

Riley	Sherwood	Thornberry
Rogan	Shimkus	Thune
Rogers	Shuster	Tiahrt
Rohrabacher	Simpson	Toomey
Ros-Lehtinen	Skeen	Traficant
Rothman	Smith (MI)	Upton
Roukema	Smith (NJ)	Vitter
Royce	Smith (TX)	Walden
Ryan (WI)	Souder	Walsh
Ryun (KS)	Spence	Wamp
Salmon	Stearns	Watkins
Sanford	Stump	Watts (OK)
Saxton	Sununu	Weldon (FL)
Schaffer	Sweeney	Weller
Sensenbrenner	Talent	Whitfield
Sessions	Tancredo	Wicker
Shadegg	Tauzin	Wilson
Shaw	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Shays	Terry	Young (AK)
Sherman	Thomas	Young (FL)

NAYS—200

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

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Farr

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	Kilpatrick	Scarborough
Bereuter	Millender-	Scott
Dunn	McDonald	Weldon (PA)
Hulshof	Rahall	

□ 1659

Mr. FATTAH and Mr. LEVIN changed their 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.

Stated against:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 561, I was detained by constituents and was unable to make it in time for this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3194, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 354 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 354

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3194) 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, 2000, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 354 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3194, the D.C. appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

The rule provides for one hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Additionally, the rule waives all points of order against the bill.

House Resolution 354 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 354 is a closed rule, recognizing the full and fair debate that the House had on similar legislation earlier in this Congress. This rule will assist the House to move forward in the appropriations process.

H.R. 3194 continues to fund the District of Columbia at \$75 million over the President's request and makes no changes to funding levels from the previous D.C. appropriations bill. With this bill, we continue to provide \$17 million for scholarships to low-income D.C. residents, \$2.5 million to help improve children's health centers, and \$5 million to provide incentives for the adoption of foster children.

The President's request did not include funding for any of these important programs.

With this legislation, charter schools will have access to construction funds, the schools will have the same opportunity to expand as other public schools, and parents will be able to send all of their children to the same charter school. H.R. 3194 enacts the \$59 million tax cut passed by the D.C. City Council, and it works with the Council to make vital changes in city management that will place Washington, D.C. on the road to financial recovery.

This bill also restores the original language for needle exchange initiatives, continuing our commitment to prohibit Federal support for these dubious and irresponsible programs. The Clinton administration's own Department of Health and Human Resources prohibits the use of Federal funds for needle exchanges, and we should maintain this consistent standard.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have taken the necessary steps in this bill to bring this chapter of the appropriations process to a close. I applaud the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) for his patience and his willingness to work through this difficult process, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in the immortal words of Yogi Berra, it is *deja vu* all over again. The first District of Columbia appropriations bill was loaded with Republican riders and it was vetoed. The second D.C. appropriations bill was loaded not just with riders but also with the Labor-HHS appropriation. It is yet to be vetoed but it certainly will be.

Before us today is D.C. Three, yet another attempt on the part of the Republican majority to move a Christmas tree to the White House even before the Thanksgiving turkey is on the table.

Mr. Speaker, pity the residents of this city. What have they done to the Republicans in this body to deserve this mistreatment? Why should their

appropriation be loaded up with ornaments designed to make good Republican boys and girls happy? This bill is truly a turkey and the Republican majority ought to face the facts and start dealing straight with the people of this city, the Democratic Members of this body and the President of the United States.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. Let us get on with legislating and stop all this tree trimming and turkey stuffing. Give the people of this city a break and send the President an appropriations bill he can sign. Give us all a real Christmas present so that we can finish our business and go home for the holidays.

I urge Members to vote against this bill so that we can send the residents of this city a real holiday treat, a bill he can sign.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, forgive me. Is the gentleman confused? I am. I feel like saying, where are we? Why are we here? Why is there another D.C. bill on the floor? How could there be another D.C. bill on the floor? One was just voted in the Senate yesterday.

I did not realize that this body loved D.C. so much that it wanted to keep voting D.C. bills. One is on its way to the President's desk. Remember last Thursday we just voted for a D.C. bill. It was called the Labor-HHS-D.C. bill. That must be a new agency.

We passed the D.C. bill they wanted. That one is about to be vetoed. Let me try to get this straight. One veto is not enough? They want two vetoes? Do they want them simultaneously or do they want them sequentially?

The last bill, we were told, was the one the majority wanted. That is why they put Labor-HHS on the D.C. bill. All of them voted for that in conference. Now they are back again with another D.C. bill. What could be the reason for a stand-alone bill? What we are seeing is the majority manipulating the smallest, most defenseless appropriation. They do not want yet another D.C. bill before the last D.C. bill is vetoed. They want another vehicle for the majority. The District is no longer a city. It is a vehicle. They want to send this vehicle over to the Senate in order to tie on yet some more bills to send to the White House to be vetoed.

What kind of way is that to treat a city of half a million people whose own money and virtually alone their own money is in this bill?

Free up the D.C. bill. Three D.C. bills are enough. Let D.C. go.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the problem with this rule is that it does not allow us to make a tiny, minuscule little change, but as little a change as it would be it would have profound consequences. We simply want to make it clear that a private, nonprofit organization in the District of Columbia can receive private funds and do with those private funds whatever they choose to do. In other words, treat that organization like we do every other private nonprofit organization.

All we are asking for is that this bill be given what the full, entire House Committee on Appropriations approved; give us the bill that the full House of Representatives on this floor approved; give us the bill that the full Senate Committee on Appropriations, the full Senate itself approved; give us the bill that the conference between the House and Senate approved. One tiny little change would give us that bill.

Then not only would we agree with this rule, we would agree with the bill. The bill would be sent over to the White House. It would be signed and that little \$429 million, which is infinitesimal compared to our Federal budget, would then be able to be spent in the District of Columbia as its citizens deem appropriate. To them, it means the difference between a solvent government that can respond to the needs of its citizens and one that is kept hostage by the Congress of the United States.

That is the problem with the rule. Let us act reasonably. Then we can both get together and do what is right in the interest of the citizens of the District of Columbia and in the public interest.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. LINDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. LINDER:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert in lieu thereof:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3194) 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, 2000, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. An amendment striking section 175 shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) yield the balance of his time?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, at this point let me state that though this amendment is somewhat unusual, we have no objection to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, is not a vote automatic, a roll call vote automatic on an appropriations conference report?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote before us was on the rule.

Mr. FROST. On the appropriations bill, I am sorry, on the rule. I withdraw my question. There will be a vote; because Members had asked me, there will be a vote on the actual appropriations conference report?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. FROST. Not on the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentlemen is correct.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 3194.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 354, I call up the bill (H.R. 3194), making appropriations for the government of the District of