

other governments would follow that strong moral lead. So I am delighted to join with the gentleman in introducing this unanimous strong resolution, and I hope that this is something that is going to lead the way for our own Government and other governments.

One point ought to be clear. People say we cannot intervene in another country's affairs, but the world has never recognized Indonesia's grab of East Timor. We have more legal right internationally to intervene in East Timor than ever existed in Kosovo, because the nations of the world, the United Nations and others, never recognized Indonesia's grab of East Timor. So it is time for the world resolutely to act, and I appreciate the initiative of the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), and I am glad to join with him in introducing this very well-done resolution.

RESOLUTION OF THE ASSEMBLEIA DA REPÚBLICA ON THE SITUATION IN EAST TIMOR

Whereas the people of East Timor accepted in good faith the tripartite (UN, Portugal, and Indonesia) project of consultation of the people of the territory via a referendum ensuring self-determination of the territory's future;

The voting process was carried out with remarkable civility and represented a rate of participation of approximately 100 percent of the registered voters;

Approximately 80 percent of the voters expressed their clear and unequivocal desire for independence; the voters' freedom and the honesty of the voting process were recognized by the Secretary-General of the UN and by the President of Indonesia;

The Indonesian authorities demanded that maintenance of order during the following the referendum would be solely their responsibility;

The Indonesian authorities, having at their disposal significant military and police forces both inside and outside the territory, were capable of ensuring maintenance of order if they had the political will to do so;

Indonesia, to the surprise and indignation of the international community, provided arms to civilian militias which, following the referendum, launched an operation of terror and death in East Timor; and sent to the territory additional military and police elements which not only did nothing to stop the atrocities but also abetted and took part in them;

With the passing of time the situation has deteriorated dramatically, as evidenced by the attacks on and destruction of both the home of the Bishop of Dili who had departed the territory in fear for his life and the compounds of the International Red Cross and the UN itself;

The Indonesian military and police forces are deliberately creating an information gap by expelling journalists and television news personnel with the clear objective of returning to domination of the territory and enabling themselves to launch a second genocide which is indeed already underway;

It is solely the opposition of the Indonesian authorities to entry into East Timor of a multinational peacekeeping force for maintaining order and respect for human rights—a force ready to go in immediately—that has allowed the chaos raging in the territory to continue;

It is impossible for the international community, and particularly for the UN, to allow this steadily worsening situation to continue for one more day without jeopard-

izing their own credibility and their capacity to prevent the massacre of a heroic and defenseless people being cruelly punished for the simple fact of having exercised their right to self-determination and their desire for independence; and

It is clearly evident that the Indonesian authorities are unable or unwilling to guarantee peace and order in East Timor by the means available to them, and that, on the contrary, their military and civilian forces are sowing the seeds of terror and conflict;

The Comissão Permanente of the Assembleia da República, at their meeting of September 7, 1999, after having heard the Primeiro Ministro and the Ministro dos Negócios Estrangeiros, has unanimously approved the following

RESOLUTION

In concert with the Presidente da República and the Government, the Assembleia da República is resolved.

1. To intensify political and diplomatic efforts toward making the international community, and in particular the UN and its Security Council, aware of the necessity for the immediate organization, under the aegis of the Secretary-General of the UN, of a multinational peacekeeping force whose purpose will be to put an end to the atrocities occurring in East Timor, to guarantee the peace, and to uphold the rights of the Timorese with respect to their freely-expressed wishes; and toward effecting the immediate dispatch of such a force to East Timor, with the consent of the Indonesian Government to the extent possible;

2. To approve any future decision of the Portuguese Government to authorize inclusion of a Portuguese military contingent in the aforementioned peacekeeping force;

3. To send immediately to the United States a delegation from the Assembleia da República, to include a representative of each party holding seats in the Assembleia, for the purpose of making the President of the UN Security Council, the US Congress, and world public opinion, aware of the clearly inevitable and urgent requirement for organization and deployment of the aforementioned peacekeeping force;

4. To appeal to the conscience of the world that a second genocide of the heroic and martyred people of East Timor be resisted by every means possible, since with their death all confidence in the liberating force of human rights and in the international bodies entrusted with safeguarding security and peace in the world would die also;

5. To condemn in the strongest terms possible the behavior of Indonesian Government, which has refused to fully comply with the New York Accord to which it has subscribed, and which in recent days, in a totally unacceptable manner, has neglected its responsibility to guarantee the security of the Timorese and respect for their will as legitimately expressed in the referendum of August 30;

6. To appeal forcefully to the Secretary-General and the Security Council of the UN, to the Indonesian authorities, and to those elements of Indonesian society who sincerely support aspirations for democracy and peace, reminding them that this critical moment for East Timor represents for them the essence of their historic responsibilities;

7. To applaud the release of Xanana Gusmão, historic leader of the people of East Timor, whose voice, finally free, will undoubtedly strengthen both the efforts underway to ensure peace in the territory and the independence of its people, and his own commitment to reconciliation.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the conference report on bill, H.R. 2587, that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived, and that H. Res. 282 be laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2587, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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 Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1900

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 5, 1999 at page H7384.)

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and all time I may yield, of course, will be for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this conference agreement on H.R. 2587, the conference report on the appropriations for the District of Columbia.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement endorses the budget and tax cuts which were approved previously by the mayor and council of the District of Columbia. This helps the District's efforts to reorganize, to cut their costs, to reduce their overhead, to reduce the size of the peril of the District of Columbia government.

In conference we retained the initiatives that were in the House bill such as major Federal funding for the largest ever crackdown on the link between crimes and drugs in the District of Columbia, going after, with drug testing and treatment, the 30,000 people in D.C. that are on probation or parole and that are a major source of further offenses. This is to make D.C. streets and neighborhoods far safer.

The conference agreement includes incentives to move children from foster care to adoption in safe, loving, and permanent homes.

It includes Federal funding for pediatric health initiatives for high-risk children in medically underserved parts of the District.

This retains the new program of \$17 million to assist students in the District of Columbia to go to college because they do not have a system of State institutions of higher education. This is to provide tuition assistance to kids in D.C. to be able to go to college.

It has language in the House bill strengthening the popular charter school movement in the conference report also.

The conference agreement has the Federal funding to clean up pollution in the Anacostia River and to complete design work and requirements to alleviate the traffic, stress and congestion with the 14th Street Bridge across the Potomac River between D.C. and northern Virginia.

In total, Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement totals \$429 million in Federal funds. That is 24 million below the House bill, 18 million above the Senate bill, \$255 million less than last year's appropriation because of nonrecurring items that are not in this year's bill.

In District funds, the conference agreement provides 6.8 billion of which 5.4 billion is operating funds; 1.4 is capital outlay.

We also have language requested regarding payment of back attorney fees for indigent attorneys or attorneys representing indigents, we ratify the bold effort made by the City Council and the mayor in reducing taxes, and, Mr. Speaker, we have been careful, of course, regarding what some people refer to as social riders.

There is nothing new, there is nothing new beyond what the House, the Senate and the President of the United States agreed upon last year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have appreciated the opportunity to work in a bipartisan basis. This bill passed the House before with 333 votes, a very bipartisan showing with a large number of Democrats as well as Republicans. However, Mr. Speaker, I am told that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle even though this is for all intents and purposes the same bill, the same piece of legislation, I am told that many of my Democratic colleagues sadly intend to oppose the bill, not because of something new, not because of something different, not because of something beyond what the President and the House

and the Senate have previously agreed to regarding the District. Unfortunately it appears to be over a drug-related issue, that there is an effort by many activists and extremists to push an agenda to permit the legalization of marijuana in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, a vote was held many months ago on an initiative referendum to establish such a law in D.C. Congress, the President, and the Senate and the House have acted before to make sure that D.C. does not enact drug laws that contravene the laws of the United States of America. However under the guise of saying that D.C. should have local control or home rule, unfortunately many of my colleagues are saying that this bill should be opposed because it does not permit the District of Columbia to legalize a drug that is illegal under federal law such as marijuana.

It is sad, it is extremely sad to see an extremist position being taken by people to oppose this bill that does so much to help bring the District of Columbia back from the sad shape in which we saw it in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I find it unfortunate, and I hope that I am mistaken and that people will not oppose this bill because it requires the District of Columbia to stay in tune with the laws of the United States of America regarding drugs. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary to remind people article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America says that legislative authority regarding the District of Columbia resides in the Congress of the United States. Some things are delegated to city government, but this Congress retains responsibility for the legislation within the District of Columbia.

So, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to so-called social riders, there is in the bill a continued prohibition on having taxpayers' money used to finance a lawsuit whereby the District is asking to have a vote in the Congress of the United States in the House and in the Senate. It is the identical language that was signed into law by the President last year, and, in fact, frankly there is no need for public financing of such a lawsuit because it is already being fully financed privately and handled on behalf of the District by one of the leading law firms in the country.

There is also people that say, oh, they are upset because the bill continues what the House and the Senate and the President agreed upon a year ago, to say that drug addicts will not be given free needles with taxpayers' money. There is already a private program that does that, Mr. Speaker. There is no need for taxpayers' money. I would hate to think that anyone would take an extremist position of opposing a bill that has anti-drug efforts, pro-education efforts, pro-law and order efforts, tax cuts and the budget that the District adopted, that they want to oppose all these things just because they want to use taxpayers'

money for drug addicts to get free needles.

Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible piece of legislation. We have worked closely with Members across the aisle, with the mayor, with the City Council. I very much appreciate the efforts of the members of the committee and subcommittee and staff on this, and I present this conference report to the House as something totally consistent with what had broad support, bipartisan support in the House just a few short weeks ago, and I would certainly hope that nobody will use some excuse to try to promote an extremist agenda in opposing this bill.

I hope I am mistaken, but I fear that it will occur. I ask people to support this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference agreement on H.R. 2587, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000. The conferees met in early August and resolved the matters in disagreement between the House and Senate bills and filed the conference report on August 5th, a little more than a month ago.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement endorses the budget and tax cuts approved by the District's mayor and council and helps the District's efforts to reorganize, cut costs and reduce overhead. We were able to retain in conference the initiatives that were in the House bill, such as Federal funding for the largest-ever effort to crack down on the link between drugs and crime, so that DC's streets and neighborhoods will be far safer. The conference agreement includes incentives to move children from foster care to adoption in a safe, loving, and permanent home, and \$2.5 million in Federal funds to complete a community pediatric health initiative for high risk children in medically underserved areas of the District. We also retained the \$17 million in Federal funds for tuition assistance to compensate for the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition so that DC high school graduates will have the same opportunities that exist for students in the 50 States who attend State-supported institutions of higher education. In addition, language in the House bill strengthening the popular charter school movement in the District has been retained. The conference agreement also includes Federal funding to clean up pollution in the Anacostia River and to complete all design and other requirements for the construction of expanded lane capacity for the 14th Street Bridge across the Potomac River.

The conference agreement totals \$429 million in Federal funds, which is \$24 million below the House bill, \$18 million above the Senate bill, and \$255 million below last year's bill. The reduction of \$255 million below last year's bill is due to several non-recurring items funded last year. The total conference amount of \$429 million is \$24 million below our 302(b) allocations in budget authority and outlays. In District funds, the conference agreement provides \$6.8 billion of which \$5.4 billion is in operating funds and \$1.4 billion is for capital outlays. The \$5.4 billion for operating expenses is \$7 million below the House level, \$29 million above the Senate bill, and \$284 million above last year; however, included in this \$284 million increase is a "rainy day" reserve fund of \$150 million.

The conferees have included language under Defender Services that will allow the use of \$1.2 million to pay attorneys for their services to indigents in FY 1999. The DC Courts underestimated the amount required and as a result the attorneys will no longer be paid for their FY 1999 services after tomorrow and there is some question as to the appointment of counsel for the remainder of fiscal 1999. This language will allow the appointments and payments to continue without disruption.

Title II of the conference agreement commends the District for reducing taxes and ratifies the city's action in that regard. One of the initiatives taken by local officials in agreeing to a consensus budget for fiscal year 2000 is to reduce income and property taxes by \$300 million over the next 5 years, including \$59 million in fiscal 2000.

I will include a table showing the amounts recommended in the conference agreement compared with last year's enacted amount, the budget request, and the House and Senate recommendations. I will also include the fiscal year 2000 Financial Plan which is the starting point for the Independent auditor's comparison with actual year-end results as required by section 143 of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, regarding social riders, the conference agreement includes language from the House bill that prohibits the use of both local and Federal funds for abortions except to

save the life of the mothers or in cases of rape or incest. Another provision prohibits the use of both local and Federal funds to implement the District's "domestic partners act". The conference agreement also includes language prohibiting the use of Federal funds for any needle exchange program or to legalize or reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of marijuana and other controlled substances. The provision adopted by the House requiring the registration of sex offenders in the District of Columbia is also included in the conference agreement. This language was requested by the City Council after the budget was submitted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the bipartisan bill that passed the House six weeks ago with 333 votes—the largest support in 10 years for a DC appropriations bill—included the exact same riders that are in this conference agreement. We need to make it very clear that each of these riders was included in last year's bill—a bill the President signed. There is nothing new in any of the provisions with the exception of the marijuana language which will allow the counting of the initiative ballots. Language in last year's bill did not allow that.

There are not any new social riders to this bill—only those that had previously been approved by the Congress and signed into law by the President. And that's exactly what I have done.

Now during the House debate on this bill, I told the Delegate from the District of Columbia that I would work in the conference to soften the restriction on the use of funds for the voting rights suit. I did that. But I am only one member and I was unable to convince my colleague on the subcommittee, let alone the Senate, to change the language. My point is I did what I said I would do.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should move ahead and adopt this conference report so that the District government can get about its business of governing and improving the delivery of services to its residents and visitors.

In closing, I want to thank all of our Members for their hard work and their contributions to this bill. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. MORAN, is the ranking Member and we work very well together. I especially want to thank our full Committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. YOUNG, for his support and for his sage advice and counsel. The staff has also done an outstanding job: John Albaugh, Steve Monteiro and Micah Swafford of my staff; and from the Committee staff, Migo Miconi, Mike Fischetti and Mary Porter. They really do a great job. Mary Porter has been doing this for 37 years—hard to imagine. I also want to thank the minority staff—Tom Forhan and Tim Aiken.

This is a good, responsible conference report and I urge its adoption.

H.R. 2587 - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
FEDERAL FUNDS						
District of Columbia Resident Tuition Support.....			17,000	17,000	17,000	+ 17,000
Incentives for Adoption of Foster Children.....			8,500	5,000	5,000	+ 5,000
Citizens Complaint Review Board.....			1,200	500	500	+ 500
Federal Payment for Human Services.....			250	250	250	+ 250
Metrorail improvements and expansion.....	25,000					-25,000
Federal payment for management reform.....	25,000					-25,000
Federal payment for Boys Town U.S.A.....	7,100					-7,100
Nation's Capital Infrastructure Fund.....	18,778					-18,778
Environmental Study and Related Activities at Lorton Correctional Complex.....	7,000					-7,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia corrections trustee operations.....	184,800	176,000	183,000	178,000	176,000	-8,800
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Courts.....	128,000	137,440	100,714	136,440	99,714	-28,286
Defender Services in D.C. Courts.....			33,336	33,336	33,336	+ 33,336
Federal payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia.....	59,400	80,300	105,500	80,300	93,800	+ 34,400
Federal payment for Metropolitan Police Department.....	1,200			1,000	1,000	-200
Federal payment for Fire Department.....	3,240					-3,240
Federal payment for Georgetown Waterfront.....	1,000					-1,000
Federal payment to Historical Society for City Museum.....	2,000					-2,000
Federal payment for a National Museum of American Music and Downtown Revitalization.....	700					-700
United States Park Police	8,500					-8,500
Federal payment for waterfront improvements	3,000					-3,000
Federal payment for mentoring services.....	200					-200
Federal payment for hotline services	50					-50
Federal payment for public charter schools	15,622					-15,622
Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration Project.....	3,000					-3,000
Federal payment for Children's National Medical Center.....	1,000		3,500		2,500	+ 1,500
National Revitalization Financing:						
Economic Development	25,000					-25,000
Special Education.....	30,000					-30,000
Year 2000 Information Technology.....	20,000					-20,000
Infrastructure and Economic Development.....	50,000					-50,000
Y2K conversion emergency funding (courts).....	2,249					-2,249
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	61,800					-61,800
Total, Federal funds to the District of Columbia	683,639	383,740	453,000	410,740	426,100	-254,539
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS						
<i>Operating Expenses</i>						
Governmental direction and support	(164,144)	(174,667)	(162,356)	(162,356)	(187,358)	(+ 3,212)
Economic development and regulation.....	(159,039)	(190,335)	(180,335)	(190,335)	(190,335)	(+ 31,296)
Public safety and justice.....	(755,786)	(778,670)	(785,670)	(778,470)	(778,770)	(+ 22,984)
Public education system	(788,956)	(850,411)	(867,411)	(867,411)	(867,411)	(+ 78,455)
Human support services.....	(1,514,751)	(1,525,996)	(1,526,361)	(1,526,111)	(1,526,361)	(+ 11,610)
Public works	(266,912)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(+ 4,483)
Receivership Programs.....	(318,979)	(337,077)	(345,577)	(337,077)	(342,077)	(+ 23,098)
Workforce Investments		(8,500)	(8,500)	(8,500)	(8,500)	(+ 8,500)
Buyouts and Management Reforms			(20,000)		(18,000)	(+ 18,000)
Reserve		(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(+ 150,000)
District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance						
Authority.....	(7,840)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(-4,700)
Financing and other		(384,948)				
Washington Convention Center Transfer Payment	(5,400)					(-5,400)
Repayment of Loans and Interest	(382,170)		(328,417)	(328,417)	(328,417)	(-53,753)
Repayment of General Fund Recovery Debt	(38,453)		(38,286)	(38,286)	(38,286)	(-167)
Payment of Interest on Short-Term Borrowing	(11,000)		(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(-2,000)
Certificates of Participation	(7,926)		(7,950)	(7,950)	(7,950)	(+ 24)
Human development	(6,674)					(-6,674)
Optical and Dental Insurance payments			(1,295)	(1,295)	(1,295)	(+ 1,295)
Productivity Bank			(20,000)	(20,000)	(18,000)	(+ 18,000)
Productivity Savings	(-10,000)	(-21,457)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-18,000)	(-18,000)
Procurement and Management Savings			(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-11,457)
Total, operating expenses, general fund	(4,418,030)	(4,653,682)	(4,694,236)	(4,658,286)	(4,686,836)	(+ 268,806)
<i>Enterprise Funds</i>						
Water and Sewer Authority and the Washington Aqueduct	(273,314)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(+ 6,294)
Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board	(225,200)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(+ 9,200)
Office of Cable Television	(2,108)					(-2,108)
Public Service Commission	(5,026)					(-5,026)
Office of People's Counsel	(2,501)					(-2,501)
Office of Insurance and Securities Regulation	(7,001)					(-7,001)
Office of Banking and Financial Institutions	(640)					(-640)
Sports and Entertainment Commission	(8,751)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(+ 2,095)
Public Benefit Corporation	(66,764)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(+ 22,244)
D.C. Retirement Board	(18,202)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(-8,310)

