

Kingston Packard Shaw
 Klug Pappas Shays
 Knollenberg Parker Shimkus
 Kolbe Paul Shuster
 LaHood Paxson Skeen
 Largent Pease Smith (MI)
 Latham Peterson (PA) Smith (NJ)
 LaTourette Petri Smith (OR)
 Lazio Pickering Smith (TX)
 Leach Pitts Smith, Linda
 Lewis (CA) Pombo Snowbarger
 Lewis (KY) Porter Solomon
 Linder Portman Spence
 LoBiondo Pryce (OH) Stearns
 Lucas Quinn Stump
 Manzullo Radanovich Sununu
 McCollum Ramstad Talent
 McCrery Regula Tauzin
 McDade McDade Taylor (NC)
 McHugh Riley Thomas
 McInnis Rogan Thornberry
 McIntosh Rogers Thune
 McKeon Rohrabacher Tiahrt
 Metcalf Ros-Lehtinen Upton
 Mica Roukema Walsh
 Miller (FL) Royce Wamp
 Molinari Ryun Watkins
 Moran (KS) Salmon Watts (OK)
 Morella Sanford Weldon (FL)
 Myrick Saxton Weldon (PA)
 Nethercutt Scarborough Weller
 Neumann Schaefer, Dan White
 Ney Schaffer, Bob Whitfield
 Northup Schiff Wicker
 Norwood Sensenbrenner Wolf
 Nussle Sessions Young (AK)
 Oxley Shadegg Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Andrews Kaptur Souder
 Dixon Livingston

□ 1642

Messrs. DUNCAN, BONO and POMBO and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FLAKE and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—231

Aderholt Bunning Crapo
 Archer Burr Cubin
 Armey Burton Cunningham
 Bachus Buyer Davis (VA)
 Baker Callahan Deal
 Ballenger Calvert DeLay
 Barr Camp Diaz-Balart
 Barrett (NE) Campbell Dickey
 Bartlett Canady Doolittle
 Barton Cannon Dreier
 Bass Castle Duncan
 Bateman Chabot Dunn
 Bereuter Chambliss Ehlers
 Bilbray Chenoweth Ehrlich
 Bilirakis Christensen Emerson
 Bishop Coble English
 Bliley Collins Ensign
 Blunt Combest Everett
 Boehlert Condit Ewing
 Boehner Cook Fawell
 Bonilla Cooksey Foley
 Bono Cox Forbes
 Brady Cramer Fowler
 Bryant Crane Fox

Franks (NJ) Lazio
 Frelinghuysen Leach
 Gallegly Leach (CA)
 Ganske Lewis (KY)
 Gekas Linder
 Gibbons Livingston
 Gilchrest LoBiondo
 Gillmor Lucas
 Gilman Manzullo
 Goode McCollum
 Goodlatte McCrery
 Goodling McDade
 Goss McHugh
 Graham McInnis
 Granger McIntosh
 Greenwood McKeon
 Gutknecht Metcalf
 Hall (TX) Mica
 Hansen Miller (FL)
 Hastert Molinari
 Hastings (WA) Moran (KS)
 Hayworth Morella
 Hefley Myrick
 Herger Nethercutt
 Hill Neumann
 Hilleary Ney
 Hobson Northup
 Hoekstra Norwood
 Horn Oxley
 Hostettler Packard
 Houghton Pappas
 Hulshof Parker
 Hunter Paul
 Hutchinson Paxon
 Hyde Pease
 Inglis Peterson (MN)
 Istook Peterson (PA)
 Jenkins Petri
 Johnson (CT) Pickering
 Johnson, Sam Pitts
 Jones Pombo
 Kasich Porter
 Kelly Portman
 Kim Pryce (OH)
 King (NY) Quinn
 Kingston Radanovich
 Klug Ramstad
 Knollenberg Regula
 Kolbe Riggs
 LaHood Riley
 Largent Rogan
 Latham Rogers
 LaTourette Rohrabacher

