district best. We know what our priorities are.

Imagine, I would ask my colleagues, consider how you would feel if the rest of your colleagues were telling you what you ought to be doing for your congressional district, what you ought to be doing to your congressional district. We would never tolerate this kind of scrutinizing, this kind of bashing in some ways, all this kind of micromanaging. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is saying, weighing all the priorities, understanding my district better than any of you do, and we know that that is the truth, what she wants is for us to recede to the Senate, get this bill passed, we are already past the beginning of the fiscal year, let the District of Columbia get its appropriation bill and let it go about its business. That is all she is asking.

I am asking my colleagues, do nothing more but nothing less than we would do for our own congressional districts. Put yourselves in the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia's shoes. If you were representing the District of Columbia, what would you expect your colleagues to do? What we would expect our colleagues to do is to recede to the Senate, to get the bill passed but most importantly to listen to us, to take our advice on our congressional district.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) to respond to the gentleman from Oklahoma's comments, and then we will summarize our motion.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, there are two points on which I simply must take exception to the remarks of the Chair of the subcommittee when he talks about the $6 billion budget and says almost $4 billion of it is from the District and about $2 billion of it is from the Federal Government. Most of that $2 billion would never have come here until recently. In all of the years that the District budget came, Federal grants, most of them competitive Federal grants, were never even included in the District budget that came here. In recent years it has been and most of that money are grants. For example, it includes the transportation money that I get for the District out of another appropriation altogether, very large set of money, had nothing to do with this appropriation or with this chairman. It is done pursuant to a formula. And that is included in the $2 billion. That is most of the money he is talking about when he says $2 billion.

Let me say what I mean when I say the President put the money in the budget. This gentleman would not have had $35 million to manipulate to other priorities. If there was not $35 million in the budget, if there were only the money funding the functions that the Federal Government took over, we would not even be having this discussion. But the Mayor, the city council Chair, the control board Chair and I went to the White House and said, ''We are funding two-thirds of the Metro stop, can the Federal Government put in one-third?'' What this chairman has done is to take a good part of that money and reallocate it to where he thinks the money should go, or else he would not have had any money to play around with at all. We do not agree with him. It is our city.

He is for some of the money, for example, into the arboretum which is in the appropriation of the agriculture committee. We are asking that the money that was added to the D.C. appropriation, funded in the President's budget, be used for the purpose he funded it for and not be used for the purposes the gentleman wants it funded for. He would not have had it to deal with at all if we had not gone to the White House. I ask him to respect the reason the money was put in there, and it was the Metro stop and the other functions that we have mentioned.

Finally, I say to my colleagues, it is not fair to you to ask you to vote against the motion to instruct because you will engage in a futile exercise. If you vote against the motion to instruct, you are voting for overtime on the smallest appropriation. You are guaranteed a fight on that appropriation, I promise you that.

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct, because I think it goes back on some very important priorities that are in this bill the way it currently is and that the Senate has avoided. There are things that were excluded in this bill that I think are important to the States that surround the District of Columbia, and yet we are willing to make an island under the Senate version, an island here in the District of Columbia on some important legislation such as an amendment presented by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

He wanted to restrict, and do it with some authority, underage smoking. If you travel across the Potomac to Virginia, you will find that they have laws to restrict underage smoking. If you go to the east on Highway 50, you drive into Maryland and you will find that they have restrictions on underage smoking. But yet we are going to create an island here under the motion to instruct for the children in the District of Columbia and allow them this underage smoking, allowing kids to drive across the bridges or come into the District of Columbia and have less fear of buying cigarettes and getting into a life-style that will shorten their lives.

In addition to that, the Senate has made the choice that they are willing to risk placing elementary school children in the proximity of drug users, people who take illegal drugs and inject them into their veins. The House version had a restriction on the needle exchange program, saying simply that we are going to place a higher priority on children than we are on drug users.

We were going to take the very same language in the bill, we have the very same language as what the District of Columbia City Council has determined as a drug-free school zone, and we applied that to the program that gives needles to drug abusers. They will then take these needles and they inject illegal drugs into their veins. Now, there have been quite a few studies about the program, and what we have found is that in the area where needles are distributed, there are drug pushers, there are obviously drug users, and there are areas where the police have had to stay away by their own accord in order to let the program go so that we can give these needles to people who illegally use drugs.

All we were trying to do in this bill was to restrict the area where these needles were distributed. The amendment that was cut out by the Senate did not exclude the program at all. It exists on private funds today. But there are 10 distribution points in the District of Columbia. Six of them are within the area known as a drug-free school zone. Some of them are as close as across the street from where children in the District of Columbia attend school. So the Senate has made a choice, and it is now supported in this motion to instruct to place a higher priority on drug users than on the children, a very disturbing thought. We should place the children in the District of Columbia in a higher priority than we do drug users.