H.R. 2587 - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Correctional Industries Fund.....	(3,332)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(-1,522)
Washington Convention Center.....	(48,138)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(+2,087)
Total, Enterprise Funds.....	(860,978)	(875,790)	(875,790)	(875,790)	(875,790)	(+14,812)
Total, operating expenses.....	(5,079,008)	(5,328,472)	(5,370,026)	(5,334,076)	(5,362,626)	(+283,618)
Capital Outlay						
General fund.....	(1,711,161)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(-492,523)
Water and Sewer Fund.....		(197,169)	(197,169)	(197,169)	(197,169)	(+197,169)
Total, Capital Outlay.....	1,711,161	1,415,807	1,415,807	1,415,807	1,415,807	-295,354
Total, District of Columbia funds.....	(6,790,169)	(6,745,279)	(6,785,833)	(6,749,883)	(6,778,433)	(-11,736)
Total:						
Federal Funds to the District of Columbia.....	683,638	383,740	453,000	410,740	429,100	-254,539
District of Columbia funds.....	(6,790,169)	(6,745,279)	(6,785,833)	(6,749,883)	(6,778,433)	(-11,736)

Fiscal Year 2000 Financial Plans
(In thousands of dollars)

	Local funds	Grants and other revenue	Gross funds
Revenue:			
Local sources, current authority:			
Property taxes	693,700	0	693,700
Sales taxes	620,000	0	620,000
Income taxes	1,185,100		1,185,100
Other taxes	348,500	0	348,500
Licenses, permits	48,498	0	48,498
Fines, forfeitures	56,771	0	56,771
Service charges	34,173	0	34,173
Miscellaneous	93,558	318,574	412,132
Tax Parity Act	(58,950)	0	(58,950)
Subtotal, local revenues	3,021,350	318,574	3,339,924
Federal sources:			
Federal payment	23,750	0	23,750
Grants	0	1,231,408	1,231,408
Subtotal, Federal sources	23,750	1,231,408	1,255,158
Other financing sources:			
Transfer Interest Income from Control Board	0	23,000	23,000
Lottery transfer	69,000	0	69,000
Subtotal, other financing sources	69,000	23,000	92,000
Total, general fund revenues	3,114,100	1,572,982	4,687,082
Expenditures:			
Current operating:			
Governmental Direction and Support	137,134	30,222	167,356
Economic Development and Regulation	52,911	137,424	190,335
Public Safety and Justice	565,511	213,259	778,770
Public Education System	681,356	113,708	795,064
Human Support Services	590,938	890,988	1,481,926
Public Works	258,341	13,054	271,395
Receiverships	217,606	124,471	342,077
Financial Authority	3,140	0	3,140
Nonunion pay increase	8,500	0	8,500
Buyouts and Other Management Reforms	0	18,000	18,000
Optical and Dental Benefits	1,295	0	1,295
Reserve	150,000	0	150,000
Productivity Bank	20,000	0	20,000
Productivity Savings	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
Management Reform and Productivity Savings	(7,000)	0	(7,000)
General Supply Schedule Savings	(14,457)	0	(14,457)
Subtotal, current operating	2,645,275	1,541,126	4,186,401

	Local funds	Grants and other revenue	Gross funds
Other financing uses:			
Debt service			0
Principal and interest	383,653	0	383,653
Other financing uses:			
D.C. General	44,435	0	44,435
University of the District of Columbia	40,491	31,856	72,347
Subtotal, other financing uses	468,579	31,856	500,435
Total, general fund expenditures	3,113,854	1,572,982	4,686,836
Surplus/(Deficit)	246	0	246
Enterprise fund data:			
Enterprise fund revenues:			
Water and Sewer Authority	0	236,075	236,075
Washington Aqueduct	0	43,533	43,533
D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Board	0	234,400	234,400
Sports and Entertainment Commission	0	10,846	10,846
Public Benefit Corporation	0	89,008	89,008
D.C. Retirement Board	0	9,892	9,892
Correctional Industries	0	1,810	1,810
Washington Convention Center Authority	0	50,226	50,226
Total, enterprise fund revenue	0	675,790	675,790
Enterprise fund expenditures:			
Water and Sewer Authority	0	236,075	236,075
Washington Aqueduct	0	43,533	43,533
D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Board	0	234,400	234,400
Sports and Entertainment Commission	0	10,846	10,846
Public Benefit Corporation	0	89,008	89,008
D.C. Retirement Board	0	9,892	9,892
Correctional Industries	0	1,810	1,810
Washington Convention Center Authority	0	50,226	50,226
Total, enterprise expenditures	0	675,790	675,790
Total, revenues versus expenditures	0	0	0
Total, operating revenues	3,114,100	2,248,772	5,362,872
Total, operating expenditures	3,113,854	2,248,772	5,362,626
Revenue versus expenditures	246	0	246

D.C. APPROPRIATIONS ACTS

General Provisions

Following is a list of when a general provision first appeared in an appropriations act

(using the general provisions in the FY 2000 Appropriations Act conference report as the base year and going back to FY 1973)

Section	Page	Conference Report—H.R. 2587 (Report 106-299)	First year	No. of years
101	13	All contracts are a matter of public record	1981	19
102	13	All vouchers covering expenditures shall be audited before payment	1973	27
103	13	Appropriations are the maximum amounts	1973	27
104	13	Allowances for privately owned vehicles for official duties set by the Mayor	1973	27
105	13	Travel expenses concerned with official business to be approved by the Mayor	1973	27
106	12	Refunds and judgment payments to be made by District government promptly	1973	27
107	13	Public assistance payments to be made without reference to the D.C. Public Assistance Act	1973	27
108	13	No appropriation available for obligation beyond current fiscal year	1973	27
109	14	No funds for partisan political activities	1973	27
110	14	No funds available to pay any employee whose name, grade and salary history is not available for inspection	1979	21
111	14	Funds are available for making payments authorized by the Revenue Recovery Act	1979	21
112	14	No funds shall be used to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress	1979	21
113	14	Mayor to develop an annual capital borrowing plan	1982	18
114	14	Council approval needed for capital project borrowings	1982	18
115	14	No capital project money is to be used for operating expenses	1982	18
116	14	Reprogramming restrictions	1983	17
117	15	No funds for personal cook, chauffeur or other servants	1973	27
118	15	No funds to purchase vehicles with less than 22 miles per gallon rating	1982	18
119	15	Compensation of City Administrator and Board of Directors of Redevelopment Land Agency set at level 15 of District Schedule	1983	17
120	15	Provisions of Merit Personnel Act of 1978 shall apply to D.C. employees	1983	17
121	15	Mayor to submit to Congress revised revenue estimates at end of first quarter	1986	14
122	15	No sole source contracts may be renewed or extended without competitive bids	1988	12
123	16	Balanced Budget Act definitions clarified	1988	12
124	16	Sequestration order from U.S. Treasury to be paid within 15 days after receipt of request	1989	11
125	16	Acceptance and use of gifts subject to certain restrictions	1992	8
126	16	No Federal funds to be used for expenses of Congressional offices under DC Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiatives	1991	9
127	16	University of DC (UDC) to prepare quarterly financial reports	1996	4
128	17	Funds for new hardware and software are also available for purchase of new financial management system (FMS)	1998	2
129	17	Cap on attorney fees for actions brought against the D.C. government under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	1999	1
130	18	No funds available for abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered or in cases of rape or incest	1980	20
131	18	No funds available to implement Health Care Benefits Expansion Act of 1992 for cohabiting couples	1993	7
132	18	DC Public Schools (DCPS) to prepare quarterly financial reports	1995	5
133	18	DCPS and UDC to prepare annual Full Time Equivalent positions reports	1996	4
134	19	DCPS and UDC to prepare revised budgets within 30 days of enactment of appropriations bill to align budget with anticipated expenditures	1996	4
135	19	Boards of DC schools and library to approved budgets prior to submission in Mayor's annual budget	1996	4
136	19	Ceiling placed on total operating expenses	1996	4
137	21	Receivership budgets to be included in Mayor's annual budget submission without revision by Council or Mayor	1998	2
138	21	DCPS employees classified in a certain manner	1996	4
139	22	Restrictions on use of official vehicles	1998	2
140	22	Sources of payment for detainees is from requesting entity's budget	1998	2
141	22	Special need students of the DCPS are to be evaluated or assessed within 120 days of referral	1999	1
142	23	No funds available to DC entities unless they comply with Buy America Act	1995	5
143	23	No funds available for the annual audit of DC financial statements unless conducted or contracted by the IG	1999	1
144	23	No funds available for reorganization plans unless plans approved by the DC Financial Authority	1993	7
145	24	Evaluation of DCPS employees a non-negotiable item for collective bargaining purposes	1996	4
146	24	No funds available for a petition to require Congress to provide voting representation for DC	1999	1
147	24	No funds available to transfer inmates classified above the medium security level as defined by the Federal Bureau of Prisons transferred to Youngstown, Ohio	1999	1
148	24	Beginning with FY 2000, the District government is to include in its annual budget submission a \$150 million reserve to be expended according to criteria established by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and approved by the Mayor, Council and DC Financial Authority	1999	1
149	25	Within 30 days of enactment of the appropriations act the CFO shall submit to Congress a revised budget of the approved appropriations	1999	1
150	25	No funds are available for the distribution of sterile needles or syringes for hypodermic injection of any illegal drug	1999	1
151	25	No funds available for rental payments under a lease unless certain conditions are met		
152	25	No funds available for new leases and real property purchases unless certain conditions are met		
153	26	Amend Student Loan Marketing Association Reorganization Act of 1966 to set aside \$5 million for a credit enhancement fund for public charter schools		
154	26	Within 90 days of enactment of the appropriations act, the city government shall implement a process to dispose of excess school real property		
155	26	Extend date for charter schools authorization		
156	26	Sibling preference to be given to charter school applicants		
157	27	Authority to transfer \$18 million from the DC Financial Authority for severance payments to individuals separated from DC employment during FY 2000		
158	27	Authority to transfer \$5,000,000 from the DC dedicated highway trust fund for design work to expand the land capacity on the 14th street bridge		
159	27	Mayor to carry out through the Army Corps of Engineers an Anacostia River environmental cleanup program		
160	27	Prohibits payment of administrative costs from the Crime Victims Compensation Fund		
161	28	No funds available to pay salary of any chief financial officer who has not filed a certification that the officer understands the duties and responsibilities of the officer as a result of the approved appropriations act		
162	28	Specify potential adjustments in next years' budgets to meet mgmt reforms savings		
163	28	Describe "misc." budget categories in the annual budget submission		
164	29	Authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to contract with the City to improve the SW Waterfront		
165	29	Sense of Congress that DC should not impose certain restrictions on an industrial revenue bond for a project of the American Red Cross		
166	29	Permits Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency to carry out sex offender registration program		
167	30	No funds available to enact or carry out any program to legalize or reduce penalties associated with possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance—modified—no ballot count allowed last year	1999	1
168	30	Authority to transfer \$5,000,000 from DC Financial Authority for commercial revitalization empowerment zones		
169	31	Directs Secretary of the Interior to implement a notice of decision concerning the issuance of right-of-way permits to locate a wireless communications antenna on Federal property in DC		
170	31	Sense of Congress that in considering the FY 2001 DC budget, Congress will take into consideration progress or lack thereof concerning certain items		
171	32	Prior to using Federal Medicaid payments to Disproportionate Share Hospitals (DSH), the Mayor should consider recommendations of the Health Care Development Commission		
172	32	GAO to conduct a study of DC Justice System to identify components most in need of additional resources		

