

I want to say a word or two about the law school of the University of the District of Columbia. Let us preserve that law school. Let us keep it going.

I want to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], but before I do I want to say, keep this law school. We need it. We need it to keep the principles of educating our children here. Do not give it any kind of standards that it cannot meet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I do want to take this opportunity during the gentlewoman's time on the debate to praise her for the unstinting, unswerving commitment that she has shown on the floor, in the committee, in the Committee on Rules for preserving the University of the District of Columbia Law School. The gentlewoman has our undying gratitude.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my very good friend for yielding me the time.

I want to say to my colleagues, it is unfortunate we cannot, I speak as a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we cannot have today, although I believe it is coming in the near future, a debate on giving low income parents the full range of choice across all competing institutions. I wish we could have a separate debate.

I am opposed to the Moran substitute, which would effectively gut the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] and the very important and I think very necessary reforms that he is trying to enact in the District of Columbia. And I am fascinated that just in terms of the politics of this debate, it is pretty clear, I hope, to those that are watching and listening, who the progressives are and who the conservatives are, the conservatives that are trying to defend an indefensible status quo.

Do not take my word for it. Listen to the Washington Post that last February ran a 5 part series. I hope my colleagues saw it. For those that want to stand up here and defend the District of Columbia public schools on that particular school system, they concluded that D.C. public schools are "a well-financed failure."

A well financed failure. A school system that employs almost two times more administrators than the national average. Despite spending between \$7,500 to \$9,000 per student, which is one of the highest averages in the country, the District of Columbia public schools have one of the highest, in fact the highest, the highest failure rate amongst their students, the lowest graduation rates, the lowest test scores of any inner city school district in the country.

We are afraid to experiment by allowing a few more parents and a few more families a way out. Last year, because we had a break in the congressional schedule, I was able to coach basketball at my son's high school. We came into the District of Columbia and we played games at Gonzaga High School just a couple of blocks away, Carroll High School and St. Johns High School right up the road. The student bodies there were predominantly, if not exclusively, African American, old facilities.

I just found myself saying, why cannot all District of Columbia families have the opportunity to send their children to these type of schools. Schools should be a magnet, not a trap. As the majority leader pointed out, schools exist to serve our children, not bureaucracies. Believe me, if I say nothing else that my colleagues recall today, the District of Columbia public school system will reform itself only when parents are able to choose the schools that they think are best able to educate their children.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would advise all Members that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] has the right to close the debate.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. He used the term "experiment." I think we all agree it is an experiment.

My question to him is, what is this experiment going to prove at the end of it? What will we do in response to that experiment?

This relates back to a dialogue that I had with the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] on this floor two years ago. We have increased the bill from \$42 million to \$45 million. So if this experiment demonstrates that these private schools are excellent, is the Federal Government, are we willing to take taxpayer money and finance all 78,000 students? What is this experiment about?

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is about challenging public schools to improve as well as giving more opportunity to the families of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, what is the experiment? After we look at this, then what do we do next? Because it is an experiment to prove or disprove something.

I will concede to the gentleman that there are good public schools and there are good private schools. What does it mean to take 2,000 vouchers and give to

people, 185 percent of poverty, some do well, others do not do well? Are we prepared to spend taxpayers' money to fund 78,000 kids in the District of Columbia and private schools?

□ 1545

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, personally I am very prepared to make that commitment, and I think that debate is coming in the near future.

But what this is all about, bottom line, is trying to create bootstrap improvement in the public schools and not lose another generation of D.C. schoolchildren.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is a violation of the House rules.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2-¾ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and for my colleagues' indulgence, especially since I have spoken a couple of times in the last 2 days, which is more commonly than I normally speak on the House floor.

This is an issue I feel strongly about, Mr. Chairman. I think it is a shame. I think it is sad that so many people inside this House and outside this House have been fighting to the last ditch on behalf of the system that has trapped thousands and thousands of poor parents and their children in schools where they are not safe, where they do not learn, and where none of us would send our own children: The D.C. public schools.

Now, we have had discussions, on this side of the aisle anyway, about the problems these schools are having. One of my colleagues said it needs some improvement. Well, that is correct. Seventy-eight percent of the 4th graders in the D.C. Public School System cannot read up to the national average. What will happen to those kids, Mr. Chairman? Do my colleagues know what happens to children if by the 4th grade they cannot read?

This is a system that closed down the schools for 3 weeks at the beginning of the year without any notice to the parents, closed down all the schools because the roofs were falling in.

We have heard a lot of arguments against this little scholarship program in this bill. It only affects 3 percent of the kids. That is because we are having difficulty getting the money even to do that. Another one: We cannot let any of these kids escape. We have to hold them all hostage to this system until we can make the whole system better.

How many of us would put our own kids in this system on the gamble that the system will change fast enough so

that our kids will not be mired in a career and a life that will not be successful? Very few people do. Last year this provision was filibustered to death in the Senate by 41 Senators, none of whom sent their kids to the D.C. public schools.

And the argument I like the best is, we cannot use scarce public resources for this. What is scarce in the District of Columbia is not resources, but education. The District has \$7300 per pupil to spend on education. The Washington Post had it right in its headline on this subject. It is a well-financed failure. The system protects jobs while short-changing classrooms. That is why the roofs are not fixed.

Mr. Chairman, I feel kind of personal about this. I have stood with a lot of these parents as they have asked desperately for the right to give their kids a future. I have stood with them in the District of Columbia and I have stood with them in Indianapolis. I asked them there how important school choice was to them, because I knew how controversial it was here. They answered the way myself and colleagues would answer.

Look, I know where the money and the strings and the power is on this. Stand with the parents and these kids. It is their future that is at stake. We should do for them what we would do for ourselves if we were in the same situation. Vote against the Moran substitute and sustain this bill.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moran amendment and in opposition to the bill, and say that the Republicans do nothing to reform school and to provide that basic opportunity, the most basic of all, the opportunity to learn.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong and unequivocal opposition to the inclusion of a provision instituting vouchers in the District of Columbia. Vouchers are not only bad policy but in this instance have clearly become the political tool of the Republican leadership to bash the public school system of this country and to play on the fears of our Nation's parents.

Vouchers have received a significant amount of attention over the past few weeks as we have seen a major push by the Republican leadership to politically capitalize on the education of our children. We have heard our Republican colleagues use words like "scholarships" instead of vouchers to portray the message which their pollsters have said is so vital. I am pleased to see so much effort being put into ensuring that this message is not being lost.

I have never been one to craft my views or modify my position just because the latest questionably accurate poll has produced certain conclusions. Instead, we should be concentrating on proposals and ideas that will increase the quality of education in this country rather than destroy it.

Regardless, as I am sure it does not come as a surprise to any which have followed this issue, I am adamantly opposed to any use of public tax dollars for any voucher-like proposal, including the provisions included in this bill authorizing vouchers to be used in the District of Columbia. Not only do these provisions raise some very serious constitutional questions, but they will do little to help only a few students while greatly benefiting those whose interests are entrenched in private schools.

In fact, Representative ARMEY himself has admitted that this bill will provide vouchers for only 2,000 D.C. children. Last time I checked this would not come close to helping the more than 80,000 school age children which reside in the District. We cannot and should not ignore the problems of today's educational system while attempting to capitalize on political rhetoric. The Republicans have sought to use D.C. vouchers as the answers to our Capital City's problems in its school system. This is wrong.

