

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2000 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1999 amount, the 2000 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2000 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1999	\$9,134,234
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	8,499,273
House bill, fiscal year 2000	8,449,742
Senate bill, fiscal year 2000	8,273,820
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2000	8,374,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1999	-760,234
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	-125,273
House bill, fiscal year 2000	-75,742
Senate bill, fiscal year 2000	+100,180

DAVID L. HOBSON,
JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
ROGER F. WICKER,
TODD TIAHRT,
JAMES T. WALSH,
DAN MILLER,
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT,
KAY GRANGER,
C.W. BILL YOUNG,
JOHN W. OLVER,
CHET EDWARDS,
SAM FARR,
ALLEN BOYD,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
DAVID R. OBEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CONRAD BURNS,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
LARRY E. CRAIG,
JON KYL,
TED STEVENS,
PATTY MURRAY,
HARRY REID,
DANIEL K. INOUE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

□ 1515

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 260

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2587) 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 first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(c) of rule XIII or section 306 or section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be

confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose 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.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 260 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2587, the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 4(c) of rule XIII, requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report; section 306, prohibiting consideration of legislation within the Committee on the Budget's jurisdiction unless reported by the Committee on the Budget; and section 401, prohibiting consideration of legislation providing new entitlement authority which becomes effective during the current fiscal year, of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill. The rule also waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unau-

thorized appropriations and legislation on an appropriations bill.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 260 specifically structures consideration of four amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR). These amendments may be offered only by the Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled between the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. The rule also waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report.

Additionally, this rule accords priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This encourages Members to take advantage of the option to facilitate consideration of amendments and to inform Members of the details of pending amendments.

The rule also provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on postponed questions to 5 minutes, provided that the vote immediately follow another recorded vote and that the voting time on the first in a series of votes is not less than 15 minutes.

House Resolution 260 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority Members of the House.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 260 is an open rule similar to those considered for other general appropriations bills. Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to the District of Columbia appropriations bill will have the opportunity to do so.

In addition, in order to better manage the debate, the Committee on Rules has structured the debate on four specific amendments:

Amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) would prohibit the use of District and Federal funds on a needle exchange program for illegal drugs, or for any payment to any individual or entity who carries out any such program.

Amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) would prohibit the use of funds contained in this bill from being used to allow joint adoptions by persons who are unrelated by either blood or marriage.

Amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) would prohibit a minor's possession of tobacco products in the District.

And, finally, amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) would prohibit the use of funds from being used to legalize or reduce penalties for the possession, use,

or distribution of any schedule 1 substance under the Controlled Substance Act.

Under this open rule, the House will have the opportunity to exercise its responsibility to address these important social issues facing the District. Rather than avoiding controversial issues like needle exchanges, legalizing marijuana, and adoption by domestic partners, Members of this House will be accountable to their constituents and the people of the District. I am pleased that this open rule will bring these honest policy disputes out into the open so that the American people will know where their representatives stand on these issues that affect them right in their own towns and neighborhoods.

I also want to discuss briefly the base bill this rule makes in order. H.R. 2587 appropriates a total of \$453 million in Federal funding support for the District, which is \$230 million below last year's level and \$59 million above the President's request. Additionally, the bill sends \$6.8 million in District funds back to the people of Washington, \$4 million less than fiscal year 1999 but \$40 million more than requested by the President.

Madam Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has once again performed admirably, working within the responsible budget limits imposed by the Balanced Budget Act while managing the available resources to best serve the American people. I applaud the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for their hard work to produce this solid legislation.

While this bill supports a broad range of District programs, I would like to focus on the bill's important provisions to improve education for the students of Washington, D.C. Specifically the bill provides \$17 million for a new scholarship to help District students attend college. It also reduces a number of regulatory barriers to ensure that District students have the chance to explore the opportunity of charter schools. 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. Good education policy must start at the local level, and this bill empowers local officials to make the tough decisions necessary to move beyond the serious problems that currently plague their schools.

Additionally, this bill works with local governments to improve city management, encourages adoptions of children currently in foster care, and enacts the \$59 million tax cut passed by the D.C. City Council.