WASHINGTON, DC, September 9, 1999.

Re District of Columbia appropriations bill.
Hon. JAMES MORAN,

Rayburn HOB., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MORAN: I have enjoyed the opportunity to work cooperatively on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, to help our nation's capital rebound from its years of troubles. That is why I was so surprised and disappointed this morning to read the letters that you sent last night to all Members of Congress.

In your letters, you take a highly extremist position that all our efforts to improve our nation's capital should be thrown away, so that you can promote a pro-drug agenda.

I fear your position would bring D.C. back to the worst of the Marion Barry days, when the loose attitude toward illegal drugs made

the city the butt of late-night talk-show jokes.

Yet your letters state that all the good work we have done on this bill is unimportant, that instead only four issues matter:

1. You want to spend taxpayers' money to finance the lawsuit challenging the U.S. Constitution's denial of statehood status (votes in Congress) for D.C., even though this questionable suit is already filed and being handled free by a leading law firm.

2. You want to spend taxpayers' money to give free needles to drug addicts, to inject themselves with illegal drugs.

3. You want the District to provide "domestic partner" benefits to unmarried live-in lovers of public employees.

4. You want to permit the District to legalize marijuana, despite federal laws to the contrary.

Your position is even stranger to understand, because the first three of these four simply repeat provisions already signed into law by the President. (The "domestic partner" restriction has been signed into law multiple times). Evidently, it must be the fourth item that is most important to you.

You attempt to couch this issue in terms of "home rule," as though every city in the country were able to adopt laws contrary to those of the nation and of the states. Where do you draw the line? If you say it's OK for D.C. to legalize marijuana, then what's next? Legalizing cocaine? Or heroin? Or perhaps rape and murder? Under your rationale, it would be fine with you if the District of Columbia did any of these. You would argue for their right to do so, and ignore the victims. You would say it's a "home rule" issue, even in the nation's capital.

The issue is not whether you choose to be pro-marijuana, or pro-needle exchange. The issue is whether you take an extremist stance—disregarding all the good contained in this legislation because these other issues are so much more important to you.

I'm amazed that you also make these pro-drug stances more important than the 14th Street Bridge project in the bill, which tries to improve the traffic snarls between Washington, D.C., and your congressional district in northern Virginia.

Let me remind you about some of the good and solid things we have worked together and that this bill does, but which you now seek to block:

—Making it far easier for the District to keep making its government smaller, more efficient and more responsive,

—Strengthening and funding charter schools,

—Creating college opportunities for D.C.'s kids, with millions in new scholarship funds for them, including extra help for those who attend school in Virginia,

—Launching America's strongest effort to break the link between crime and drugs, (including drug-testing and treatment for all offenders on probation or parole),

—Funding aggressive adoption efforts to find new homes for abandoned kids,

—Cleaning-up the Anacostia River, and

—Lowering taxes in the District, as approved by the mayor and council.

The bill also honors and approves the budget approved by D.C.'s mayor and council. We respected this key aspect of "home rule".

I'd like to remind you that the bill's language, requiring that D.C. not legalize drugs which are illegal under federal law, was approved by the entire House of Representatives without objection on a voice vote, and while you were on the House floor. If you wanted to kill the bill because you want to let D.C. legalize marijuana, then was the time to do so—in public and on C-SPAN, not with private letters to House Members such as you have now sent quietly.

And you never even attempted a vote on the "domestic partners" issue, you know the House has rejected your position many, many times.

This bill has hundreds of millions of dollars of federal money for Washington, D.C. It is not too much to expect some common-sense provisions to accompany the money.

Further, the other three items mentioned in your letters—no public money for the lawsuit or for a needle exchange program or for "domestic partners" benefits—were both contained in the bill last year. The identical language was then approved by the House and by the Senate and signed into law by the President.

Finally, none of the items you now question were changed during the House-Senate conference. These provisions are identical with the bill passed by the House, and for which you voted. I am perplexed by why you now choose an extremist position rather than the solid position you took when you voted for the bill just a few weeks ago.

I regret that your actions, by sending your letters to all House Members, might complicate our future efforts to work within the subcommittee. However, I do not intend to let this happen. I pledge nevertheless to continue working with you in good faith on all issues. We may disagree on various things, but that's no reason to abandon the good we can do together.

Very Truly Yours,

ERNEST J. ISTOOK, Jr.,

Member of Congress.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) will

control the 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

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

I was out talking with the Mayor of the District of Columbia on the phone when this bill came up. I appreciate the Chair's clarifying that I will be managing this bill.

As my colleagues know, it is sad and unfortunate that we find ourselves in this position because the D.C. appropriations bill really ought to be one that we could reach consensus on, send to the White House, get signed, and get out of the way and deal with the other bills. It should almost be done in a perfunctory fashion because, as the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) remembers, and I know he voted for the legislation, in 1997 we voted for the D.C. Revitalization Act, and what that said was that we are no longer going to do things in the way that had traditionally been done with regard to the District of Columbia. We are going to give them as much home rule as our Constitution allows. What we are going to do is to take the functions that other States perform, and the Federal Government is going to perform them, and the local functions, the functions that our cities perform, we are going to fund those with the same kind of grants and contracts that the cities in our legislative districts receive.

So D.C. is going to be treated the same way that any of our own local jurisdictions would be treated.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is that D.C. has not been treated the way that we would have treated our own constituents. That is why we oppose this bill.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has done a terrific job. I hope he listens to this although he is talking with the very distinguished ranking member of the full committee. But I want him to know that I appreciate what he has done as an appropriations chairman. As an appropriations bill, this is a good bill. It deserves support. The problem is not with the appropriations. The problem is with the authorizing legislation that has been attached to an appropriation bill. That is the extremist legislation.

Mr. Speaker, who is the extremist here? We are appropriators. We do not have any business getting into needle exchanges, and into abortion, and into same-sex marriages, and into medical medicinal use of marijuana. All that kind of stuff, that is not our job. We appropriate money, and if we had stuck to appropriations, everything would have sailed through. But we did not. We came out of the House with a bill that had a number of riders although there had been some compromise, and there was an agreement we would do what we could to compromise with the Senate.