Any proposal which invites the idea of providing private school vouchers dismantles an educational system which guarantees access for all by leaving "choice" in the hands of private school admissions officers.

In addition to the destruction of equality in the most basic opportunity—the opportunity to learn—there is not one research study, which accurately provides evidence that vouchers improve student learning.

Because of this lack of evidence, I see little reason to establish any type of Federal voucher program, including one in the District of Columbia. We have seen the existing voucher programs in Milwaukee and Cleveland provide no improvement in student achievement levels despite the fact that they have been in operation, at least in the case of Milwaukee, for over 6 years.

In addition to the complete lack of a policy basis for enacting any type of private school voucher proposal, the American people have spoken repeatedly that they have no interest in such programs. Over 20 States, including the District of Columbia, have held referenda on this issue and the citizens of all 20 States have rejected voucher programs.

Our goal as public policy makers should be to construct broad policy which will improve the educational results of all of our children—not a select few.

One of the most deeply rooted values in this country has been that all children are guaranteed access to an education. The public school system has been the institution in this country which has provided this opportunity. Yes, there are problems in our public schools, problems which deserve and need our attention. All of us in Congress realize that the District has a great share of problems in its public school system. However, we should not look for quick fixes to a situation which deserves careful consideration.

As I said at a recent hearing in the Education and Workforce Committee on this subject, those who support vouchers want to abandon our public schools and the vast majority of children who would remain in what is already an underfunded system.

Those of us in Congress need to show leadership in combating the problems that face us as elected leaders—not run away from them.

Only by working within the public school system, both in the District and throughout the Nation, can we build upon the successes and

learn from our failures in our attempts to educate our Nation's children.

In closing, I would urge Member to vote for the Moran amendment, which in addition to its lack of a voucher proposal is a much improved version of this bill in many other areas. Now is not the time to go back on our educational commitments to our children.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury Postal Service, and General Government.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Those watching this debate on this floor or otherwise must think that Lewis Carroll must have written most of the speeches, because they are Alice in Wonderland types.

I do not come to speak about the voucher system. The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] was on the floor and talked about that system. Let him report a bill and we will debate the bill, and we will send it to the other body and they can send it to the President. And if the President decides to veto it, we will have an issue for the 1998 election.

This bill is deadlier than a doornail and every one of my colleagues know it. The Moran amendment that the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] referred to as the Democratic alternative, my friends, the Moran amendment is the Republican bill passed by the U.S. Senate. That is what it is.

This is a game. This is a game to appeal to some very good spirited people who want to have greater opportunity for their children. God bless them. Every one of us does as well. But this is the D.C. appropriation bill, not the authorizing bill, and this is a contentious issue.

Not only that, my colleagues, the House, without any debate, any discussion, and against the advice and counsel of the Secret Service and Lew Merletti, the head of the Secret Service, and the Treasury Secretary, and General Jones, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Bill Webster, the former Chairman of the CIA and FBI, has said open Pennsylvania Avenue. That in the face of the Murrah Building, I tell my good friend from Oklahoma, that saw a car bomb parked close to the Murrah Building and 168 Americans lost their lives. That is why Pennsylvania Avenue was closed.

But without hearings, without discussion, without any thoughtful consideration, we say expose the White House to that threat. My colleagues, remember in Saudi Arabia our troops housed there, but with a not big enough perimeter, had a car bomb explode and kill over 100 American troops. Who on this floor wants to expose the President of the United States, his family, the staff and the visitors to the White House to that risk? If we do not vote for the Moran amendment, that is what we do.

Again, the Moran amendment is the Republican alternative passed to us by the other body. It will be signed by the President. That is the difference between that and the committee's recommendation. Vote for Moran.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my 435 colleagues in the House of Representatives how can the Government say to any American parent, regardless of their economic status, that they cannot send their children to schools that work? How can they force their kids to go to school on a daily basis, terrorized to walk down the halls, having to pass through metal detectors to enter the building, where discipline, achievement and values have been swept away by drugs and violence? Which of us in this Chamber, which of us, I would love for one of us to stand up and say that we would send our children to such a school.

How many years of our children's education would we waste waiting for officials, whose children go to schools across town, by the way, to the schools that work, waiting for the latest experiment to solve these problems? How many of us would put our children into these schools tomorrow based on a politician's promise that they will be better next year?

For these children, these schools are not the great equalizer the other side talks about. These are forgotten kids, the victims of a terrible experiment in education that has gone terribly wrong, an experiment that has failed them for life.

We have heard people say that we should not treat our children as guinea pigs. Well, I have to tell my colleagues what any one of these children's parents will tell us. These children are being treated much worse than guinea pigs. The experiment we have run on them has been much more cruel, and it has failed a long, long time ago. The lost generations of our inner city kids that cannot read and write and do the arithmetic are walking witnesses to that fact.

I ask my colleagues to look at the terrible cost of the status quo, the cruel consequences of our inability as public officials to come up with solutions to a problem that has been with us for the last two decades. The time for empty promises is over. The time for positive action is upon us. The only question left to ask is how many more children will lose out on their most basic birthright as Americans: A quality education? We should promise the kids in the inner cities the same quality of education as the kids in the suburbs.

It has been said that the President will veto this legislation because of the D.C. scholarship program. I ask my col-

leagues this question: If the President can live in public housing and send his child to private schools, why can poor people not live in public housing and send their children to private school?

We can start to fulfill this promise today by voting against the Moran substitute.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to portions of the D.C. appropriation measure, which undermines the ability of the people of the District to govern themselves.

It is instructive that the gentleman from the District of Columbia will not vote on this bill and will not vote on any of the amendments. It is symbolic of the fact that the people of the District are without any choice in this matter.

It is especially troubling that language was included in this bill that will impose a school voucher program in the District. Let me remind my colleagues that the District has already rejected school voucher programs by wide margins. And if things have changed since then, then give the District the money for the scholarships and let them decide whether to use it for vouchers, and that will be real choice.

If we let this ideology of the proponents of school choice, then surely Congress would be willing to entertain other choice initiatives. Let us see if we can improve public transportation, reduce traffic, and improve road conditions by giving individual citizens a voucher to buy a car rather than investing resources into highways and public transportation.

Support the Moran substitute.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I wanted to read my colleagues a letter we received from the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. It says, "As in many areas where education opportunities are poor, a disproportionate number of the children attending failing schools in our Nation's capital are Hispanic."

We strongly support H.R. 1797, the Taylor bill, not the Democrat substitute. And that is parenthetically. I am explaining. Students would benefit from this. This is from the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. They support this.

Here is a resolution from the Baptist Convention of D.C. They support it. Here, Mr. Chairman, is a group called Save the Kids. Over 100 ministers from inner city churches; Baptist churches, Episcopalian, CME, Christian, Catholic, AME, full gospel and Methodist churches, all that support student choice and the voucher scholarship program proposed in the Taylor bill.