The Senate has gone on to take other very vital services and completely strike them out. They struck a hotline service that exists here in the District of Columbia. There are people in our society that are in dire need, they are in dire straits or in a difficult time and in the District of Columbia today you can call an 800 number and the people on that hotline will not let you off the phone until they connect you with the service that will meet your need, until that is connected, until that connection is made. But yet that was struck in this motion to instruct, that whole area is taken out. The Senate took it out, turning our backs on people that are truly in need.

They also struck the money for a mentoring service. There are kids in the District of Columbia that do not have much of a future. They are in a single-parent household, some of them are living with grandparents, aunts and uncles, and this mentor organization provides an individual to stay with them and meet their needs, if it is going to school to help them with their studies and talk with their teachers, if that is going to court with them, if it is helping them just get the medication they need. The mentoring program accompanies these children to help them get a start in life, to give them a little bit of hope in a community that is in desperate need of hope. Yet the Senate

and this motion to instruct will completely strike that program, leaving these children without the help that they need.

They also went on to cut other grassroots community organizations, and $500,000 for a cleanup. We heard a lot of talk about how the Metro stop is more important than these programs and that we have taken money, reprioritized it through the Senate, through this motion to instruct, for a Metro stop, but we have overlooked important things in this community. We have overlooked these children, we have overlooked the hotline service, we have overlooked a program that just is trying to restrict where we distribute needles to drug abusers. We have problems in the hospital, overlooked by this motion to instruct, a hospital that has twice as many employees than they need, completely overlooked, and half a million dollars for an environmental cleanup, overlooked because we want to change it to a Metro stop. I think the Metro stop is needed. I think we need some upgrades there. But to place that at a higher priority than the children of this community I think is wrongheaded, wrongminded. I think it is the wrong direction.

I would suggest that we vote against this motion to instruct and that we keep the House version of what was passed here. It makes more sense, it is more compassionate, and it is the right thing to do.

□ 1115

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and thank the gentleman also for his great leadership on behalf of the District of Columbia making decisions for itself.

I also want to commend the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her tireless leadership on behalf of the people of the District and on behalf of the people of our country, because the principle of local control over some of these decisions is one that serves us all well in this country.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct offered by my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The House bill that this body voted on earlier unfortunately included several riders that would interfere with the District of Columbia's ability to serve its citizens. Among these riders is the Tiahrt amendment, a bill that would kill the District's needle exchange programs, which have been proven effective in reducing the number of new HIV infections in the District and in this country, especially among children.

Think about the children. Approximately half of all new HIV infections are linked to injection drug use, and three quarters of new HIV infections in children are the result of injection drug use by a parent. Why would we pass up the opportunity to save a child's life by shutting down programs that work?

Although AIDS deaths have declined in recent years as a result of new treatments and improved access to care, HIV/AIDS remains the leading cause of death among African American males age 25 to 44 in the District. In spite of these statistics, this amendment that is contained in the House bill attempts to shut down programs that the local community has established to reduce new HIV infections.

This Congress should be supporting the decisions that the local communities make about their health care and the health care of their people, not limiting local control. Numerous health organizations, including the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, have concluded that needle exchange programs are effective.

Madam Speaker, in addition, at my request, the Surgeon General's office has prepared a review of all peer reviewed scientific studies of needle exchange programs over the past 2 years, and they also conclusively found that needle exchange programs reduce HIV transmission and do not increase drug use.

Madam Speaker, the President will veto this bill in the present form. If we support the motion to instruct, we will be able to send this bill to the President and have it signed into law. Here we are past the date of the end of the fiscal year, and we still have 11 appropriation bills out there.

I just want to take another moment to go back, to the needle exchange program. Since the inception of the needle exchange program in the District of Columbia in the latter half of 1996 through 1999, the number of new IDU cases has fallen more than 65 percent from some 396 in 1996 to 139 in 1997, which represents the most significant decline in new AIDS cases across all transmission categories over this 4-year period.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to instruct.

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, if I may inquire of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), would it be agreeable if I take 2 minutes to close, then the gentleman take 2 minutes to close?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I think I may get wound up a little more. Madam Speaker, let us yield ourselves at least 3 minutes for this.

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to remember that were we to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and just accept everything that the Senate has done on this bill, first, we would blow a $61 million hole in the District's budget because we would not have the language that was intended to be put in and will be put in the conference agreement to enable the District to issue securities against the revenue they expect from the tobacco settlement and that the District is counting on in this budget this year. So we would cut out that $61 million and blow a hole in their budget.

I do not know where they would try to make it up. If we were to adopt the gentleman's motion, we would also remove the public-private effort, not only to work with public housing but to work with the residents of public housing to improve their employment, which is part of the project of the Washington Interfaith Network that the House version funds but the Senate version does not.

Also, were we to adopt the Senate version, we would cut out the funding that the House has to help teenagers, young women, in the District to promote abstinence, to try to stop the major problem with teenage pregnancy and sex and the difficulty it leads to for so many people. We would cut out that funding if we were to adopt the gentleman's motion.

Also under the gentleman's motion, we would remove millions of dollars from the drug testing and drug treatment program that is a major effort to reduce crime in the District of Columbia. We would cut that out if we were to adopt the gentleman's motion.