Well, we go into the conference committee. We find out there have been pre-conference meetings that the Democrats did not even know about,

never mind participate in. So we walk in, and it is a done deal. Virtually no room for maneuver, virtually no room for any kind of negotiation or compromise, and boy did we take the most reasonable position imaginable.

Let me suggest to my colleagues some of the most reasonable things that one could imagine that we suggested that were rejected. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) had a proposal that I think was wrong for last year. He prohibited D.C. from even counting the ballots on whether the referendum as to whether there should be medicinal use of marijuana. This year he prohibited the use of drugs that included marijuana, made it a criminal penalty. So in conference we suggested, well, let us at least clarify some very important points.

I offered an amendment that said first of all that the prosecutors will still be able to plea bargain agreements. If somebody is caught with marijuana, and they know that there is a major distributor out there, and they could get some information on the major distributor instead of somebody that is using marijuana for some kind of recreational use but had no prior record or whatever, let us not stick them with a mandatory criminal penalty.

□ 1915

Let us let the prosecutors perform their job as they would with any other criminal penalty. Make sure they are allowed to plea bargain.

Secondly, let us make sure that we are not unintentionally prohibiting the legal use of other drugs, such as Marinol, which apparently is a derivative of marijuana but is regularly prescribed as a painkiller. We do not want to make legal drugs illegal. So what could be more reasonable? We offered that. I just assumed that it would be accepted. Rejected. Not even any discussion.

We suggested, in terms of the use of needles, this free needle exchange. We have an enormous problem in the District of Columbia. There is an article in the Washington Post today that shows that the number of children infected by their mothers because of dirty needles, that the number of children infected with the HIV-AIDS virus has gone up 70 percent between 1988 and 1997. D.C. has a worse problem than any other jurisdiction in the country.

So we suggested, let us have the language say you cannot use federal or local funds for the needle exchange program, but let us at least let a private nonprofit organization function. Let us just put that language in, to make sure that Whitman-Walker can carry out its own program. We should not have any business in restricting a private nonprofit from doing what private funds enable it to do. Rejected. Not accepted.

So it went on like that. The Senate thought it was a deal to accept the social riders that they did not have; and

in return, they cut the money that the House had. What kind of a compromise is that? It was a lose-lose, when it should have been a win-win situation.

So the major reason why we oppose this goes back to the golden rule: do unto others as you would have them do unto you. In this case it applies to our own local jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, we would not impose the kinds of restrictions on any of our local jurisdictions that are imposed on the District of Columbia.

Let me give you an example. Sixty-seven State and local government health care plans allow health care coverage for domestic partners. Ninety college and university health care plans, 70 Fortune 500 company health care plans and at least 450 other private company not-for-profit and union health care plans have that kind of coverage.

I have never seen a Member of this Congress stand up and ask that those organizations in their district not be able to have that coverage. We are not talking about federal funds.

Likewise, I have never seen any Member of Congress that has a congressional district in California, Oregon, Nevada, Alaska, Arizona or Washington State offer an amendment to block the implementation of a ballot initiative on the medical use of marijuana.

It was approved in California. Where are the Members coming up and saying, despite what the voters of my jurisdiction did, I want to prevent them from carrying out the results of that referendum? We have not done it to ourselves. On none of these things have we done it to the people in our own constituency, yet we would do it to the District of Columbia. That is why we oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time, because we want to hear from the one democratically elected delegate from the District of Columbia who truly is elected to represent her constituency, and get her point of view.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Virginia and others try to couch this issue as though it were home rule or local control, as though every city in the country were able to divorce itself from the rest of the country and adopt laws contrary to the laws of the Nation and the laws of the States.

Where do you draw the line? If you say it is okay for D.C. to legalize marijuana, as the gentleman from Virginia argues, then what is next? Do you say it is okay for them to legalize heroin, to legalize cocaine, to legalize murder, rape, arson? Where do you draw the line?

Under the rationale of the gentleman from Virginia, it would be fine if the District of Columbia legalized anything whatsoever, disregarding the

laws of the country, disregarding the Constitution that makes this Congress responsible for the laws of the District of Columbia. If you legalize marijuana, what is next? Cocaine? Heroin? Where do you draw the line?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the District of Columbia appropriations conference report. We all hope some day the District of Columbia will be a crown jewel in our republic form of government, a place we are all proud of, a place that we will bring our families with pride in our hearts and a place that is safe and clean, where the citizens greet each other with a smile. I believe this conference report takes us a long step in that direction.

First of all, this conference report does have a lot of pro-home rule provisions. The District of Columbia Council approved a budget. The Mayor approved the very same budget. This conference report continues along that same line and supports the District of Columbia's budget. I think that is self-rule where it counts, in the budget area, in the finances.

Now, there have been problems. There have been problems with the District of Columbia following the guidelines that this body has laid forth. District of Columbia employees have taken automobiles outside the District of Columbia, against the guidelines. The District of Columbia has paid for abortions with tax dollars, against the guidelines. But, to the credit of this Mayor and the City Council, they have made long strides in overcoming the areas where they have fallen short, and I think that is why there is such strong support for their budget.

But the opposition seems to be in very radical areas. Number one, the opposition says that we want to finance challenging the U.S. Constitution, something that has been around since almost when George Washington was a corporal. It is already going forward. It is going forward pro bono, or free, and we ought to let that proceed, without taxpayer dollars.

If there was a provision to allow the people of the District of Columbia to become part of Maryland so that they could vote in congressional districts in Maryland, I would be glad to help support that. We have seen part of the District of Columbia being yielded back to Virginia, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) represents part of that area as I recall. So perhaps we could move the balance of the District of Columbia into Maryland's congressional districts.

But that is not the issue here. They want to go for statehood, and that is something that has been around for the endurance of our Constitution.

They also want to take taxpayer dollars and buy needles to give illegal drug users the opportunity to shoot up illegal drugs in their veins.

Now, there have been a lot of areas that have had similar programs. Baltimore has had a program for 7 years. They found out this summer that 9 out of 10 injection drug users are infected with a blood-borne virus, 9 out of 10 who are in the program. Now, if 9 out of 10 are getting a virus, a blood-borne virus, and they are in the needle exchange program, I would consider that failure. How do you define failure, if that is not failure? Yet that is the very thing that you want to fund, and that is the very reason you want to oppose this piece of legislation, so we can take tax dollars and use them for a needles program.

I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify some things that I know my friend, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), inadvertently must have left out, because I think it is relevant to inform the Members that every single scientific and medical study has affirmed that needle exchange programs in fact do work with the highest-risk population in our urban areas. Baltimore's works particularly well, and that is why they continue it as one of the few programs that has worked effectively, because it brings people into the system where they can get into substance abuse prevention programs, reduction programs, and it enables them to be monitored so that you can limit the spread of AIDS.

The National Institutes of Health, the American Medical Association, the Centers for Disease Control, we can go right down the line. Every prestigious organization that you would think would have an opinion has done a study, and they have all come to the conclusion that needle exchange programs do not increase the use of the illegal drugs, and they do reduce the transmission of the HIV-AIDS virus.

But the other thing that inadvertently might have been omitted, or I guess actually it was misstated, but I think I know the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) or the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) would want me to clarify, because we are not talking about the use of taxpayer funds. That is what was referred to. The amendment in conference would have precluded the use of federal or local public funds. It only allowed private money, not taxpayer money, for the needle exchange program.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has forced me and D.C. elected officials to the outrageous position of opposing our own appropriation. No local budget has any business here, but the least D.C. residents are entitled to is respect. Once their elected officials have submitted a frugal balanced budget, D.C. went even further. The local budget

has tax cuts that the majority likes and a surplus, signalling that the city has pulled itself out of fiscal crisis.

I ask for a no vote, not because of attachments. The District has long lived with attachments, and I would not ask for a no vote because of attachments alone. The opposition of the District is based on new and unprecedented inroads into self-government for the first time in 25 years of home rule.

First, the bill takes funds slated for urgent District priorities and redirects those funds. In addition, not only have attachments grown more numerous, now they are prepackaged in the bill before it even goes to subcommittee. Further, whatever the District wins, fair and square, along the way, does not matter. The Committee on Rules simply reverses the vote and reinstates defeated amendments. We lose even when we win.

Yet the District now has a new management-oriented Mayor with a proven track record of fiscal prudence and a revitalized City Council. If anyone has been reasonable during this process, I believe I am that Member.

The bill has gotten this far not because it is fair to the District. It would never have gotten to conference except that I stretched to be fair to the Committee on Appropriations that had worked hard on a bill that had some features I supported.

□ 1930

Even yesterday I asked the Committee on Rules to send the bill back as I considered new approaches that might satisfy all concerns. I believe, and Members who know me know I believe, in negotiation over confrontation.

Many Members did not want to vote for an appropriation that had attachments they opposed. Many more simply did not want to be dragged into controversial local issues. Nevertheless, I counseled a yes vote because of promises made and of prospects for improvement. The bill passed only because many Members voted for it as a courtesy to me.

Out of the same courtesy and out of respect for the people I represent, I now ask Members to oppose the conference report before us. The bill has grown worse in conference as the Senate simply piled on with unrelated additions, and the House made no improvements and kept no promises.