Here is a petition signed by over 2,000 Washington, DC residents, people who are interested in having their children compete.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year we were contacted in our office to see if we could hire, temporarily, give an opportunity to a child from Washington, DC to work in our office because she was a junior in high school but did not have her school open this year because the schools in Washington, DC are in such disrepair. We had this young lady working in our office. I believe that she deserves the opportunities that other kids have from all over the country have from affluent families, of being able to pick and choose her school that she could go out and compete in the international and national marketplace.

This is about children. This is not about inner city power. This is about kids of America; giving them a choice.

□ 1600

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman what bill he was referring to. He said H.R. 1797. We are not debating H.R. 1797. That must be some outdated bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ETHERIDGE].

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Moran substitute and in opposition to the risky scheme to provide taxpayer-funded vouchers.

I served as superintendent of schools in my State for a total of 8 years. That State is North Carolina. I know what it takes to improve the quality of education, because in the latest release of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, our fourth-graders gained three times the national average in growth and our eighth-graders gained a full year in this past decade, and our African American students had achieved some of the same gains, only greater than other students.

Vouchers will only divert attention away from improving public schools. Vouchers will increase the cost of education. Vouchers will reduce the accountability of schools to the American taxpayers. And vouchers will rob our communities of the resources needed to improve education.

Mr. Chairman, improving schools takes bold, visionary leadership, it takes a commitment to improving educational opportunity for all children, and it takes setting high standards, holding the school administrators, teachers, parents, and students accountable for these standards. Vouchers are the exact opposite of what is needed.

I urge my colleagues to reject this cowardly act of surrender and support the Moran amendment and against vouchers.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, I come from the fine tradition of public schools in the State of South Dakota. Frankly, we do not need a voucher system in South Dakota. But last year, our legislature approved open enrollment with the full support of the educational community because we recognize the value of parental choice.

When I moved to this area this year, we decided to live in Arlington, Virginia, because of the school system. We predicated that decision based upon the school system. I happen to believe that parents and kids here in DC deserve better than what we have got. The system is broken.

I do not know how anybody can defend the status quo. We have an opportunity here to help provide a better future for the kids and parents who live in this area. We probably see here a culture in which we spend more dollars for less results than anywhere in the country. We need innovation here. And I think it is very important that we move this forward, defeat the Moran amendment, and advance an issue and a cause which I think is going to be very beneficial to the community and to the parents and the kids who live in this area.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD]. The Chair would advise all Members that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] has 9¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] has the right to close.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, where one stands is what one does and not what one says. The opposition says we are supporting a good public school. What we have heard is a problem of public schools. The solution we have is to give 2,000 students an opportunity to live.

Where are the 76,000 students that need that help? We need to find ways to improve the school for the majority and not hold up the false pretense of choice. This is not about choice. I am for choice. This is not anti-parochial school. I am a product of a parochial school.

One needs not to say this is about having income that they can go to private school or not. Parochial school gives opportunity to disadvantaged schools. That is how I got through parochial school. We do not take away the needed resources to make the school work. It is not working. But they are going to ensure that it does not work.

Yes, we wish we had open choice here that anyone could go to any public school. That is not true. We must improve the school. The only way to do that is to support the Moran bill and defeat the House bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for yielding me the time.

I am very disappointed that I have to stand on this side of the House of Representatives to talk on behalf of this voucher bill.

I first became interested in choice vouchers, scholarships, whatever we want to call them, back in 1979, when I became the chairman of the education committee in the Chicago City Council. At that time, a number of minority aldermen came to my meeting that I was having on education, and they are the ones that brought choice to my attention. Since that time, it is something I have been very much supportive of.

Over the course of the 15 years that I have been in the United States House of Representatives, there are several bills that have I put in dealing with voucher choice programs. Unfortunately, they never went anyplace. So today I find myself on the other side of the aisle speaking on behalf of a program I do support. And I support it because there are two other locations in this country where this type of program is going on. One is in Cleveland; one is in Milwaukee.

In both of those communities, choice has improved, the reading level, the math level of the students in the choice voucher program. The program that is going to be established here in Washington, D.C., is a small program, but I believe it is a step in the right direction for these students.

I think choice is not going to do away with the public school system. I certainly do not want to do away with the public school system, but I do sincerely believe that the competition that choice will provide will motivate the public school system to do a better job across the board.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, as the debate nears to a close, I think just about everybody has figured out the Gingrich scheme. This Republican bill is supposed to fail. Of course it will fail, and of course the District will be plunged further into chaos.

That is the whole idea, and that is why even moderate Republicans have to jump bail, and that is why our conservative Democrats are joining us in the Moran substitute. The whole idea is that we finally got a Republican measure in the substitute that the Republicans are attacking as if it was a Democratic bill. It is just the best we can do.

I have never in my life supported a Faircloth measure, and I find myself doing it today. And it is not bad.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD]. The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if it is permitted under the Rules of the House to refer to a Member of the other body by name.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Referring to a Member of the other body in a factual reference to sponsorship of a companion measure is not out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] brings us the bill from the other side of the body, a bill that is acutely interesting to me in that it does not include the parental choice language for 2,000 school scholarships that I authored. A bitter disappointment to me.

The language, exact language, that we have in our bill was offered on the other side by Senator LIEBERMAN and would have been included in this bill, in this substitute, except for the fact that it did not make the cut on a filibuster offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

It did have 58 votes, though, instead of the required 60. It might have had the other two votes if there had not been 22 National Educational Association lobbyists working the halls of Congress on that day. So on a square vote, your substitute would include this parental choice language.

I have worked on this for a long time, and I have to tell you something. While so many times I deal with legislation in somewhat of an objective, abstract way, this is personal, this is very, very deeply personal with me. It is not about my party. It is not about your party. It is not about the city of D.C., although I should tell you, this committee has been generous in that it has put in this bill \$1 million more for the D.C. education budget than what was asked. And we support every effort to rehabilitate the D.C. schools.

But what is upsetting people is, we add, in addition to that extra \$1 million, \$7 million to go directly to the families, directly to the children, for them to pick a school with \$3,200 scholarships for the children.

I know these children. I want to talk to you about two of these children, two of these children that have made it personal for me. There is 9-year-old Sherard. Nine-year-old Sherard should be in the fourth grade. And if he were in public school, he would be. But he can only read at the second-grade level.

By the generosity of some private source, his family received for him a scholarship to go to a private school. When he went to that school, they told him they would have to hold him back to the second grade. And they would have done so but for two very dedicated people who said, "We will continue to tutor this child." And on the basis of

that commitment, Sherard was not dropped back to the second grade but was held to the third grade.

And Sherard is happy. His mother told me that, 2 weeks after Sherard had been in school, 1 week before he would have been in school had he been in the D.C. schools, she had already had more contact from this school about what to do with Sherard, how to help Sherard, how she can attend better to Sherard than she had ever had for any of her other children from the D.C. public schools.

The school reached out to this child. Some private benefactor reached out to this child, his mother is reaching out to this child, two tutors are reaching out to this child, because they love this child too much to let him be the victim of social promotion.

There is another young man that I know of. My neighbor runs a prison ministry. In a prison in D.C. right now, he is teaching a young man in his early twenties how to read out of second- and third-grade primers, despite the fact the young man has a high school diploma from the D.C. schools.

