

Manzullo	Portman	Smith (TX)	Wexler	Wise	Wynn
McCollum	Pryce (OH)	Smith, Linda	Weygand	Woolsey	Yates
McCrery	Quinn	Snowbarger			
McDade	Radanovich	Solomon			
McHugh	Ramstad	Souder	Bateman	Hall (TX)	Meek (FL)
McInnis	Redmond	Spence	Dixon	Jefferson	Sandlin
McIntosh	Regula	Stearns	Gonzalez	Kennelly	Smith (OR)
McKeon	Riggs	Stump			
Metcalf	Riley	Sununu			
Mica	Rogan	Talent			
Miller (FL)	Rogers	Tauzin			
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)			
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas			
Nethercutt	Roukema	Thornberry			
Neumann	Royce	Thune			
Ney	Ryun	Tiahrt			
Northup	Salmon	Trafficant			
Norwood	Sanford	Upton			
Nussle	Saxton	Walsh			
Oxley	Scarborough	Wamp			
Packard	Schaefer, Dan	Watkins			
Pappas	Schaffer, Bob	Watts (OK)			
Parker	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)			
Paul	Sessions	Weldon (PA)			
Paxon	Shadegg	Weller			
Pease	Shaw	White			
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Whitfield			
Petri	Shimkus	Wicker			
Pickering	Shuster	Wolf			
Pitts	Skeen	Young (AK)			
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)			
Porter	Smith (NJ)				

NAYS—199

Abercrombie	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Green	Morella
Allen	Gutierrez	Murtha
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Baesler	Hamilton	Neal
Baldacci	Harman	Oberstar
Barcia	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Olver
Becerra	Hilliard	Ortiz
Bentzen	Hinchey	Owens
Berman	Hinojosa	Pallone
Berry	Holden	Pascrell
Bishop	Hookey	Pastor
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Payne
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Borski	(TX)	Pickett
Boswell	John	Pomeroy
Boucher	Johnson (WI)	Poshard
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Reyes
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
Cardin	Kildee	Rodriguez
Carson	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Clay	Kind (WI)	Rothman
Clayton	Klecicka	Roybal-Allard
Clement	Klink	Rush
Clyburn	Kucinich	Sabo
Condit	LaFalce	Sanchez
Conyers	Lampson	Sanders
Costello	Lantos	Sawyer
Coyne	Lee	Schumer
Cramer	Levin	Scott
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Danner	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis (FL)	Lofgren	Sisisky
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Skaggs
DeFazio	Luther	Skelton
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Slaughter
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Smith, Adam
DeLauro	Manton	Snyder
Deutsch	Markey	Spratt
Dicks	Martinez	Stabenow
Dingell	Mascara	Stark
Doggett	Matsui	Stenholm
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Stokes
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Edwards	McDermott	Stupak
Engel	McGovern	Tanner
Eshoo	McHale	Tauscher
Etheridge	McIntyre	Taylor (MS)
Evans	McKinney	Thompson
Farr	McNulty	Thurman
Fattah	Meehan	Tierney
Fazio	Meeks (NY)	Torres
Filner	Menendez	Towns
Ford	Millender-	Turner
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Velazquez
Frost	Miller (CA)	Vento
Furse	Minge	Visclosky
Gejdenson	Mink	Waters
Gephardt	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Goode	Mollohan	Waxman

Smith (TX)	Wexler	Wise	Wynn
Smith, Linda	Weygand	Woolsey	Yates
Snowbarger			
Solomon			
Souder			
Spence			
Stearns			
Stump			
Sununu			
Talent			
Tauzin			
Taylor (NC)			
Thomas			
Thornberry			
Thune			
Tiahrt			
Trafficant			
Upton			
Walsh			
Wamp			
Watkins			
Watts (OK)			
Weldon (FL)			
Weldon (PA)			
Weller			
White			
Whitfield			
Wicker			
Wolf			
Young (AK)			
Young (FL)			

□ 1152

Ms. WATERS 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the rule just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STUDENT OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP ACT OF 1997

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 413, I call up the Senate bill (S. 1502) entitled the "District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997", and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of S. 1502 is as follows:

S. 1502

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS; PRECEDENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997".

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Public education in the District of Columbia is in a crisis, as evidenced by the following:

(A) The District of Columbia schools have the lowest average of any school system in the Nation on the National Assessment of Education Progress.

(B) 72 percent of fourth graders in the District of Columbia tested below basic proficiency on the National Assessment of Education Progress in 1994.

(C) Since 1991, there has been a net decline in the reading skills of District of Columbia students as measured in scores on the standardized Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills.

(D) At least 40 percent of District of Columbia students drop out of or leave the school system before graduation.

(E) The National Education Goals Panel reported in 1996 that both students and teachers in District of Columbia schools are subjected to levels of violence that are twice the national average.

(F) Nearly two-thirds of District of Columbia teachers reported that violent student behavior is a serious impediment to teaching.

(G) Many of the District of Columbia's 152 schools are in a state of terrible disrepair,

including leaking roofs, bitterly cold classrooms, and numerous fire code violations.

(2) Significant improvements in the education of educationally deprived children in the District of Columbia can be accomplished by—

(A) increasing educational opportunities for the children by expanding the range of educational choices that best meet the needs of the children;

(B) fostering diversity and competition among school programs for the children;

(C) providing the families of the children more of the educational choices already available to affluent families; and

(D) enhancing the overall quality of education in the District of Columbia by increasing parental involvement in the direction of the education of the children.

(3) The 350 private schools in the District of Columbia and the surrounding area offer a more safe and stable learning environment than many of the public schools.

(4) Costs are often much lower in private schools than corresponding costs in public schools.

(5) Not all children are alike and therefore there is no one school or program that fits the needs of all children.

(6) The formation of sound values and moral character is crucial to helping young people escape from lives of poverty, family break-up, drug abuse, crime, and school failure.

(7) In addition to offering knowledge and skills, education should contribute positively to the formation of the internal norms and values which are vital to a child's success in life and to the well-being of society.

(8) Schools should help to provide young people with a sound moral foundation which is consistent with the values of their parents. To find such a school, parents need a full range of choice to determine where their children can best be educated.

(c) PRECEDENTS.—The United States Supreme Court has determined that programs giving parents choice and increased input in their children's education, including the choice of a religious education, do not violate the Constitution. The Supreme Court has held that as long as the beneficiary decides where education funds will be spent on such individual's behalf, public funds can be used for education in a religious institution because the public entity has neither advanced nor hindered a particular religion and therefore has not violated the establishment clause of the first amendment to the Constitution. Supreme Court precedents include—

(1) *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972); *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925); and *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923) which held that parents have the primary role in and are the primary decision makers in all areas regarding the education and upbringing of their children;

(2) *Mueller v. Allen*, 463 U.S. 388 (1983) which declared a Minnesota tax deduction program that provided State income tax benefits for educational expenditures by parents, including tuition in religiously affiliated schools, does not violate the Constitution;

(3) *Witters v. Department of Services for the Blind*, 474 U.S. 481 (1986) in which the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that public funds for the vocational training of the blind could be used at a Bible college for ministry training; and

(4) *Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School District*, 509 U.S. 1 (1993) which held that a deaf child could receive an interpreter, paid for by the public, in a private religiously affiliated school under the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et