The District should not be asked to grovel to get its own money. I stand here to put Members on notice that I will never grovel before this House to get the money to which we are entitled, our own money. Nor should the District be asked to live with automatic attachments and redirected local spending. If we do not send this bill back to conference, it will be vetoed.

Mr. Speaker, the new city, the new District of Columbia that on its own might, with its own sacrifices, has risen from the ashes, deserves better. District of Columbia residents deserve much better.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would have to note, in response to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and it has been a good opportunity to work together, but if we saw, as was presented, if the Members of her party, the Democrat members, the 160 or so who voted for the bill before, switch their votes today because the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia asks them to, then I would have to wonder who is in charge of the votes of those Members. Is it the people who elected them, or have they locked up their votes and handed them to another person, in the person of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

I would certainly hope that constituents would not find that their Members of Congress changed their votes just because the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) was unhappy.

I would have to say that the things of which they complain, and we have put in the RECORD a chart, these are nothing new. These are what has been part of this bill for years. We have not added anything new. The only thing new is in their extremism to get the District of Columbia to be legalizing drugs, to go back to the days when it was the butt of late night talk show jokes about the then mayor of the District and drug use.

If they want the scenario of the Nation's Capital legalizing drugs, as they have said in their letters sent to other Members of this Congress, then the American people need to know that that is the agenda and that is why the Democrats in this body are opposing this bill, because it is their desire to legalize marijuana, which this bill does not permit our Nation's Capital to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying I cannot think of another Member whose opinion on this I respect more than the delegate, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON). She has worked very hard and been a great partner in helping to bring the Capitol city back, and ably represents that city.

My friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), we have worked very hard on these issues together. As part of the Washington metropolitan region, I think he deeply cares and is concerned about the District.

We come to a different conclusion about this bill. There are good things in this bill, as has been outlined by my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, and there are things in this bill that are in it that I do not like, as have been outlined by my friends on the other side.

But at the end of the day, if I vote to reject this bill, I am basically voting for a no for \$17 million additional dollars for the D.C. College Access Act.

This is a first-time opportunity for children in the District of Columbia graduating from high school to pay State university costs, to attend State universities in other places in the country, similar to the right that the people in my State get to go to the University of Virginia or George Mason or the University of Maryland and pay in-State tuition, something affordable to them when otherwise they would have to pay out-of-State tuition. That is unreachable for many able students in the District of Columbia. So Members vote to reject that if they vote this down.

They vote to reject more dollars for charter schools, which have gone a long way. Over 2,000 students have signed up for charter schools in the District of Columbia, and a long waiting list to get back in, people who want the opportunities for education this alternative offers within the public school system.

We would be rejecting a \$5 million study of the 14th Street bridge that can add an additional lane there at the interchanges where the Parkway feeds into that. If Members vote no, they are voting to reject that and sending it back and taking our chances.

We are rejecting a \$5 million Federal appropriation for the cleanup of the Anacostia River. This is critical for the city and for its economic redevelopment and comeback.

Most of all we are rejecting, Congress, acceptance of the D.C. consensus budget, something put together by the Control Board, the mayor and the council, working in harmony. That is what the crux of the whole control board legislation was, to get everybody working and singing from the same page.

There are some provisions in this bill that I find obnoxious, that I did not support. One is not allowing the city to sue over its statehood right, a suit I think they will probably lose, but I think they ought to have that right, since we do not give them the right to vote on the House floor, something I think the city deserves.

That was in the bill last year. I do not think by itself that that means we should reject all of these other items in the appropriation bill. This is not new, unprecedented inroads. This in fact was in the bill last year.

The needle exchange program is something I think reasonable people can disagree about. We waiver back and forth when we hear the arguments. But this was in the legislation last year and we supported it, and the President signed it. This is not a new, unprecedented inroad.

Cellular telephone towers at Rock Creek Park, this obnoxious movement into home rule was put on by the Democratic leader in the other body. Members may find that an obnoxious provision, but that was something put on by the Democratic leader in the other body. That is a first-time unprecedented inroad, but I do think by itself

is not grounds for rejecting this legislation.

The domestic partners legislation and the prohibitions on the funding for abortion have been in this legislation for years and years and years. This body has on a consistent basis, although many of us do not like some of these provisions, has voted for that because we did not think it overcame the positive things that have come out of these appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleagues on this, am not happy with every provision of this bill. I stood in the well of the House and spoke against some of these provisions when they came up for amendment on the House floor. But there is much good in this bill.

The fact that the consensus budget has been agreed to without the kind of tampering we have seen in this body in the past, the fact that the college access program is funded for the first year and we can get that off the ground, a \$5 million study for the 14th Street bridge, cleanup for the Anacostia River, money for charter schools, money for drug abuse, these items I think make this legislation worthwhile to support.

On those grounds I am going to support this legislation, and urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about extremism. I ask my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, to perhaps listen as we talk about extremism.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), with whom I agree so much of the time. I say to him, the good news is that if we reject this conference report, I do not think we will ultimately lose any of the good things of which the gentleman spoke. If we do, it will be a mean-spirited action, indeed, because I presume they are included, because the gentleman's side of the aisle as well as my side of the aisle think those things are positive. We agree on them.

I do not rise because I want to legalize drugs. No matter how many times the chairman tries to articulate my reason for taking my action, it will not make it so, Mr. Speaker.

Nor will I oppose this bill because the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) tells me to, although I will tell my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), I believe that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is due great deference on this issue, because in this democracy she has been elected by Americans, American citizens, almost 600,000 of them, as we have seen, to represent their views. Those views represented by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms.

NORTON) are due deference, in my opinion.

But I will oppose this bill for what I believe to be one of the most extreme, tyrannical, dictatorial provisions that I have ever seen in a bill on this floor. It is a shameful provision in this bill. For the American Congress to take the position that an American citizen cannot seek redress in the courts of this land through its corporate structure I say is un-American. It is contrary to the principles that the people's houses ought to represent.

I am shocked that it was not dropped in conference. The fact of the matter, the chairman has said, oh, it was in last year's bill, so those who hear that statement will say, oh, well, it must have been, and it was. But last year's bill was included in a bill that appropriated \$400-plus billion. It was incorporated in a bill that we had to pass at the last minute because of the failure of the Committee on Appropriations to pass its appropriations bills seriatum, so we did them all in one package, so the President was left with really no alternative.

So in this bill we incorporate a provision, and Mr. Speaker, it is not made better because it was included last year. It is made worse that we would repeat this error, this egregious denial of democracy, where we say to the citizens of the District of Columbia, you cannot go to court and say that the way you are being treated is unconstitutional.

That is the basis of our government. Why? Because it says to every individual, no matter how small, whether they are 99 and 9 tenths percent not agreed to by the rest of us, that they have the inherent right as a citizen of this country to go to the courts and seek redress of their grievances.

Mr. Speaker, this provision of the bill is offensive to democracy, offensive to our Constitution, offensive to the basic rights of individuals to redress their grievances in the only way the Constitution sets forth ultimately for the minority. The majority can redress its grievances by voting in this body. The majority can always redress its grievances. But the genius of our system is that we provide a procedure where even the minority can redress its grievances. That is addressing the court.

This bill ought to be rejected for the inclusion of that provision alone.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think some people could have been thoroughly confused by what we just heard from the gentleman from Maryland.

This bill does not stop anybody from going to court. The gentleman knows better than what he has said. They have already filed that lawsuit. It is already in court. It is already pending before the judge for a decision. This bill did not stop anybody from going to court, it just said they cannot use taxpayers' money to finance the lawsuit.

They have one of the best legal firms in the country, Covington & Burling,

handling that lawsuit that the gentleman claims people are stopped from bringing. They are already in court. It is already happening. The bill just says we do not use taxpayers' money to pay for that lawsuit.

To pretend that somehow this has denied people access to the courts would be just plain hogwash.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

□ 1945

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in history and in the last Congress, we had over 20,000 children in the D.C. school system request to go to summer school, not because they had to, but because they wanted to.

We are trying to turn the entire education system around in D.C. to where most of the children that graduate are functionally illiterate and those who do not graduate drop out. The system has totally gone bankrupt.

Education, public works, the city, a mayor sniffing cocaine and putting the rest of it up his nose, the system to where we had school board members that were hired because of their political affiliations to Marion Barry. The mayor today is a bright light and has tried to work with this Congress and I think has done very well.

Charter schools. The education system. We did not cut public education. We actually increase education dollars and the charter schools. Thanks to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for the first time in this bill, children in D.C. can go to other universities of other States and not have to pay that tuition.

I mean, that is fantastic, those kinds of changes that have been made in this.

The Anacostia River. How many have ever been up to Bladensburg? Look at the mud flats, the toxic wastes that are up there. For years, it has piled up. The Anacostia River has more parts per fecal than any river in the United States of America. Why? Because every time it rains, the sewage from D.C. system flows into that valley, and all of that fecal material goes into that river.

It is so bad, there is so much bacteria that it soaked up all the oxygen in the Anacostia, and that is why the fish died, bacteria taking up oxygen.

The Navy has agreed to dig out those areas with toxics and the PCB. We have established a \$25,000 fine for dumping. I took a little boat up there. One cannot even get one's boat up there for the beer cans and the dump and the trash.

These are good things. It is a health hazard. It is an economic hazard. And we are changing those kinds of things.