I refuse to let Sherard, and if I can help 2,000 other children in a way that Sherard has been helped to escape the victimization of social promotion from schools that are dysfunctional, so bad that the Washington Post characterized them as well-financed failures, to happen.

This is not about me. It is about some concept. It is not about some experiment. It is not about partisan politics. It is about whether or not we can take an extra \$7 million, an extra \$7 million and help 2,000 precious children. If I had put in this bill \$7 million of extra money to fix potholes, there would not have been one voice raised in protest.

□ 1615

I would ask my colleagues, look in your hearts, think about these children. Are my colleagues going to tell me that fixing children is less important than fixing potholes? I do not think so. Soften your hearts, get beyond the politics, get beyond the big, powerful, well-financed special interests, get beyond the National Education Association. Get in touch with these children and these parents.

I had another couple of parents that I talked to one evening. They were in their early 20's. Neither one had finished school. They had a child; I thought that child was their younger brother. They said, "No matter what, our child will have more."

They got a scholarship, again, from a private funding organization, a Washington scholarship fund, that paid for half that child's expense to go to a private school where it would cost \$3,200, as over and against the \$9,000 that is spent on children in the D.C. schools to fail the children. And this very, very young and dedicated mother took a second job so she could make up the difference between that \$1,500 and the \$3,200.

The slots are there. We know that there are positions available, there are places, little desks for little people, for 2,200 children at least. I personally documented that in my own office by making the phone calls. The schools are there, and the schools are there because the people in the communities saw the need and put the schools in place.

I must tell my colleagues, there is nothing that could be sadder than a school system that has been such a failure to these very, very precious children, and a Congress of the United States that would support a filibuster against their help in the other body, and deny that help in this body.

The only thing that I can think that could break these children's hearts more than to realize that the Congress of the United States think of them has nothing other than a social experiment. They are real children. They are no less precious than my children, they are no less precious than your children, and each and every one of these children deserves the support of my colleagues over and above any disdain one has for those who brought the language to the floor.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands [Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN].

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Once again, Mr. Chairman, we are here on the floor of the House attempting to reverse an assault on the District by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle as they embark on their annual journey to use the District of Columbia as a laboratory and to experiment with their favorite political and ideological issues, ones that they would not attempt in their own districts.

On top of everything else that is abhorrent in this bill, Mr. Chairman, the bill would impose what the authors of the bill would admit is another experiment, the school voucher program, one which might help 3 percent of D.C. students but would definitely keep needed funds from the D.C. public school system.

This is not about parental choice, Mr. Chairman. This is about writing off almost 78,000 children in the District of Columbia, and Democrats are not going to allow you to do that.

As a mother of two public school students who plan to be public school teachers, and as a PTA president for many years, I urge my colleagues to support the Moran amendment and reject this regressive bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Moran substitute for three basic reasons.

One, it eliminates the opportunity to waive the prevailing wage. Anybody working, no matter what they work on,

should be adequately paid. It takes the caps off of medical malpractice, which is nothing more than an attempt to backdoor tort reform to the detriment of consumers. And of course it eliminates vouchers, which have been spoken to all evening.

The fact of the matter is that public education has been the greatest equalizer existing on the face of this Earth. It is the main way that most of us were able to move beyond the immediacy of our burden, of our circumstances.

I believe that if we want to equalize America, public education is the way.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moran substitute.

Today we are witnessing perhaps the grossest abuse of power that many of us have ever seen or will ever see. I remember a movie that I saw, "To Kill a Mockingbird," and the moral and the lesson of that movie was never to use one's strength and power against the vulnerable, or do not just run over the powerless, do not take advantage of those who cannot fight back.

Today Washington, DC, is that mockingbird. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] the Delegate here, does not have a vote. They do not have representation over in the Senate. But we are not only disregarding that fact, we are disregarding the fact that we have a finance control board controlled by and run by conservative economists, a city council, a mayor, those people who are elected to do the work at the local level.

We have 62 riders in this bill that we are trying to defend against with this amendment; 62 riders that talk about everything from how many people can be the security for the Mayor, or whether or not one can have a lease for helicopters, on and on and on. And the most egregious part of this is that you would shove vouchers down the throats of the District of Columbia, despite the fact that over 80 percent of the people voted against vouchers in this District.

Do my colleagues care about education? Many of the people on the other side of the aisle want to get rid of the Department of Education. Where would these people, when many people from communities around this world wanted choice through busing and they stood up and they said, "No, we will not allow you that choice, to open up the District's line so you can have your children go to any of the schools they would choose."

I tell my colleagues, we have to support this amendment. We have to support it because it is the only right thing to do.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD].

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, as a former educator, I have sat here to try and listen to a plan for our children. I have not heard it, and so I will say that I am for the Moran amendment, and I oppose anyone who has not given us a plan for absolutely educating our children in this country.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor to say that my colleagues can cite their deceptive letters and free money petitions all they want to, but I got 90 percent of the vote in the last election in the District of Columbia, and I think I can say with confidence that the people I represent would deeply resent the imposition of vouchers paid for out of our own rescue package money when we have rejected such a measure by 89 percent.

There is another reason for voting against this bill, and I will let the conservative Washington Times have the last word on that, and I am quoting:

Charles Taylor, whose litany of amendments which at one point numbered an incredible 62, threatens to unravel the very fiscally conservative and sound management reforms Congress has been working on for the past 2½ years. It is one thing to question the resolve of a few of D.C.'s elected officials to get the job done, but has Mr. Taylor no confidence in even the efforts of his colleagues on Capitol Hill?

R-E-S-P-E-C-T spells respect. Show some respect for me and for the people I represent. Support the Moran substitute.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, despite all the rhetoric, this amendment is not about vouchers. It is about choice: Whether the residents of the District of Columbia are able to choose their own government, are able to choose their own budget. Their democratically elected government did submit a budget. The mayor, the city council, the congressionally-created control board submitted a consensus budget.

The other body agreed with that budget. All this substitute amendment does is it enables the House to agree with it so that the District of Columbia can run its own affairs.

The chairman of the District of Columbia control board said that this bill, if it is approved as presented to the House, will further weaken the District of Columbia by severely undercutting the ability of the District of Columbia financial responsibility and management authority, the control board that the Congress set up to carry out the mandate of Congress, to restore the District's financial base and implement management reforms. That is all this amendment is all about.

The gentlewoman cited the Washington Times. Here is The Washington Post. It says that this is the House at its worst on D.C. The House of Representatives need not do this to the Na-

tion's Capital or to itself. The city needs an appropriations bill that will help it manage its own affairs competently as both a locality and the Nation's Capital. It does not need and cannot conceivably be helped in this effort to reform itself by what it calls the silly, showboating indulgences of Congressmen who act as if they have nothing else to do.

We have something better to do. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] certainly can do better than to submit this bill. Our House will be proud of the bill that we agreed to if we agree to this substitute amendment. We can get the bill enacted. We can give the money to the District and to the control board that we created to carry out their affairs according to their own priorities.

That is all this is about. It is not about vouchers. It is about giving local government the authority that they deserve. We need to respect them and to respect the democratic process. That is all our amendment is all about.

