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Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. POMEROY changed their vote from "nay" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

So the joint resolution was not passed.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 365, it has been brought to my attention that I was recorded as voting AYE. I seem to recall pressing the red button for a NAY vote. So there is no misunderstanding of my position, I wish for the record to indicate that I should be recorded as a NO vote.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFERENCE ON H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part in aid of revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, 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. BURR of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have no objection to this motion. We do want to use this opportunity, though, to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and congratulate him for the 333 to 92 vote on final passage of the D.C. appropriations bill.

I do not know that anybody in this body is aware of this, but over the past 20 years, no D.C. appropriations bill has ever passed the House of Representatives with a higher margin of votes. This strong bipartisan support reflects a vote of confidence on a number of positive developments in the district. It is important to understand that that was unprecedented, virtually unprecedented to get that kind of margin of support for a D.C. appropriations bill.

It is really for three reasons, a strong fiscal picture that includes a budget surplus that will make it possible for the first time in a decade to cut any taxes for D.C. businesses and residents. We have got a new mayor and city council who are committed to revitalizing the district, its businesses, its infrastructure and schools, and its public services.

Thirdly, we have a new chairman who has made every effort to familiarize himself with the affairs of the District and played a fair and even hand with District officials, with the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and with myself.

I believe the strong bipartisan support, however, also reflects confidence that the Senator that both the administration and many in Congress have objected to can be modified in conference.

I am speaking of the commitment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) to revisiting proposals restricting the District from using even its own funds to pursue legal redress in Federal court on its voting rights claim.

The amendment of the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) to allow local funds to be used on this lawsuit lost on a tie vote, and the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee has given us a commitment that he will try to fix that because it was so close in the House.

The second issue is the needle exchange program. As my colleagues know, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) prohibits the use of Federal or local funds for any needle exchange program in the District. The amendment goes even further to prevent any private organization or individual from offering a needle exchange program if they are in receipt of other Federal funds.

This amendment ties the hands of the District to respond to a public health crisis. D.C. has the highest rate of HIV infection in the United States, and intravenous drug use is the second leading cause. It is the most likely cause that we can reduce with action that we might take, or at least enabling the District to take such action.

It is wrong that the District suffers from the most restrictive language of any other city in the country, hampering its ability to stem the spread of AIDS. No such ban would ever be considered in any other jurisdiction where the other 113 needle exchange programs are operated throughout the country.

Since the Senate is silent on restricting the District’s needle exchange program, many are confident that this language will be modified in conference. I hope this will be the case so
that the final conference report will be a
document we can all support and, thus, I
thank the chairman.
Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for
letting us express our views on this
again. We are not going to try to in-
struct the conference. We had an over-
whelmingly positive vote, I hope we can
continue that spirit in conference, and I
hope we can bring back a bill to this
floor that will get the same type of
overwhelming vote in support of it and
get a bill signed by the President.
Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the
gentleman yield?
Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to
the gentleman from Oklahoma.
Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I very
much appreciate the gentleman’s very
positive comments, and like him, I am
committed to accenting the positive on
this bill.
As we know, I certainly made a com-
mitment, and I intend to honor the fol-
lowing, the President has indicated
regarding working something out on
the local funding of the litigation that
the gentleman described.
We are both aware of the issues sur-
rounding the needle program, and there
is a privately funded needle program
operated. We certainly do not intend
anything that would go beyond the lan-
guage the President signed into law
last year.
I do not think we are in a position
where he would take the extreme ac-
tion of vetoing something, but I look
forward to working with the gentleman
on this and all other issues in this con-
fERENCE.
Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker,
reclaiming my time, I will just con-
clude that the Senate has indicated
that if we could get that language that
said no Federal funds could be used for
such a program, that would certainly
be acceptable to him, and I believe to
the body of this House, in the con-
fERENCE report.
But again let me conclude where I
started. I thank the chairman for his
cooperation and his leadership on this
bill.
Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reserva-
tion of objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
Buch of North Carolina). Is there ob-
jection to the request of the gentleman
from Oklahoma?
There was no objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair
applies the following conferences: Messrs.
ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, TIAHRT, ADERHOLT, Mrs.
EMERSON, and Messrs. SUNUNU, YOUNG of Florida, MORAN of Virginia, DIXON,
MOLLOHAN and OBEY.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PASSING OF
ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, FORMER
MEMBER OF THE HOUSE FROM
WEST VIRGINIA

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with
a great deal of sorrow that I rise to an-
ounce the passing of a former Member of the House of Repre-
sentatives from West Virginia, Robert
H. Mollohan.