Mary Williams has worked with us to revitalize that waterfront. Go down there. There are empty lots down there full of beer bottles and trash because the D.C. system wanted a year-by-year lease. They get money under the table. Well, we will give one a lease but one has got to give a little bit of money back to me. That liberal system failed.

We are putting in 30-year leases so that there will be businesses established down there. We want to take that whole waterfront and turn it into a San Francisco waterfront where we have got businesses that are creating dollars instead of the neglect that D.C. has given it.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) says, "We did it on our own." I do not believe that. The system was so far out of line that the control board had to be established. For 40 years, the Democrats did nothing. The neglect for D.C. Look at the education system. Look at the crime. Look at the streets. Look at everything.

We took the majority. We established a control board. We are coming in. We are changing the school systems. We are cleaning up the Anacostia River. We are cleaning up the waterfront. They want to oppose it because they want to give drug addicts needles, or they want to legalize marijuana.

I disagree with my friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) that every study has not been conclusive. Take a look at Sweden and other areas. I ask for a "yes" vote on this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) to respond to the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, to clarify on the court suit, the measure in the bill keeps our corporation counsel, the one lawyer with expertise in District affairs, from even looking at the papers that had, in fact, been drawn by the private law firm, on his own time. When our corporation counsel did so on his own time, after getting permission of a court, a Member of this body wrote him and asked him to submit all of his leave records. If that is not extreme, the word needs a new definition.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma says that the District of Columbia should not be able to use taxpayers' dollars to petition for the right to be represented in this body. What he forgot to tell us is that it is their money. Each of us represents half a million people, and we cast a vote on their behalf in this chamber. This bill says that the city cannot even use its own money to pursue the right in court to have their own voting representative.

Now, one may disagree with their right to have that idea, but to say that the City cannot use its own resources and has to depend on private fund raising in order to achieve a public right is, to me, the ultimate act of antidemocratic arrogance.

These are Americans we are talking about. These are taxpayers we are talking about. Yet, we say that they have

to go hand in hand to raise private money in order to achieve their own public rights. That is outrageous to be heard in any democratic institution. If big brother is going to tell the City what their own ordinances can contain, then at least that City ought to have a voting right in this body, and they ought to be able to use their own resources in order to try to achieve that end.

If he disagrees with the idea that they ought to have a voting right in this body, so be it. But they have a right to use their own money the way their own local taxpayers want it to be used, not the way the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks is correct. That is the ultimate big brother arrogance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlemen from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each have 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would suggest that my friend across the aisle who has such harsh words for this provision ought to be addressing those harsh words to the President of the United States who signed into law the identical provision word for word, comma for comma of which they now complain.

That is the only reason why it remains in this bill because it was approved last year by the House and Senate even before it was an omnibus bill and then signed into law by the President of the United States. Thus, that being the position that these bodies and the White House have taken before, it remains the position.

We had a vote in the body. The Senate was not willing to change on this provision, and it remains as it has been. But it does not cost anybody their rights to pursue their desire to have a vote in this Congress. The lawsuit is in court. It is pending. They have one of the top-notch law firms in the country representing them at no cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time.

I wanted to touch base real quickly on this lawsuit a little bit, Mr. Speaker, because what the lawsuit is about is Washington, D.C.'s right to become a State, and that is something that this Congress has voted on, and the votes fell short. So now Washington, D.C. is trying to take a court route for their right, and I do support their right to go to court.

But I want to remind everybody today we voted to reduce funding for something that is also very important to our counties and municipalities around the country, and that is the CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant program. Let us say, if some counties out there did not like the amount that we voted on, should

they be suing us, and should we give them money to sue us for that?

This matter that is pending in court has been debated on this floor in the House. It has been voted on by this floor of the House, and it was voted down. I am sorry that folks in Washington, D.C. want to take this to court. They do not like this legislative process. But that is why we have a legislative process. There are winners, and there are losers in it.

On the issue of home rule, Washington, D.C. as a city grew up around the Capitol of the Nation. This was a swamp. There was the City of Georgetown, but there was not Washington, D.C. until the United States Capitol came here. Because of that, there has always been a relationship between the government and Washington in terms of who is going to run what.

I believe there was not home rule for a while, and then there was home rule up until something like 1871, and then it was lost because one of the mayors 100 years ago was spending too much money on roads, and Congress took the right of home rule away. Then I think in, what, in the 1970s, it came again.

Then in 1994, there were debates about taking home rule away. Because of the leadership of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and many others who said, wait, that is too harsh on this city. Let us keep home rule in place, and let us work through this control board. A lot of things, because of their position taken by these folks and their leadership, prevailed.

The university, the law school, and the hospital, all of which 2 to 3 years ago were on the chopping block to be cut, but because of the autonomy of Washington, D.C., they were able to retain that.

There is a relationship between the Congress and Washington, D.C. It is not always a happy marriage, but it is there. They will probably not have complete home rule for many years to come. But in the meantime, I, as a Member of Congress, cannot vote to legalize marijuana in Washington, D.C. I cannot give them that option, because what about the other cities who want to do that or some of the other proposals like needles to drug addicts? If Washington, D.C. wants that, is it not fair to give that option to all other cities across the Nation? We as a Congress have voted not to do that.

Now, there are a lot of good, positive things in this bill, despite the fact that we disagree on much.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond.

The gentleman, for one thing said with regard to the needle exchange programs that we should provide such authority to all the jurisdictions. Every jurisdiction in the country has the authority to determine whether or not they want a needle exchange program. A great many of them, I think it is 113 cities, have chosen to do so.

All we are saying is the District of Columbia, under a democratic, small "d," form of government ought to be able to make that decision on their own. Our language which said no Federal funds and no local public funds should at least have been accepted so one can use private funds.

But with regard to the voting rights act, let me suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who is my friend, the gentleman who consistently underscores the fact that the White House signed a bill that included this language, we have a written correspondence from the Executive Office of the President making clear that the administration opposes language included in both bills which would prohibit the use of Federal or District funds to provide assistance for petition drives or civil actions that seek to require voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

That was an omnibus bill. There were hundreds of provisions, thousands of them, actually, if one has gone into all the different tax provisions and so on. Politics is the art of compromise. We had to keep the government going, and there was some compromise sought. But that legislation expired at the end of this fiscal year.

So the administration feels I know very strongly that that legislation should not be renewed and would be one criteria for vetoing this bill.

Again, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) says, there are some things that do require some resources from the District of Columbia, such as the D.C. Corporation Counsel being able to review the legal briefs to make sure there is no problem with the litigation that the private law firm is bringing forward. I am not talking about much money. Pennies. One has to know it is nothing that would even show up in an appropriations bill.

But to be so extreme as to prohibit D.C. Corporation Counsel from reviewing that legal brief just does not seem fair or appropriate and does seem to the extreme.

Now, I was looking for the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) represents the City of Baltimore, and, Mr. Speaker, he feels very strongly, having seen the very positive impact of the needle exchange program in Baltimore with regard to the serious drug problem that they are experiencing, that this is a proven program that should be renewed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

□ 2000

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to address this whole issue of the courts. As a lawyer of 21 years, I am very concerned about this. It is interesting to listen to this argument as basically a new Member and re-listen to the other side talk about how

the law firm is doing its thing and working hard for the District. And I certainly applaud that, but the thing that they fail to say is that this is something that has been basically rammed down their throats.

It is nice for that law firm to be doing this, but when we hear the words of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), which really shocks the conscience when she talks about the fact that the corporation counsel on his own time has to then go back and report to a Member of Congress, I do not think any Member of this body would stand for that kind of thing in their district.

There is a portion of the Bible that says a very simple, simple thing; and I think that we ought to think about it more in this body, and as a new Member I say it to my colleagues: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." As I said before a little earlier, I do not think any Member of this body would stand for the people in their districts not being represented and not having the funds and not being able to use their funds to do the things that they want to do.

On the issue of needle exchange, I want to make it clear. I started not to speak, because I did not want this bill and this effort to be viewed as a needle exchange effort. It is not about that. But the needle exchange portion is very important because it is about saving lives.

I hope that none of my colleagues on the other side, and those people who may be against needle exchange, ever have the opportunity to attend the funeral of someone whose body is all shriveled up. I hope they never have a loved one who is lying in bed in pain, and in so much pain they do not even know they are in pain. I hope they never experience that, but I have seen it in Baltimore.

I do not have to go to Sweden; I can go 45 miles away from here and see a program that works and works very effectively. The people of the District of Columbia are simply saying we want to do this; we want to use our funds to do this, and they are asking us to yield and give them that opportunity.

So when we err, and we always worry about erring on the side of what is right or erring on the side of what is wrong; but if we err, let us err on the side of life and not death. Let us err on the side of those programs that do work. As I said, we do not have to go to Sweden; we can go 45 miles away and see something that works. I see it every day. I see it working. I see crime reduced. I see the number of AIDS cases reduced. I see the number of people on drugs reduced. And I see that in my district.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to rise this evening in support of the conference report. The subcommittee has worked very diligently under its chairman's leadership to put this bill together.

Opponents of this bill claim that this is a question about home rule. The Constitution, in Article 1, Section 8, gives Congress the ultimate responsibility for decisions affecting the District. The subcommittee has upheld the Constitution and found ways to work positively with the D.C. government.