NAYS—197

Abercrombie Doggett
 Ackerman Dooley
 Allen Doyle
 Baesler Edwards
 Baldacci Engel
 Barcia Eshoo
 Barrett (WI) Etheridge
 Becerra Evans
 Bentsen Farr
 Berman Fattah
 Berry Fazio
 Blagojevich Filner
 Blumenauer Flake
 Bonior Foglietta
 Borski Ford
 Boswell Frank (MA)
 Boucher Frost
 Boyd Furse
 Brown (CA) Gejdenson
 Brown (FL) Gephardt
 Brown (OH) Gonzalez
 Capps Gordon
 Cardin Green
 Carson Gutierrez
 Clay Hall (OH)
 Clayton Hamilton
 Clement Harman
 Clyburn Hastings (FL)
 Coburn Hefner
 Conyers Hilliard
 Costello Hinchey
 Coyne Hinojosa
 Cummings Holden
 Danner Hooley
 Davis (FL) Hoyer
 Davis (IL) Jackson (IL)
 DeFazio Jackson-Lee
 DeGette (TX)
 Delahunt Jefferson
 DeLauro John
 Dellums Johnson (WI)
 Deutsch Johnson, E. B.
 Dicks Kanjorski
 Dingell Kennedy (MA)

Ros-Lehtinen Nadler
 Roukema Neal
 Royce Nussle
 Ryun Oberstar
 Salmon Obey
 Sanford Olver
 Saxton Ortiz
 Scarborough Owens
 Schaefer, Dan Pallone
 Schaffner, Bob Pascrell
 Schiff Pastor
 Sensenbrenner Payne
 Sessions Pelosi
 Shadegg Pickett
 Shaw Pomeroy
 Shays Poshard
 Shimkus Price (NC)
 Shuster Rahall
 Smith (MI) Rangel
 Smith (NJ) Reyes
 Smith (OR) Rivers
 Smith (TX) Roemer
 Smith, Linda Rothman

NOT VOTING—4

Andrews Kaptur
 Dixon Souder

□ 1700

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 89, the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. YATES of Illinois.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-191, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. THOMAS of California, chairman;
 Mr. NEY of Ohio,
 Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio,
 Mr. HOYER of Maryland,
 Mr. CLAY of Missouri, and
 Mr. FROST of Texas.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Section 703 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C.903) as amended by Section 103 of Public Law 103-296, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member to the Social Security Advisory Board to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Ms. Jo Anne Barnhart, Arlington, Virginia.

There was no objection.

SCHOOL FUNDING IN AMERICA NEEDS OUR HELP

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the USA Today written by columnist DeWayne Wickham entitled "Cash-Short Schools Need Nike More Than Twain."

In order to make up for shortfalls in their educational budget, the school system in Seattle has figured out a creative way to gather and galvanize funds for the school system. They have invited commercial advertisers into school grounds and school property to advertise to help make up for the shortfall.

I say to this Chamber and I say to colleagues on both sides of the aisle, what kind of message are we sending people in America? We can find money for programs throughout the budget. When it comes to children, we have to ask corporate America, and I salute our private citizens and the private sector for coming forward, but at a time when prison construction is growing at a rapid and exponential rate, Mr. Speaker and Members on both sides of the aisle, in this bipartisan fervor, what kind of message are we sending the children, schools, parents, and teachers throughout this Nation when we do not have the courage, the temerity or the will to step up to the plate and make sure that future generations of America are prepared, equipped, and ready for the challenges that we face in the 21st century marketplace.

[From USA Today, Mar. 11, 1997]

CASH-SHORT SCHOOLS NEED NIKE MORE THAN TWAIN

(By DeWayne Wickham)

The Washington Bullets do it. So do the Indianapolis Colts, Boston Celtics and New York Yankees. But if opponents get their way, Seattle's school system won't be following the lead of these and other major sports franchises. While the moguls of pro sports are lining their pockets with revenue from deals that transform sporting venues into giant billboards, Seattle's cash-strapped system is embroiled in a debate over whether to

allow "reputable" companies to advertise their products on school grounds. Cigarette and liquor ads would not be allowed.