Bob Mollohan served the United
States Senate early in his career as
Clerk of the Senate Committee on the
District of Columbia from 1949 to 1952.
He was elected to this body in 1953,
where he served until 1957, at which
time he ran for governor of West Vir-
ginia.
He returned to the House in the 91st
Congress, serving from 1969 to 1993
when he retired, and returned to the
family insurance business in Fairmont,
West Virginia.

Bob Mollohan was the father of our dis-
guished colleague and dear friend, Alan B. Mollohan, who succeeded his
father when he was first elected to fill
his seat in 1982.

Robert Mollohan served with distinc-
tion during his time in the House,
working for the people of his Congress-
ional District for 17 years. He was a
compassionate and caring representa-
tive of his people, and a pillar of his
community throughout his lifetime.
Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it was not until
he retired from this body that this cor-
er back here became known as the Pen-
nsylvania Corner. Prior to that, it
was known only as the West Virginia
Corner.

He will be sorely missed by West Vir-
ginians who will remember his dedica-
tion, his compassion, and his thought-
ful, caring nature. Robert Mollohan
was greatly beloved by his people for
his tireless efforts to bring quality and
dignity to the lives of West Virginians,
and for his deep personal commitment
to making sure that their government
served the people.

But more, he will be missed by his
family. Our thoughts and prayers go
to Mrs. Robert, Helen, Mollohan, who
survives his husband, and to his
son, Representative Alan B. Mollo-
han, his wife, Barbara, and children,
and to other family members as they
mourn the great loss of a husband, fa-
ther, and grandfather, Robert H. Mol-
lohan.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS
OF COMMERCE, INSURANCE,
AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY AND
RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRI-
ATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Com-
mittee on Rules, submitted a privi-
leged report (Rept. No. 106–284) on
the resolution (H.Res. 271) providing
for the consideration of H.R. 2670,
-making appropriations for the Depart-
ments of Commerce, Justice, and
State, the Judiciary and related agen-
cies for the fiscal year ending Sep-
tember 30, 2000, and for other purposes,
which was referred to the House Cal-
endar and ordered to be printed.

WORKPLACE PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by di-
rection of the Committee on Rules, I
call up House Resolution 271 and ask
for its immediate consideration.
The Clerk reads the resolution, as fol-
lows:
H. Res. 271
Resolved. That at any time after the adop-
tion of this resolution the Speaker may
pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the
House resolved into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for
consideration of the bill (H.R. 987) to require
the Secretary of Labor to wait for comple-
tion of a National Academy of Sciences
study before promulgating a standard or
guideline on ergonomic practices, report of
the bill shall be dispensed with. General de-
bate shall be confined to the bill and shall
not exceed one hour equally divided and con-
trolled by the chairman or co-chairman of
the minority member of the Committee on Education
and the Workforce. After general debate the
bill shall be considered for amendment under
the five-minute rule, except one motion to recommit with or with-
out缵意, and for its immediate consideration.

The previous question shall be considered as
read. During consideration of the bill for
amendment, the Chairman of the Committee
of the Whole may call attention in recogni-
tion on the basis of whether the Member of-
faring an amendment has caused it to be
printed in the portion of the Congressional
Record designated for that purpose.

Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of
the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone
until a time during further consideration in
the Committee of the Whole a request for a
recorded vote on any amendment; and (2)
reduce to five minutes the minimum time for
electronic voting on any postponed question
that follows another electronic vote without
intervening business, provided that the mini-
imum time for electronic voting on the first
in a series of questions shall be ten min-
utes. At the conclusion of consideration of
the bill for amendment the Committee shall
rise and report the bill to the House with
such amendments as may be adopted.
The previous question shall be considered as
ordered on the bill and amendments thereto
to final passage without intervening motion
except one motion to recommit with or with-
out instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentle-
man from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS)
is recognized for 1 hour.
Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for pur-
pose of debate only, I yield the cus-
tomary 30 minutes to the gentleman
from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which
I yield myself such time as I may con-
sume. During consideration of this res-
olution, all time yielded is for the pur-
pose of debate only.

House Resolution 271 is a modified
open rule, providing for the considera-
tion of H.R. 987, the Workplace Pres-
ervation Act.

The purpose of this legislation is to
ensure that the National Academy of Sciences
completes and submits to Congress its study of a cause-and-effect
relationship between repetitive tasks