The alternative is not to have vouchers, the alternative is to have nothing, to have no bill. D.C. will not get its funding. D.C. will not be able to carry out its contracts. The control board we created will not be able to function. That is not fair. It is not right. It certainly is not what the Congress intended.

Do not do this to our Nation's Capital, do not do this to the House of Representatives. Support this amendment. Do the right thing.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, despite all the loud rhetoric we have heard today, this chairman holds the people of DC in respect. That is why I have so suffered the editorials and the charges in the press, and I sometimes wonder whether the editorial writers are talking to their reporters, because the press each morning runs an article showing problems in the city and at the same time on their editorial page they criticize this body for trying to fix those problems.

□ 1630

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker of the House.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker of the House, is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] for a very clever motion. Rather than have a straight-up vote on the issue of whether or not the poorest children in this city should have a chance to get a decent education instead of ending up illiterate and going to jail, rather than having a straight-up debate about the failure of a school system that spends \$10,000 per child, according to the U.S. Department of Education statistics, instead of talking about saving children who are

being destroyed by being trapped in buildings in which they have no future, while we prattle on about reform some day and we talk about all sorts of abstract rights as the children are destroyed, the gentleman from Virginia cleverly said, I will take LAUCH FAIRCLOTH's, a North Carolina conservative, Senate bill and try to substitute it entirely, so we can talk in general about how you might change this gentleman from North Carolina's bill by substituting Senator FAIRCLOTH of North Carolina's bill. It is a wonderful ploy.

But that is not what this vote is really about. The truth is, we will go to conference. The truth is, many of the things they are most concerned about will be fixed or changed. The truth is, that is the normal process. This is not the final passage on the final day. This is moving a bill to conference.

But what the gentleman cleverly did, and it was clever, is he just happened in his motion to drop out the chance for 2,000 children to have a better future. He just happened to drop out the chance for families whose income is below the poverty level to have a better future.

I want every Member of this House to think about this, because I am, frankly, sickened by 14 years of excuses. For 14 years, since A Nation At Risk was printed in 1993, for 14 years we have been promised by the education bureaucrats, the education certifiers, the education professionals, the education unions, that some day we will get decent schools, and the kids are destroyed and they end up in prison.

I talked to Mayor Reardon of Los Angeles, a man who has personally given millions of dollars to literacy programs, a man who has been personally engaged in helping poor children learn how to read. He told me in August, in his estimate in Los Angeles in the poorest neighborhoods, 12 percent of the 18-year-olds are learning to read at the eighth grade level. Eighty-eight percent of the children in the poorest neighborhoods read below the eighth grade at 18 years of age.

There is something tragically, profoundly wrong. We all know it. We know that despite all the promises, despite all the university studies, despite all the committees, today, while we are debating, poor children in America are being destroyed. We know that. We know that when they cannot read, in the age of the computer, they are going to end up in jail. We know that. We know it is not a function of money, because if money would have done it, then in a school system that spends \$10,000 a child, D.C., it would have been fixed.

I have heard Democrats come in here and promise to fix it, and I have heard Republicans promise to fix it, and nobody has fixed it. They closed the school for 3 weeks, every school in this city for 3 weeks, to fix the roofs. Last week they had to close one of the schools to fix the roof.

We had a picture in the Washington Post of what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] was referring to on the news page, not the editorial page. There was a picture of children being led, walking, to another building, because their building had been closed. This is the circumstance we are faced with. This is the circumstance we are all faced with.

Let us be honest about it, that thousands of children today in the Nation's Capitol, at \$10,000 a child, are being cheated. They are being cheated by the politicians, they are being cheated by the unions, they are being cheated by the bureaucracy. The answer of my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is, well, some day, some day.

We have at least a start. It is not a great start, it is not perfect, but it says to 2,000 children in this city, you will have a chance, if your parents are below poverty, and the gentleman from Texas has shown great courage in standing up and saying he wants those children now to have a chance to go to a school that is safe, that is drug-free, and that actually teaches kids, so they can go to college and not go to jail.

What, I would say to my liberal friends, what are they afraid of? Do they think these 2,000 children will have less education? Do they think these 2,000 children will have less of a chance to avoid jail? Do they think these 2,000 children will somehow magically disappear? No.

They are not even afraid the money will come from the schools, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has met that objection, because he was offering \$7 million additional. Normally a person who comes and says, I will give the inner city \$7 million additional, is viewed as a good person. So it does not even come out of the \$10,000.

That means the D.C. schools will have \$20 million additional to spend if those 2,000 kids leave, because the \$10,000 per child stays in the school. So the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DICK ARMEY] is offering \$7 million over and above the budget, and that will increase to \$20 million to be spent per capita, and the kids are already in the school, and now they are still complaining, they are still against it. And do Members know why they are afraid? Because if this works, if this succeeds and these kids have a decent future, the failure and the bankruptcy of the unions and the bureaucracies will be proven.

I just want to say to all of the Members to vote their conscience, but I will tell the Members this. What this vote is about is whether or not 2,000 children have a chance to go to college and not go to jail. And if Members vote no, they know that they can at least say, I did everything I could to save those children from jail, and everything I could to give those children an education, and everything I could to send a signal that we are fed up with children being destroyed by bureaucracies that refuse to reform.

If Members vote yes, then one day down this road, when they meet those children and they are illiterate, ignorant, and helpless, and going to jail, they should look in the mirror when they want to know what happened.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 212, answered "present" 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

AYES—197

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

Wexler
Weygand

Wise
Woolsey

Wynn
Yates

NOES—212

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Parker
Archer	Gillmor	Paul
Armey	Gilman	Paxon
Bachus	Gingrich	Pease
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Barr	Goodling	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Pickering
Bartlett	Graham	Pitts
Barton	Granger	Pombo
Bass	Greenwood	Porter
Bateman	Gutknecht	Portman
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Bilbray	Hansen	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hastert	Radanovich
Bliley	Hayworth	Radmond
Blunt	Hefley	Regula
Boehner	Herger	Riggs
Bonilla	Hill	Riley
Bono	Hilleary	Rogan
Brady	Hobson	Rogers
Bryant	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Hostettler	Royce
Burton	Houghton	Ryun
Callahan	Hulshof	Salmon
Calvert	Hunter	Sanford
Camp	Hutchinson	Saxton
Campbell	Hyde	Scarborough
Canady	Inglis	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Istook	Schaffer, Bob
Castle	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Chenoweth	Jones	Shadegg
Christensen	Kasich	Shaw
Coble	Kelly	Shays
Coburn	Kim	Shimkus
Collins	King (NY)	Shuster
Combest	Kingston	Skeen
Condit	Klug	Smith (MI)
Cook	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Cox	LaHood	Smith, Linda
Crane	Largent	Snowbarger
Crapo	Latham	Solomon
Cubin	LaTourette	Souder
Cunningham	Lazio	Spence
Davis (VA)	Linder	Stearns
Deal	Lipinski	Stump
DeLay	Livingston	Sununu
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Talent
Dickey	Lucas	Tauzin
Doolittle	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	McCrery	Thomas
Ehlers	McDade	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McInnis	Thune
Emerson	McIntosh	Tiahrt
English	McKeon	Upton
Ensign	Metcalfe	Walsh
Everett	Mica	Wamp
Ewing	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Foley	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Forbes	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Fox	Ney	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Northup	White
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Whitfield
Galleghy	Nussle	Wicker
Ganske	Oxley	Young (AK)
Gekas	Packard	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Pappas	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Nethercutt

NOT VOTING—24

Baker	Dooley	Lewis (KY)
Baldacci	Dreier	McCarthy (MO)
Berman	Gonzalez	Miller (CA)
Brown (FL)	Hall (OH)	Schiff
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Schumer
Chambliss	Hefner	Smith (OR)
Clement	Hilliard	Torres
Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Wolf

□ 1656

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hall of Ohio for, with Mr. Wolf against.
Mr. Berman for, with Mr. Chambliss against.