This is a responsible bill that makes the Federal Government a partner in D.C. government and helps our Nation's capital move closer to the success and independence that its residents deserve.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2587 was favorably reported out of the Committee on

Appropriations as was this open rule by the Committee on Rules. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the Committee on Rules has done it to the District of Columbia again. The Republican majority has deliberately stuck a finger in the eyes of the residents of the District of Columbia. Accordingly, I rise in opposition to this rule which specifically makes in order four Republican amendments which seek to micromanage the District, all to advance an agenda which may or may not be shared by the citizens of this city.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia made an eloquent plea to the Committee on Rules yesterday asking that the committee not make in order amendments which affect social policy in the city she represents. The committee totally ignored her, Madam Speaker, and in fact the committee did exactly what she asked it not to do.

Madam Speaker, I am not here to advocate one social policy over another. I am not here to advocate the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes, or needle exchange programs, or the sale of tobacco to teenagers, but I do think that the Mayor and the Council of this city ought to be given an opportunity to govern and make the kind of decisions that city councils, county governments and State legislatures in the rest of the country are allowed to make without interference and micromanagement by the U.S. House of Representatives.

The Committee on Rules apparently does not think that Mayor Williams and the City Council should be given that kind of responsibility. Instead, they have made in order in this rule amendments which would prohibit the city from counting ballots cast in an election last year, which would prohibit the city from using its own money to allow adoptions by unmarried couples, and which would prohibit the city from contributing its own funds to a needle exchange program specifically designed to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS in this city.

Madam Speaker, the Mayor and all 13 members of the City Council have asked that these riders, among others, not be included in this appropriations bill. But the Committee on Rules seems to know what is best for this city. This paternalism is insulting and patronizing, Madam Speaker, and for that reason I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and of the underlying bill that the rule authorizes to be considered.

I appreciate the Committee on Rules' cooperation in putting the package together for fair consideration of this appropriations measure. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) with whom I have worked, and, of course, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

This rule keeps in place what the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations have sought to do; that is, to, to the maximum extent possible, respect and follow the budget that was put together by the Mayor and the City Council in the District of Columbia.

There are certain things, of course, that we undertake pursuant to our constitutional obligation. Article 1, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution provides that this Congress has exclusive legislative authority regarding the District of Columbia. However, many years ago, we delegated as much as we could through home rule charter to the District, and I am pleased that the budget that was adopted by the City Council, by the Mayor and by the D.C. Control Board is followed in this appropriations measure.

Let me mention, so that all Members will be fully aware, several things that are in the bill that I do not believe will prove controversial. They are not controversial, and I believe they should be the focus of the consideration of the rule and of the underlying bill.

For example, we are all familiar with the problems of drug and crime that have plagued the District for far too many years. We have a very ambitious program created in this piece of legislation, a \$25 million addition on top of other drug testing and treatment funds for the Federal Office of Offender Supervision that is in charge of supervising some 30,000 persons that are on probation or parole within the District of Columbia.

One of the conditions upon being on probation or parole and not being incarcerated is that they remain drug-free. We all know they are not remaining drug-free. In fact, working with the Chief of Police, Mr. Ramsey, here in the District, he advises me, as other people do, that this population of 30,000 offenders is the core of so much of the crime that continues to plague the District of Columbia, persons that are free on supervision, or supposed supervision, that commit hundreds of crimes apiece in many cases, all too often because of the link between crime and drugs.

This bill establishes for those 30,000 offenders a program of consistent, universal drug testing, for some of them once a week, for some of them twice a week, coupled with a major expansion of the drug treatment programs, saying to those offenders, if you wish to remain free on the streets, you must remain free of drugs.

□ 1530

This will be the largest program of its kind of any city in the United States of America. We are dead serious about the war on drugs. This bill takes the largest step we have taken toward attacking that problem. I believe it deserves focus.

We also have within this bill the ratification of the bold tax cut plan that was adopted by the city council and the mayor in the District of Columbia beginning with \$59 million the first year and larger amounts thereafter of property tax and income tax relief trying to help revitalize the city that has lost over 200,000 people in recent years, trying to be part of turning it around with economic development initiatives.

And we all know, of course, that even if they have a more vibrant economic city, it still has to be a safe city. So we ratified the council's action in this bill at the same time as we undertake the attack on drugs.

We have \$5 million for a special environmental clean up of the Anacostia River. I want to especially commend one of the members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who took a special interest in that particular measure.

We have a major problem within the District of Columbia, one of the many accumulated problems through many bad years for the District of long-term foster care, 3,500 kids that need a permanent, stable, loving home. We have \$8.5 million for adoption initiatives to help solve this long-term problem and get these kids out of long-term foster care and adopted into stable, permanent, loving homes. That is a very important initiative.

