I commend the Congress for developing a bill that includes requested funding for the District of Columbia. The bill includes essential funding for District Courts and Corrections and the D.C. Offender Supervision Agency and goes a long way toward providing requested funds for a new tuition assistance program for District of Columbia residents. I appreciate the additional funding included in the bill to promote the adoption of children in the District's foster care system, to support the Children's National Medical Center, to assist the Metropolitan Police Department in eliminating open-air drug trafficking in the District, and for drug testing and treatment, among other programs.

However, I am disappointed that the Congress has added to the bill a number of highly objectionable provisions that would interfere with local decisions about local matters. Were it not for these provisions, I would sign the bill into law. Many of the Members who voted for this legislation represent States and localities that do not impose similar restrictions on their own citizens. I urge the Congress to remove the following provisions expeditiously to prevent the interruption of important funding for the District of Columbia:

—*Voting Representation.* H.R. 2587 would prohibit not only the use of Federal, but also District funds to provide assistance for petition drives or civil actions that seek to obtain voting representation in the Congress for residents of the District of Columbia.

—*Limit on Access to Representation in Special Education Cases.* The bill would cap the award of plaintiffs' attorneys' fees in cases brought by parents of District schoolchildren against the District of Columbia Public Schools under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In the long run, this provision would likely limit the access of the District's poor families to quality legal representation, thus impairing their due process protections provided by the IDEA.

—*Abortion.* The bill would prohibit the use of not only Federal, but also District funds to pay for abortions except in those cases where the life of the mother is endangered or in situations involving rape or incest.

—*Domestic Partners Act.* The bill would prohibit the use of not only Federal, but also District funds to implement or enforce the Health Care Benefits Expansion Act of 1992.

—*Needle Exchange Programs.* The bill contains a ban that would seriously disrupt current AIDS/HIV prevention efforts by prohibiting the use of Federal and local funds for needle exchange programs. H.R. 2587 denies not only Federal, but also District funding to any public or private agency, including providers of HIV/AIDS-related services, in the District of Columbia that uses the public or private agency's own funds for needle exchange programs, undermining the principle of home rule in the District.

—*Controlled Substances.* The bill would prohibit the District from legislating with respect to certain controlled substances, in a manner that all States are free to do.

—*Restriction on City Council Salaries.* The bill would limit the amount of salary that can be paid to members of the District of Columbia Council.

I urge the Congress to send me a bill that maintains the important funding for the District provided in this bill and that eliminates these highly objectionable provisions as well as other provisions that undermine the ability of residents of the District of Columbia to make decisions about local matters.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 28, 1999.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, President Clinton has just surrendered in America's war against drugs. I'm deeply disturbed by this veto, and every parent, teacher and police officer should be, too.

His veto throws away all the good things this bill does: help D.C. kids go to college, get foster kids into permanent homes, clean up the foul Anacostia River, crack down on drug offenders, and reduce the size of D.C.'s bloated government.

And for what?

I'm appalled that the President of the United States would throw away all these good things just to support legalizing marijuana.

This is about legalizing drugs in the nation's capital, and using that as a stepping-stone for the rest of the country. Nobody should be fooled by the pretense that this is a medical issue. That's a smoke screen. Anyone who reads D.C.'s proposed new law knows:

It wouldn't even require an actual doctor's prescription.

People who claim they have approval to use marijuana are allowed to authorize their friends to grow and keep it for them.

It even requires government to provide the marijuana in some cases, at taxpayers' expense.

It's wide-open for abuse. It conflicts with our national law making marijuana illegal.

It's also a smokescreen for the President to pretend this is about local control. The Constitution (Article I, Section 8) puts Congress in charge of the laws in D.C. Furthermore, the items of which the President complains were all approved by him in last year's bill. They are not new. The only new thing is that now D.C. wants to legalize marijuana, and President Clinton wants to help them.

Everyone who cares about combating drugs should be sickened by the Clinton veto. You can't have a war on drugs if the President turns the nation's capital into a sanctuary. This ends any hope of drug-free zones around D.C.'s schools.

Every police officer, every teacher, and every parent who has ever fought against drugs should be crying today. The President is sending the worst possible message to our children.

Not only that, he's exposing our nation's capitol to renewed ridicule over drug abuse and hijacking D.C.'s progress on the road to recovery from the Marion Barry days. I'm shocked that he would sacrifice everything just to promote a pro-drug agenda. Neither the Congress nor the country will accept what the President has done.''

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President, together with the accompanying bill, H.R. 2587, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 68. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2605) ''An Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.''

NAVY ENSIGN DAN JOHNSON, A TRUE HERO

(Mr. BALLENGER 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. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, some say that America lacks true heroes, and I disagree. Last Friday, I had the privilege to see a young man, a constituent of mine, Navy Ensign Dan Johnson receive the Navy/Marine Corps medal for heroism.

On August 23, Ensign Johnson, a safety officer aboard the USS Blue Ridge, was working on a deck as the ship prepared to leave Pusan Harbor. During