Mr. Baldacci for, with Mr. Lewis of California against.

Mr. HEFLEY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 512, the Moran substitute amendment to DC Appropriations bill, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the school voucher proposal for the District of Columbia.

Our focus as a Federal Government should be on improving our public schools rather than abandoning them. Diverting public money to private schools is not a way to improve education. It is, however, an experiment that is doomed to fail leaving this city's schoolchildren as the casualties.

Not one of us is going to contest the assertion that the D.C. public schools need help. But the way to do this is through efforts like comprehensive school reform, by engaging parents, teachers, and the community in creating and maintaining high performance centers of learning with challenging academic standards.

Creating a voucher system does not solve the problem, it merely shifts the responsibility elsewhere. It also does not guarantee that students from low-performing schools will meet the admission standards of private institutions.

Public school choice, magnet schools, charter schools, and comprehensive school reform efforts can provide effective alternatives to passing our problems off on private schools.

The GOP voucher plan offers this ill-conceived alternative to 2,000 of the school system's 78,000 students. General Julius Becton, the superintendent of the D.C. Public Schools has set out on a serious effort to provide the best education we can for all of the children of the District of Columbia.

Our Federal responsibility in education is to support States and local school districts in their efforts to make better public schools and better learners. It is not an acceptable solution to engage in misguided social engineering by draining funds that would be used to improve the public schools. The Democrats of this House have a plan, a good plan that raises the prospects for all of America's public schoolchildren, not just a select few at the expense of all the rest.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the Sabo amendment to H.R. 2607, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998. H.R. 2607 includes a provision allowing public school contractors to waive Davis-Bacon requirements for construction and repair laborers. This provision is voluntary, not mandatory. This provision would help the District attract volunteer services to help with the emergency repairs needed at the District's public schools. Residents in the entire Washington metropolitan area, as well as most of the Nation, are aware of the dilapidated state of the District's schools. Clearly, the first priority should be to get the schools opened as soon as possible. Yet, an offer by the Promise Keepers to volunteer their services and make repairs at all the schools was denied. They were only allowed to repair one school. This is incomprehensible. Their offer was denied. Why? Davis-Bacon.

Why force schools to spend scarce funding to make repairs that could be made for free? Our children cannot learn if they cannot attend school. There is no reason to give rigid Davis-Bacon rules a veto over the needs of Washington, DC's students. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the Sabo amendment.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Moran substitute. I support it because it eliminates many of the harmful riders that the majority has added to the D.C. appropriations bill, including the \$7 million to fund tuition vouchers for district students.

It is appalling that the majority would blackmail the citizens of this great city into accepting a congressional mandated school voucher program that the District voters overwhelmingly rejected, and is opposed by District school officials.

This voucher plan is seriously flawed. First, it does nothing for 97 percent of the District students who would not receive a voucher. We should be helping all 78,000 of the district's children, not draining taxpayer dollars from the public schools for just a lucky few that may benefit from a voucher program. Further, the amount of the voucher would not even pay entry into many private schools, and many of those that would be affordable have limited slots and barriers to admission.

The real Republican agenda is to undermine public support for public education, and ultimately close down our neighborhood schools. We saw the real Republican agenda in action when they tried and failed to abolish the Department of Education, attempted to block grant education programs, and worked to slash Federal funding for education. Now, desperate to advance their right wing agenda, they are looking to drain taxpayer dollars out of public schools and into private and religious schools.

I call on the majority to stop playing politics with our public schools and join with Democrats to invest more in early childhood education, give relief of our crumbling and overcrowded schools, give Federal support for local school renewal plans, and ensure that we have well-trained teachers.

I urge support for this substitute.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, let me rise in support of this amendment and describe why I believe the philosophy behind the Davis-Bacon Act is so important. It is my belief that the Federal Government should not use its vast procurement power to depress the wages and living standards of construction workers across this country. That philosophy is as valid today as it was when the law was first enacted.

Let's remember the Davis-Bacon Act does not require the payment of the union wage. The Department of Labor is charged with determining the prevailing wage rates for each job classification required for a project based on the area where the particular job is located.

I don't want and don't believe anyone in this body wants to go back over 50 years to a time when low-paid workers move into an area and depress wages for local workers. That is the basis for this legislation and that is why it is important to support this amendment.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support providing the District of Columbia with the flexibility and choice to waive the Davis-Bacon Act to help complete emergency school repair projects.

Opponents of this modest effort claim the sky is falling in and that this is really a vote

on repeal—it is not. The bill does not repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. It is not a mandate and it is not an order. It simply grants D.C. schools the option of waiving Davis-Bacon requirements. This is a vote to promote fairness, flexibility and choice.

Rather than forcing D.C. school districts to comply with an expensive, antiquated, out-of-date Government requirement, Congress has the chance to provide flexibility to the school system. D.C. schools may have the opportunity to fix more roofs, paint more classrooms, or expand classroom learning opportunities.

Instead of putting more taxpayer funds into the pockets of big labor, let's use it to help children—to repair schools and provide a better educational environment. Oppose the Sabo motion to strike, free the District of Columbia schools.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my support for Representative MORAN's substitute that will eliminate the school voucher proposal from the D.C. appropriations bill. While Majority Leader ARMEY may call this provision a scholarship opportunity please do not fail to see this as a voucher program in its purest form. This voucher will do nothing to solve the real problems of the D.C. public schools and only separate children into a two tiered public education system. There will be the lucky few who can find a private school that has a tuition of less than \$3,200 out in the suburbs of Virginia and Maryland. The parents of these children will then be forced to scrape together enough money to pay for the transportation, books, and supplies private schools require an this voucher does not cover. The rest of the children will be left to spend their days in a less than stellar school system. The rest of these children are being ignored by those who support this voucher as castoffs and less than worthy of quality education.

We must ask ourselves what exactly this provision of the bill will achieve? I am not sure but I can tell you what it will not achieve: It will not be cost effective but waste precious tax dollars that will send children away from their neighborhoods to a few select Virginia and Maryland private and religious schools. It will not reflect what the residents of the District of Columbia really want. Instead it allows the Republican leadership to use the children of this city as guinea pigs for their misguided programs. It will not give parents a better opportunity to educate their children but provide federal, public funds for private and religious schools. It will not ensure equity for all students because the bill does not have adequate antidiscrimination language. To make matters worse, voucher programs have been continually voted down in State legislatures in 19 States including the District of Columbia. Therefore, Republican leaders are asking us to support a measure for this city that many of their own constituents have voted against back home.