The mayor and the council have been very diligent in bringing in, for the second year, a balanced budget within the District of Columbia. Thanks to some changes in the Federal relationship, some expenses that the Federal Government has assumed, they have a balanced budget; and we respect the priorities they put in.

We also create further tools for rightsizing the size of city government. With the Control Board, in recent years, taking the lead and the gentleman who is now mayor of the city, Anthony Williams, who was Chief Financial Officer of the Control Board leading that way the city has been working to rightsize city government. There is still a problem with too many city workers for the size of the community. We have \$20 million to help them with the downsizing initiative through buyouts and early retirements for persons that should be retired from the city payroll but that we need to make sure that we do it without a disruptive mechanism.

We have these and other important initiatives that I think justify the accent upon the positive. We have a new mayor, we have a new council that is working diligently on the problems of city government, and we have also

made sure that we do not open up new difficulties in this particular bill.

I commend the Committee on Rules because the amendments which they placed in order are amendments which have previously been important to this House of Representatives. For example, the needle exchange prohibition with public funds that we will be voting on later is the identical provision that was approved by the House, approved by the Senate, and signed into law by the President of the United States last year. The amendment we will vote on is to continue that policy, not to create a new one.

The committee has placed in order an amendment that is different in some ways, however, when it comes to the issue of the medical marijuana initiative petition that was conducted in the District.

We dealt with, last year, a prohibition on counting the ballots. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) which we will offer later today that the Committee on Rules has placed in order is not quite the same. It is a prohibition on changing the law in D.C. to legalize marijuana, but it is not a prohibition against counting the ballots.

The amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) relating to adoption needing to be by couples who are related by marriage or by blood is the same language that was adopted by this House last year. It is not something new that has been brought up.

The language of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) regarding tobacco was also something that was attached by the House to this legislation last year.

So the Committee on Rules has avoided opening new fronts with the amendments that are placed in order. I recognize that there are some issues of social policy where there may be disagreements between persons in the District, persons in this Congress, persons on one side of the aisle and persons on the other side of the aisle. But I think when the House works its will with those amendments, we will see that what remains is a bill that promotes fiscal responsibility, that keeps the budget balanced running a surplus with tax cuts to help with the economic revitalization of the District of Columbia, significant incentives regarding the problems of drugs and crime and their interrelationship in D.C. and other measures such as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has pointed out to strengthen the educational system through the charter schools provisions being made permanent.

They are 5 percent of the District's school enrollment right now. They are projected to be 10 percent this fall, and also the education initiative with the D.C. scholarships, as it is called, which is a tuition aid grant modeled after the tuition aid grants that are currently in place in virtually every State in the Union.

These are things that the Committee on Rules has left intact, they have not fostered disagreement or argument over these issues, and I think it is important that, as we consider the rule, we have that perspective. Yes, we will have disagreements over certain items in the bill, but after we resolve those disagreements, I urge people to adopt the underlying bill, and I urge adoption of the rule that makes it possible.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who have worked so hard and so well to bring the D.C. appropriation to the floor early this year. My thanks also to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) who met with the District's new mayor Tony Williams and me earlier this year and indicated that they would work for early consideration of the city's budget. They have kept that promise.

I want to say a special word of sincere appreciation to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) in particular for his openness and communication with me and with city officials that enabled us to settle amicably the small differences that inevitably arise. His respect for the work of our new mayor and the D.C. City Council is manifested in the city's consensus budget which came with the approval of the District's Control Board and to which the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has now given his approval as well.

This hard work is now threatened by amendments that legislate on the appropriation in ways that are strongly opposed by the new mayor and all the members of the revitalized city council. Congress has the right to make policy decisions for this Nation. You have no right to dictate policy to a local jurisdiction. Yet four amendments have been made in order and protected, and they are taken straight out of the annals of authoritarianism.

They would impose on the District a provision that is not only grotesquely anti-democratic, but also is moot, that prohibits local funds for a constitutional test of congressional voting rights, a prohibition on even local funds to contribute to a private life-saving needle exchange program that has saved hundreds of residents from death and disease caused by the HIV/AIDS epidemic, a prohibition on unmarried couples jointly adopting a child despite 3,000 children awaiting adoption, an entire bill penalizing the possession of tobacco by minors that Mayor Williams has specifically asked be deferred in favor of his own approach, and an amendment that seeks to overturn a local initiative on medical marijuana when no such law has been enacted.