Madam Speaker, the things that were mentioned by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) as I tried to make clear throughout, we always expected, and it is the intention in the conference, that more funds are now being made available to the House, which is the amount that we were counting on to provide the full requested funding on the New York Avenue Metro station. That has been the plan all along, that is what is happening; but we did not have the money available to us in the House in our subcommittee previously.

It was not that we had the money and spent it elsewhere, we did not have the money. And we were going to say we are going to wipe out everything else, because we knew what was going to happen, and it has happened with or without adopting the motion of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the bill, when it finally goes to the President's desk, will have the full funding for the New York Avenue Metro station and the full funding for the college tuition program, because any excess in that program would just be carried through to the next year anyway.

We have tried to make that clear. That is not an issue. That is not an issue whatsoever. In the conference report, those are the things that we intend to do, but let us not undo the work of the House of Representatives. We had amendments that this House

adopted by voice vote, because the support was so firm. We had an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) for example that was adopted in this House by 265 votes, very strong, very bipartisan votes that the gentleman's motion would wipe out.

I urge defeat of the motion to instruct conferees, so we can very, very quickly go to conference, get these issues resolved and bring the confercne agreement right back to this floor.

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

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

I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK), that while some of the points are valid with regard to the House bill and the Senate bill, the conclusion is not one we could agree with.

Let me respond to some of the points that have been made by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and by my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

My colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), suggested that in some way the Senate bill shortchanges youth programs, and yet the Senate bill adds $500,000 for a new community center for homeless runaway at-risk youth. The Senate bill adds another $250,000 to enhance reading skills of District public school students.

There is a whole list of programs that the Senate bill has that I know that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) would not object to, but these are good programs that are not in the House bill.

The main thing that I have to take issue with is that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) have suggested that the House bill takes a more responsible approach to some of these difficult issues that we have been wrestling with, and I do not think that is the case.

I would remind both the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and anyone who does not think that the Senate bill is a responsible bill that it passed the Senate unanimously, unanimously.

Madam Speaker, with regard to this needle exchange program, the Senate bill that we are asking my colleagues to accept and that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is willing to accept says we cannot use any Federal funds for needle exchange programs. We cannot use any local funds for needle exchange programs. We cannot use any public funds for needle exchange program. It is pretty tough language. But it is in the bill. And to suggest, as my friend, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), suggested that somehow the Senate is taking too liberal an approach here, I do not think that the Senate is some cabal of left-wing ideologues. I should not characterize the Senate.

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, the gentleman mentioned the effort of the Senate. I was watching, and perhaps the gentleman was, when the Senate brought the bill up. Is the gentleman aware the consideration the Senate gave to this bill on the floor when they brought it up and passed it in about 30 seconds? That was the extent of the consideration, literally 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, I am very grateful for the gentleman for making note of that, because I think that is exactly what we should be doing here.

These are bills that were requested by the White House because they came from the District of Columbia City Council, the Mayor, the financial control board agreed to them. So this is a budget that already has been scrutinized. I do not know why we need to take more than 30 seconds. This is the District's bill. It makes sense. It is a responsible bill.

We want to get our appropriations bills done. It is after October 1. We have a terrific chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, he wants to get our work done. He is upset. And it is past October 1. The fiscal year has begun.

We have an opportunity to get a bill passed that the Senate agrees to, that the White House will sign. We are only talking about $34 million that was within the budget request. We are probably going to go $25 billion over our budget resolution. Here we are talking $34 million. We can get this bill out of the way. Let us get our job done. The chairman has worked so hard, we ought to let him get his job done.

Let us not mess around with these tangential issues, these ideological issues. Let us let the citizens of the District of Columbia decide what is in their best interests, let us recede to the Senate, let us get this appropriations bills signed, get our work done.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the electronic vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5212, as amended, immediately following this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 219, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—219

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)

Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Baca
Brown (FL)
English
Eshoo
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilleary
Houghton
Hoyer
King (NY)
Klink
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
Meehan
Paul
Riley
Skelton
Sweeney
Vento
Wise

□ 1151

Mrs. BONO and Messrs. RADANOVICH, HORN, BACHUS, HOLDEN, SMITH of Texas, EWING and LUCAS of Kentucky changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay''.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Messrs. OWENS, ORTIZ, and GREENWOOD 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, TIAHRT, ADERHOLT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Messrs. SUNUNU, YOUNG of Florida, MORAN of Virginia, DIXON, MOLLOHAN and OBEY.

There was no objection.

VETERANS' ORAL HISTORY PROJECT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5212, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5212, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Baca
Barrett (WI)
Brown (FL)
Clayton
English
Eshoo
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilleary
Houghton
Hoyer
King (NY)
Klink
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
Meehan
Paul
Riley
Skelton
Sweeney
Vento
Wise

□ 1201

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 510, a bill instructing conferees on H.R. 4942, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001. Had I been present I would have voted ''nay.'' Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 511, H.R. 5212, the Veterans' Oral History Project Act. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''