Finally, I would like to say that I find this measure included in the D.C. appropriations bill an antihome rule violation and a failure of our Government to reform and help mend our inner-city public schools for not just here in the District of Columbia but in cities across this Nation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to strike and to support the provision waiving the

Davis-Bacon prevailing wage law when awarding construction and repair contracts for District of Columbia schools. This provision is voluntary.

Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements increase the cost of school construction—forcing taxpayers to pay more and receive less in return. Government estimates, economic studies, and those involved in the construction industry believe that the Davis-Bacon Act inflates the cost of a construction project by an estimated 5 to 38 percent. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that Davis-Bacon adds about \$2.8 billion, over 5 years, to the cost of all Federal construction projects.

Recent headlines in the Washington Post, highlight the problem with D.C. schools. Every conceivable problem plagues the school system—from fire code violations to water pouring into leaking roofs to boilers that don't work forcing children to wear coats and mittens to class. The General Services Administration surveyed every D.C. school and found that the typical building is more than 50 years old and repair or replacement costs are estimated to be \$2 billion.

The D.C. appropriation bill gives the District a choice—officials can opt to waive the Davis-Bacon Act. This is voluntary, not a mandatory requirement. It is one small step that may help resolve some of the problems facing a school system in deplorable shape—and in the process help the children of the District of Columbia receive the education they deserve.

Support the voluntary waiver, oppose the motion to strike.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2607, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998. This bill not only sets dangerous precedents, it is just plain bad policy. The leadership of this body claims to want to expand the role of State and local authority while shrinking the size of the Federal Government. However, this bill is yet another attempt to micromanage the District of Columbia. There are at least 60 extraneous policy riders on this bill, two of which are so egregious they deserve specific criticism.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill because of its unfair treatment of school children in our Nation's capitol. The bill we consider today establishes a voucher program which purports to allow poor children in Washington, DC to attend private schools. Under this bill, we will allocate nearly \$45 million in Federal funds to pay for the private school education of approximately 3 percent of the District's students—about 2,000 school children. While I in no way would favor denying educational opportunities to children, is this really the best use of Federal dollars? Instead of siphoning money into private and parochial schools, I believe we should focus on fixing the problems in our public schools so that all school children will benefit. We should rebuild our educational foundation to make our public schools a safe haven for learning. Here in the District of Columbia, some schools remain closed because of construction problems. It is a great travesty that in the most influential city in the world students cannot go to school because of fire code violations. It is shameful that today we debate ways to put more children in private schools rather than working on improving our public schools. A free public school education for all Americans is one of the basic tenets of our Nation. We must not abandon this principle.

Another issue that some are trying to claim as a school issue is the waiver of the Davis-Bacon Act. Davis-Bacon for years has guaranteed American workers an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. This law helps promote greater productivity, cost-effective construction and stable economies for America's communities. This should be no exception in the District of Columbia. I have heard from some of my colleagues that eliminating Davis-Bacon will save money on school construction. However, gutting the income of workers will not lower the costs of school construction for taxpayers. In fact, a recent study showed that repeal of Davis-Bacon indicated that square foot construction costs are lower in States with prevailing wage laws compared to those where this law no longer exists. I support the Sabo amendment to strike this provision of the bill. Eliminating Davis-Bacon is unfair to workers in D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot, in good conscience, support this bill. It is bad for children, bad for workers and insulting for District residents who continue to be denied fair representation. This bill represents a step backward for the people of D.C.

I support the Moran substitute amendment which eliminates the dangerous and extraneous riders to this bill. The Moran amendment enables funding to continue to our Federal city without imposing burdensome new policies on D.C. residents. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD]. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PEASE] having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2607) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 264, he reported the bill, as amended pursuant to that rule, back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1700

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2607, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 202, answered "present" 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—203

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Oxley
Archer	Gillmor	Packard
Armey	Gilman	Pappas
Bachus	Gingrich	Parker
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Paxon
Barr	Goodling	Pease
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett	Graham	Petri
Bass	Granger	Pickering
Bateman	Greenwood	Pitts
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bilbray	Hansen	Porter
Bilirakis	Hastert	Portman
Bliley	Hayworth	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hefley	Quinn
Boehner	Herger	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hill	Redmond
Bono	Hilleary	Regula
Brady	Hobson	Riggs
Bryant	Hoekstra	Riley
Bunning	Horn	Rogan
Burr	Hostettler	Rogers
Burton	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Hulshof	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Hunter	Royce
Camp	Hyde	Ryun
Canady	Inglis	Salmon
Cannon	Istook	Sanford
Chabot	Jenkins	Saxton
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Coble	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Coburn	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Collins	Kelly	Sessions
Combest	Kim	Shadegg
Cook	King (NY)	Shaw
Cooksey	Kingston	Shays
Cox	Klug	Shimkus
Crane	Knollenberg	Shuster
Crapo	Kolbe	Skeen
Cubin	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Davis (VA)	Latham	Smith (TX)
Deal	LaTourette	Smith, Linda
DeLay	Lazio	Snowbarger
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Solomon
Dickey	Livingston	Souder
Doolittle	Lucas	Spence
Dunn	Manzullo	Stearns
Ehlers	McCollum	Stump
Ehrlich	McCrery	Sununu
Emerson	McDade	Talent
English	McInnis	Tauzin
Ensign	McIntosh	Taylor (NC)
Everett	McKeon	Thomas
Ewing	Metcalf	Thornberry
Fawell	Mica	Thune
Foley	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Upton
Fowler	Myrick	Walsh
Fox	Nethercutt	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Neumann	Watkins
Galleghy	Ney	Watts (OK)
Ganske	Northup	Weldon (FL)
Gekas	Norwood	Weldon (PA)
Gibbons	Nussle	

Weller
WhiteWhitfield
WickerYoung (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doyle
Duncan
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
GreenGutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchesy
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
NealOberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—28

Baker
Baldacci
Barton
Berman
Brown (FL)
Buyer
Chambliss
Clement
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Edwards
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (WA)
Hefner
Hilliard
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
McCarthy (MO)
McHugh
Miller (CA)
Schiff
Schumer
Smith (OR)
Torres
Wolf

□ 1732

Mr. HOYER (during the vote). Regular order.

The SPEAKER (during the vote). The Chair would note that if, in fact, Members would read the Rules, 15 minutes is the minimum and the Chair has the option of keeping the vote open longer.

The Chair would point out, this is regular order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER (during the vote). Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Only if it relates to the vote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it does relate to the vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, can you, by any chance, give me the page number on which the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects the views of the minority when Jim Wright held the vote open so that we can review those comments?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. But the Chair will get that for the distinguished gentleman in the near future.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it

□ 1737

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wolf for, with Mr. Hall of Ohio against.
Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Baldacci against.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FAWELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. PAUL changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon and was not present for several rollcall votes on H.R. 2607, the FY 1998 District of Columbia Appropriations Act.

I ask that the RECORD reflect that if I had been present and voting, I would have voted as follows: "No" on the Moran substitute amendment and "yes" on passage of H.R. 2607.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 513, final passage of the D.C. Appropriations bill, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, having voted yea, the question is, "Shall the House reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed?"