The bill itself also contains two provisions highly objectionable to city

residents and elected officials that I cannot possibly support, a prohibition on the use of even local funds for abortions for poor women and a bar on implementation of the city's domestic partners law.

The district has just elected a new reform minded mayor and revitalized its city council. They have sent us a balanced budget with a surplus consisting only of their own money with prudent investments in neglected services and with a tax cut for residents and businesses. Their work should not be undermined by the imposition of the personal preferences of Members on a local jurisdiction when Members are not accountable to local voters. The cumulative effect of these appendages to what is essentially a local budget is so obnoxious that a veto specifically has been threatened. I can only plead with my colleagues to save my appropriation from needless contention and a veto by defeating each and every one of these autocratic, anti-home rule amendments. This rule defeats the good work of the subcommittee by drowning it with irrelevant legislation anathema to the people I represent.

I therefore must ask my colleagues, must plead with my colleagues, to vote against this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the chairperson of the appropriations subcommittee, for working very hard on this bill and coming up with a bill that from every budgetary standpoint, from every appropriations standpoint, is a good bill. It should be passed. We should be unanimous here in our support of the consensus budget that is reflected in this appropriations bill.

In fact, we went beyond the consensus budget and put in things that the mayor and other leaders of the city wanted. We have got more money in here for drug treatment programs, for court programs that supervise probationers and parolees. We have got programs that clearly will substantially reduce the rate of crime in the city. We have got money to address child abuse and neglect, to assist foster care children in getting adopted. Lots of good things, and I wish I could stand up here right now and say let us vote for this rule because it is such a good bill.

Unfortunately, I cannot. I have to urge the body to vote against the rule because it is not a good rule, it is not a fair rule, it is not an appropriate rule. It specifically enables debates on issues that are not appropriately within the appropriations committee's jurisdiction. The reason why this is not a good rule is it puts in things that lie well beyond the scope of the Committee on Appropriations, well beyond the scope of Federal governance.

It makes in order four amendments, four amendments offered by Republican colleagues, makes in order no amendments offered by Democratic colleagues, particularly the one offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) in alliance with the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), it makes that out of order, and makes in order four amendments, all of which are inappropriate and would be ruled out of order if this was an open rule.

This should be an open rule. Because it is not, I have to urge all the Members of this body who believe in fairness and in the integrity of the appropriations process to vote no on the rule.

The needle exchange amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) inserts new language, goes beyond the use of funds appropriated in the act and places conditions on private funds.

□ 1545

That is not appropriate for an appropriations bill.

We rejected what he was trying to do in full committee; but yet, the Committee on Rules enables him to take out the language that we agreed to in a bipartisan vote, a strong bipartisan vote in full committee.

The Largent amendment would impose a new duty upon District officials. It is an unfunded mandate, imposes a new requirement on District officials to conduct additional screening requirements on applicants for adoption that go considerably beyond the funding issues in this bill to determine who is and who is not eligible to adopt children in the District of Columbia. It is going to restrict a lot of fine people from being able to adopt children when we have more than 3,000 kids in need of adoption.

The Bilbray amendment writes criminal legislation in an appropriations bill. This should be with the Committee on the Judiciary. I am sympathetic with what the gentleman wants to do, but we do not write criminal penalties into appropriations bills. What are we doing that for? It is not the right thing to do. And one can make an argument that this is not even lawful, to be putting in criminal penalties for minors' possession of tobacco. As much as we might like to do it, it does not belong in an appropriations bill.

Then the fourth amendment, this is the Barr amendment, this is brand new. We rejected the gentleman's attempt to prevent the District from counting its own ballots on its own referendum. It would have cost about \$1.30 to press a button and announce the results of the referendum. The committee, in a bipartisan aye vote, agreed that we should not be doing that. So we rejected it. So now the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) has a brand-new thing, brand-new language that needs a hearing, needs consideration by the

Committee on the Judiciary that places new penalties on the possession of a long list of substances: peyote, mescaline, marijuana, a whole long list of things.

We have not thought about this, because we have not had any hearings; we do not have any knowledge about what we should be doing on this.

This is clearly authorizing legislation. It has nothing to do with the appropriations bill; and yet, the Committee on Rules makes it in order. The Committee on Rules should not have made that in order. So four amendments do not belong in this bill. If they get attached to this bill, we are going to vote against this bill, and the President is going to veto the bill. They should not be in here. We should be giving credit where credit is due to the Committee on Appropriations for appropriating properly. If we were considering just an appropriations bill, we would have unanimous support for it, but we cannot go writing these kinds of laws on an appropriations bill.