The system's bean counters predict that the sale of advertising on athletic field scoreboards and at selected locations inside school buildings might generate \$1 million annually. That's roughly 8.5% of the \$35 million funding shortfall facing Seattle schools over the next three years.

But the plan, approved by the school board in November, is under attack. Last week, it tabled a call by its school superintendent to suspend the proposal. The superintendent's request followed complaints from people who want Seattle's schools to be an advertising-free zone. Like the constitutional separation of church and state, they think this divide should be a basic tenet of our way of life. I think they need a reality check.

Schools already are overrun with advertising. The free kind. Most of it is worn into classrooms by schoolchildren. They are human ads for Tommy Hilfiger, Calvin Klein, Nike and a host of other name-brand makers. Banning advertising won't stop the walking commercials that many fashion-conscious students have become. The only thing this policy reversal will do is deepen the school system's financial problems.

The projected budget deficit, a result of caps on state education aid and property tax rates, has forced the board to consider requiring thousands of middle and high school students to ride public buses to save on transportation costs. As this revenue crisis deepens, opponents remain unmoved. They say students are a captive audience, and it isn't fair to allow companies to target them, even if it would bring in some badly needed cash. But if the job of schools is to prepare youngsters for the real world, why not introduce them to it by opening the doors to advertisers? The benefit of doing so can be more than financial.

School systems that permit advertising are in a better position to influence the kinds of ads students see. They can reject moronic, tasteless ads. Conditioning advertisers to make more intelligent, less socially offensive commercials can produce some valuable, long-term rewards. Commercial ads are an important part of this nation's pop culture. Like it or not, the Energizer Bunny is probably better known to most schoolchildren than Mark Twain. But that can change.

Forced to compete for the chance to put their images before youngsters—many of whom will be making lifelong product choices—advertisers will bend over backward to satisfy the demands of educators for the highest quality commercial messages. Enter Mark Twain.

That's the kind of change school officials ought to be climbing over each other to achieve. Students who grow up with smart ads will become adults who expect no less from product promoters. That's a small but important victory against the dumbing of America.

Seattle can turn its fiscal crisis into an educational triumph for students—and advertisers. Or it can fool itself into believing that by refusing to accept paid ads, city schools will be commercial-free zones.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PITTS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DECERTIFICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HINOJOSA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my feelings about certification of Mexico. I feel very strongly about this issue because I despise what drugs are doing to this Nation. It is a scourge that is ravishing our most precious resource: our youth.

Unfortunately, we know this all too well in the area of the Nation that I represent, south Texas. Daily in our papers and on the news, we see the devastation that is occurring with the impact that drugs are having on our children and our communities. It is a problem that I am committed to addressing, and one that is a priority of mine.

I know, however, that this is not a problem that I alone can solve. If we are to win the war, it will take a united effort. By that I mean efforts must be made on every level: local, State, and Federal. Just as important are the efforts we must make in our own homes. Only by joining together in combating this epidemic will we ever be able to declare victory.

That is why the issue of certification is so important to me. We are all aware that the drug problem is not unique nor internal to our Nation. It is an international crisis. As it affects us, so does it affect our neighbor to the north and our neighbor to the south. So when I say we must work together, I mean all of us, because we share borders. By doing so, and only by doing so, can we begin to turn the tide.

On March 1 the President certified Mexico, and since then we have heard from many who feel this was not a wise decision, that they are not making enough of an effort in this battle. I, however, feel that to take any action other than certification would be counterproductive, injurious, and unfair. I say this because I think it is we, in the long run as a nation, who ultimately will lose.

First, let us look at the facts. Last year Mexico seized 30 percent more marijuana than in 1995, 78 percent more heroin than in 1995, 7 percent more cocaine than in that same year, and arrested 14 percent more drug traffickers than this in 1995. Those are substantial numbers, showing the improvement that has been made. They are impressive numbers. What these figures tell me is that Mexico is making the effort, that Mexico is cooperating. Why then do we want to send back a message that says, nice try, but you failed?

In addition, Mexico has greatly improved its record on extraditions. During 1996 Mexico extradited a record number of individuals. Two of these