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Objection. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider. No one has made the motion to reconsider.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HANSEN

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman

from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote as stated by the Chair.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 162, noes 135, not voting 136, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

AYES—162

Aderholt	Hayworth	Portman
Archer	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Armey	Herger	Quinn
Bachus	Hill	Radanovich
Ballenger	Hilleary	Ramstad
Barr	Hobson	Redmond
Bartlett	Hoekstra	Regula
Bateman	Horn	Riggs
Bereuter	Hostettler	Riley
Bilbray	Houghton	Rogan
Billakis	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Hunter	Roukema
Boehlert	Hutchinson	Royce
Brady	Inglis	Ryun
Bunning	Istook	Salmon
Burr	Johnson (CT)	Sanford
Burton	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Camp	Jones	Scarborough
Campbell	Kasich	Schaefer, Dan
Canady	Kelly	Schaffer, Bob
Castle	Kim	Sessions
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shadegg
Christensen	Klug	Shaw
Collins	Knollenberg	Shays
Combest	Kolbe	Shimkus
Cook	LaHood	Skeen
Cox	Latham	Smith (MI)
Crane	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Leach	Smith (TX)
Cubin	Linder	Smith, Linda
Cunningham	Livingston	Snowbarger
Davis (VA)	LoBiondo	Solomon
DeLay	Lucas	Souder
Dickey	Manzullo	Stearns
Doolittle	McCrery	Stump
Dunn	McInnis	Sununu
Ehlers	McIntosh	Talent
Ehrlich	McKeon	Tauzin
English	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Ensign	Moran (KS)	Thomas
Fawell	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Foley	Ney	Thune
Fox	Northup	Tiahrt
Franks (NJ)	Nussle	Traficant
Gibbons	Oxley	Upton
Gilchrest	Pappas	Walsh
Gillmor	Paul	Watkins
Gilman	Paxon	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Pease	Weldon (PA)
Granger	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Greenwood	Pickering	White
Gutknecht	Pitts	Whitfield
Hansen	Pombo	Young (AK)
Hastert	Porter	Young (FL)

NOES—135

Abercrombie	Cummings	Gephardt
Allen	Danner	Goode
Andrews	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Baldacci	Davis (IL)	Green
Barcia	DeFazio	Hamilton
Barrett (WI)	DeGette	Hinojosa
Becerra	Delahunt	Hoyer
Bentsen	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bishop	Dellums	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	Dingell	(TX)
Bonior	Dixon	Jefferson
Boucher	Engel	Johnson (WI)
Boyd	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (CA)	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Evans	Kaptur
Capps	Farr	Kildee
Cardin	Fattah	Kilpatrick
Carson	Fazio	Kind (WI)
Clayton	Filner	Klecza
Condit	Flake	Klink
Conyers	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Coyne	Frost	LaFalce
Cramer	Furse	Lampson

Lantos	Obey	Skaggs
Levin	Ortiz	Slaughter
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Smith, Adam
Lofgren	Pascarell	Spratt
Lowey	Payne	Stabenow
Maloney (NY)	Pelosi	Stenholm
Manton	Peterson (MN)	Stokes
Markey	Pickett	Strickland
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stupak
McGovern	Rahall	Taylor (MS)
McHale	Rangel	Thurman
McIntyre	Reyes	Towns
McKinney	Rivers	Turner
McNulty	Rodriguez	Wasclosky
Meek	Roemer	Waters
Millender-	Roybal-Allard	Watt (NC)
McDonald	Sabo	Waxman
Minge	Sanchez	Wexler
Mink	Sanders	Weygand
Moakley	Sandlin	Wise
Mollohan	Scott	Woolsey
Moran (VA)	Serrano	Wynn
Nadler	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—136

Ackerman	Fowler	Miller (CA)
Baesler	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Baker	Gallegly	Morella
Barrett (NE)	Ganske	Murtha
Barton	Gejdenson	Myrick
Bass	Gekas	Neal
Berman	Gonzalez	Neumann
Berry	Goodlatte	Norwood
Blagojevich	Goodling	Oberstar
Blunt	Graham	Olver
Boehner	Gutierrez	Owens
Bonilla	Hall (OH)	Packard
Bono	Hall (TX)	Parker
Borski	Harman	Pastor
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Petri
Brown (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Pomeroy
Bryant	Hefner	Poshard
Buyer	Hilliard	Rogers
Callahan	Hinchee	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Holden	Rothman
Cannon	Hooley	Rush
Chabot	Hyde	Sawyer
Chambliss	Jenkins	Schiff
Clay	John	Schumer
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Sensenbrenner
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Shuster
Coble	Kennelly	Sisisky
Coburn	Kingston	Skelton
Cooksey	Largent	Smith (OR)
Costello	LaTourette	Snyder
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Deutsch	Lewis (KY)	Stark
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Tanner
Dicks	Luther	Tauscher
Doggett	Maloney (CT)	Thompson
Dooley	Martinez	Tierney
Doyle	Mascara	Torres
Dreier	McCarthy (MO)	Velazquez
Duncan	McCarthy (NY)	Vento
Edwards	McCollum	Wamp
Emerson	McDade	Watts (OK)
Everett	McDermott	Wicker
Ewing	McHugh	Wolf
Foglietta	Meehan	Yates
Forbes	Menendez	
Ford	Metcalf	

□ 1757

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber for rollcall vote No. 514. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, regrettably I was not present to vote on rollcall vote No. 514 on the motion to table the motion to reconsider. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 514, the motion to reconsider the DC bill I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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 concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

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. 2158) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, 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. 2169) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, in my considered opinion, I believe every Member of this body has had enough fun for today. We have a few Members that want to conduct some routine business, a unanimous-consent request, to help with the general orderly business of the House.

It would be my preference, Mr. Speaker, that these Members be allowed to do that. I see the distinguished minority whip is there. I would like to ask the whip if perhaps he might be able to give me some assurance that these Members could conduct that business in an orderly fashion, and I could release the rest of the body to begin their district work period.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague that we do not expect any other votes on this side of the aisle.

But I would also say to my colleague, and with respect to the Speaker as well, it is my understanding at the beginning of this Congress it was decided

that we would have votes held to 17 minutes. I want to note that that vote that we just had went over 40 minutes.

When the Speaker says in the middle of a vote that he has prerogatives under the House to extend the vote beyond the 15 minutes, I suspect under the Rules, and I do not know this, but I suspect he perhaps is right. But it was the announced policy of the Speaker and of the majority that we would hold votes to 17 minutes, and the public should take note that that vote went over 40 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would simply like to observe for the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] that on one recent occasion, at the request of the Democratic cloakroom, a vote was held open for more than 17 minutes because Members were at the White House meeting with the President, and that the Chair always has the prerogative to lengthen a vote at the Chair's discretion, and that is clear in the rules.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I believe I am correct in understanding, Mr. Speaker, that it is the assurance of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] that there should be no more recorded votes expected.

That being the case, I would encourage everyone to return to their districts, have a productive work period, and please do enjoy time with their families.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2579

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2579.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1984

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1984, on which my name appeared in error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the chair the rollcall numbers on which I missed votes, due to being at the White House this morning.

On rollcall No. 507, I would have voted "yes." That was the District of Columbia Appropriation. On rollcall No. 508, the Transportation Appropriation Conference Report, I would have