So I strongly urge a "no" vote on the rule. We have a different situation this year from past years. Washington, D.C. is no longer a sharecropper's settlement on a congressional plantation. We should be treating them like every other city in our own Congressional districts and that is why we should vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as required to explain that the only notice that the Committee on Rules got was that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) had an amendment to introduce was not submitted to the Committee on Rules; she mentioned it in her testimony. It is a striking amendment, and it is in order.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for letting us know that the amendment has been stricken and made in order, that the Norton-Kilpatrick amendment will be able to be debated.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule. Madam Speaker, there are 500,000 people who choose to call Washington, D.C. their home. This rule is undemocratic, and it is unfair.

My colleagues may not know it, but the residents of D.C. pay both local and Federal taxes. Last year, some \$4.2 billion worth of Federal taxes were paid, more than some States pay. My colleagues may not know it, but D.C.'s population is larger than three other States in our Union who are represented by two Senators, as well as Congress people in this House of Representatives.

The rule that was let yesterday from the Committee on Rules does not allow

the District to operate as any other American jurisdiction would be allowed to do so: with its own local tax base. I think it is unconscionable, it is undemocratic, and it is unfair.

Madam Speaker, D.C. residents are taxpaying American citizens and are denied full representation here in the Congress. Some of the amendments that are allowed in order ought not be in an appropriations bill, they should go through the regular process. It is a bad rule, it is unfair, it is undemocratic, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and have an open and honest debate on the important issues that the Nation is watching us for.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2605, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 261

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 7, line 1, through page 9, line 2; page 36, lines 11 through 25. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the

Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), 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.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 261 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2605, the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule 13, which requires a 3-day layover of the committee report. The rule also waives clause 2 of Rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, and it waives clause 5(a) of Rule XXI, which prohibits a tax or tariff provision in a bill reported by a committee with jurisdiction over revenue measures. These are waived against provisions in the bill, except as otherwise specified in the rule.

Madam Speaker, this rule accords priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This will simply encourage Members to take advantage of the option in order to facilitate consideration of amendments on the House floor and to inform Members of the details of pending amendments.

The rule also provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment, and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on postponed questions to 5 minutes, provided that the vote immediately follow another recorded vote, and that the voting time on the first in a series of votes is not less than 15 minutes. This will provide a more definite voting schedule for all Members and hopefully will help guarantee the timely completion of the appropriations bills.

House Resolution 261 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority Members of the House.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 261 is a typical open rule to be considered for general appropriations bills. This rule does not restrict the normal open amending process in any way, and any amendments that comply with the standing Rules of the House may be offered for consideration. While a vast number of amendments is not expected, the rule permits those Members who have amendments every opportunity to offer them.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2605 appropriates a total of \$20.2 billion in discretionary budget authority, which is \$880 million below last year's level and \$1.4 billion below the President's request. As we all know, the Committee on Appropriations has, once again, had to balance a wide array of interests and make tough choices with scarce resources. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member for their work on this legislation.

Specifically, the bill provides \$4.19 billion for the Corps of Engineers for civil projects such as flood control, shoreline protection and navigation and environmental projects, which is an increase of \$91 million over last year's level. The bill also provides \$784.7 million for the Bureau of Reclamation to maintain, operate, and rehabilitate Bureau projects and western water infrastructure, which is \$2.6 million over last year's level.

As we keep our fiscal House in order, we must ensure that all funding is spent efficiently and where it is needed most. This bill achieves this goal. Notwithstanding the constraints we now face after decades of fiscal irresponsibility, H.R. 2605 effectively funds solar and renewable energy programs, nuclear energy programs, science programs, and atomic energy defense activities.

Madam Speaker, clearly the Department of Energy is a department that is plagued by mismanagement and abuse, and I want to comment on two specific provisions in this appropriations bill that the Committee on Appropriations has taken to reform and improve management and security.

First, the bill reduces contractor travel by 50 percent, a decrease of \$125 million from last year's level. The General Accounting Office has reported widespread abuses of travel funds, excessive waste of taxpayers' money, and the overall use of contractors on Department of Energy programs. We cannot stand for this kind of mismanagement and waste, and I strongly support the significant reduction in funding for contractor travel in this bill.

I also wanted to comment on the bill's provisions that delays \$1 billion in obligations for the Department of Energy until after June 30, 2000, and