The subcommittee approved intact the same budget that the D.C. Council and the Mayor approved. Also, this bill ratifies \$59 million in tax relief that the D.C. Council and Mayor approved as well.

Almost all of the so-called riders are incidental to what Congress passed and the President signed last year. These measures provide common sense policies that all Members should support. For example, why should we allow the District of Columbia to spend funds to legalize marijuana when such efforts contradict current law?

But aside from these measures, this bill has many other positive aspects. There are funds to provide better education for children by strengthening public charter schools. There are funds to provide high school graduates with millions of dollars for new scholarship opportunities and more choices when deciding which college to choose.

This is a bill that will continue, in my opinion, to improve our Nation's Capital. I urge support of the conference report.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think we have made our point. Number one, this is a good appropriations bill. If the Members wanted to change the national law with regard to the medicinal use of marijuana, with regard to needle exchanges, with regard to a host of other issues, there are dozens of social riders in this thing, we should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is here, and let him take them up. Let it go through the authorization process, not the appropriations process.

We have agreed that there will not be federal funds used for any of these controversial measures. No federal funds. We are not arguing that. We are just saying treat D.C. like we treat the jurisdictions in our own congressional districts. That is all we are asking. And if we were to do that, we would all vote for this appropriations bill because it is a good appropriations bill. It has tax cuts, it has a surplus, and it does the right thing.

We should do the right thing for the District. Vote against this. Let us get a real appropriations bill.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is pretty simple for most people to weigh the good against the bad. We have a bill that has a balanced budget, reducing the size of D.C. government, streamlining it, helping it be more efficient and effective. There is scholarship money for kids to go to college. Charter schools are strengthened so they are not trapped in dead-end schools. It has the Nation's best new program to fight the link between crime and drugs. We have in this bill opportunity; we have cleanup of the Anacostia River. We have all of these good, strong, solid things.

What is on the other side of the scales? Well, it does not let the District of Columbia legalize marijuana, and it does not let them use public money for a lawsuit that is already filed and being paid by private individuals. Therefore, they say, that outweighs everything else in this bill. How extreme. How extreme.

And for people to say they will reverse their support, 160 Democrats going to reverse their support because they have surrendered their vote to an extreme position, following the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia; that they have surrendered their vote. What will their constituents think? That outweighs all the good in this bill. To legalize drugs? No. Vote for the conference report.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the District of Columbia, but in opposition to this Appropriations conference report. Our Capital City and its residents deserve to enjoy the benefits of the democratic process without interference from the Congress. This conference report is full of provisions that adversely affect the government of the city.

The right of self-governance is something that all of us take for granted. We take for granted that our respective districts, whether they are large metropolitan cities like Houston, or small rural towns, depend on the democratic process. In every place, except for the District of Columbia, the decisions made by the locally elected government are respected.

Even when these local officials make decisions that we might not agree with, there is no congressional action taken to overturn them. This is because local government is subject to a democratic process that provides an internal system of checks and balances. If the people do not like the decision of their officials, then the people vote those officials out of office.

This same process occurs here in Congress. We are also subject to the will of the people. However, we live and work here in the District of Columbia, and we insist that the principle of democracy we hold so dear does not apply. How hypocritical!

This Congress should be ashamed of this conference report. Once again, we intend to force the will of our special interests against this city. Proposals that we would not dare entertain in our own districts, we impose on the District.

We require the District government to jump through various hoops so that the elected mayor can receive his powers to govern. We humiliate the elected City Council by over-

seeing every piece of legislation they consider. We continue to treat the city and its residents as if they do not exist.

However, this year D.C. has proven that its government works and that its elected officials can handle the day-to-day management of the city. With a new mayor and city council, this city is on its way to financial recovery. The city has even submitted a sound budget with a surplus.

Congress should reward that progress by staying out of the internal affairs of the District government. Their citizens pay their taxes, vote and work just as hard as our constituents at home and we should not infringe upon their rights as American citizens.

The conference report includes provisions that restrict certain uses of District government funds. It includes the provision that prohibits federal and District funds from being spent on needle exchange programs.

The needle exchange program could help the District combat the spread of AIDS through contaminated needles, but this Congress has decided that D.C. residents cannot benefit from this sort of program. This Congress determined this program was too controversial for the D.C. government to spend its own funds.

Although this report does allow the city to count the ballots from the referendum on the legalization of marijuana, the city cannot spend any of its funds to reduce penalties or for legalization. If another state had a similar ballot referendum, this Congress would not prevent the results from being known, nor would we interfere with the implementation of such.

It continues to prohibit the use of District funds for abortion, although no such prohibition exists for other states. It also prohibits the use of funds for extending rights to domestic partners. Again, this would not be heard of for any State.

Since the federal payment to D.C. was eliminated in 1997, the Congress has no interest in how funds are spent in the city. Unfortunately, the appropriation process in the District is being held hostage to the interests of a few who would seek to continue the "big brother" watch over the city.

Although we are approaching the 21st century, the beginning of a new millennium, in Washington, DC, it is more like 1984—like the book written by George Orwell. Watch out D.C., "Big Brother" is watching your every move!

Please support the notion of local governance that we fight so ardently for in our own jurisdictions. Let's give a strong vote of confidence to the new mayor and city council in the District by voting against this conference report.

The citizens of the District of Columbia are not second-class citizens. They are just as important as my constituents in Houston are and as any of your constituents. Do not continue to send the message to the District residents that we do not care about democracy in this city. Vote against this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 206, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

YEAS—208

Aderholt	Gillmor	Packard
Archer	Gilman	Pease
Armey	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Goodling	Petri
Baker	Goss	Phelps
Ballenger	Graham	Pickering
Barcia	Granger	Pitts
Barr	Green (WI)	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Porter
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Portman
Barton	Hansen	Quinn
Bass	Hastert	Radanovich
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Bereuter	Hayes	Regula
Biggert	Hayworth	Reynolds
Bilbray	Hefley	Riley
Bilirakis	Herger	Rogers
Bliley	Hill (MT)	Rohrabacher
Blunt	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehlert	Hobson	Royce
Boehner	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Bonilla	Horn	Ryun (KS)
Bono	Hostettler	Salmon
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Sanford
Bryant	Hunter	Saxton
Burr	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Burton	Hyde	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Isakson	Sessions
Callahan	Istook	Shadegg
Calvert	Jenkins	Shaw
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Shays
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Sherwood
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Shimkus
Castle	Kasich	Shuster
Chabot	Kelly	Simpson
Chambliss	King (NY)	Skeen
Chenoweth	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Coble	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Collins	Kuykendall	Souder
Combest	LaHood	Spence
Cook	Largent	Stearns
Cox	LaTourette	Stump
Crane	Lazio	Sweeney
Cubin	Leach	Talent
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Tancredo
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Deal	Linder	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	LoBiondo	Terry
DeMint	Lucas (KY)	Thomas
Dickey	Lucas (OK)	Thornberry
Doolittle	Manzullo	Thune
Dreier	McCollum	Tiahrt
Dunn	McCrery	Toomey
Ehlers	McHugh	Upton
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Vitter
Emerson	McIntyre	Walden
English	McKeon	Walsh
Everett	Metcalf	Wamp
Ewing	Mica	Watkins
Fletcher	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Foley	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Moran (KS)	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Myrick	Whitfield
Frelighuyzen	Nethercutt	Wicker
Gallegher	Ney	Wilson
Ganske	Northup	Wolf
Gekas	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Nussle	
Gilchrest	Ose	

NAYS—206

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)
Allen	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Andrews	Brown (OH)	DeGette
Baird	Campbell	Delahunt
Baldacci	Capps	DeLauro
Baldwin	Capuano	Deutsch
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Dicks
Becerra	Carson	Dingell
Bentsen	Clay	Dixon
Berkley	Clayton	Doggett
Berman	Clement	Dooley
Berry	Clyburn	Doyle
Bishop	Condit	Duncan
Blagojevich	Conyers	Edwards
Blumenauer	Costello	Engel
Bonior	Coyne	Eshoo
Borski	Cramer	Etheridge
Boswell	Cummings	Evans
Boucher	Danner	Farr
Boyd	Davis (FL)	Fattah

Filner	Lowey	Rothman
Forbes	Luther	Royal-Allard
Ford	Maloney (CT)	Rush
Fossella	Maloney (NY)	Sabu
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sanchez
Frost	Martinez	Sanders
Gejdenson	Mascara	Sandlin
Gephardt	Matsui	Sawyer
Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Schaffer
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Gordon	McDermott	Scott
Green (TX)	McGovern	Serrano
Gutierrez	McInnis	Sherman
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Shows
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Sisisky
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Skelton
Hill (IN)	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Hilliard	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Hinchey	Menendez	Snyder
Hinojosa	Millender-McDonald	Spratt
Hoefel	Minge	Stabenow
Holden	Mink	Stenholm
Holt	Mollohan	Strickland
Hooley	Moore	Stupak
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Tanner
Inslee	Morella	Tauscher
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Jefferson	Neal	Thompson (MS)
John	Oberstar	Thurman
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Tierney
Jones (OH)	Olver	Traficant
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Turner
Kaptur	Owens	Udall (CO)
Kennedy	Pallone	Udall (NM)
Kildee	Pascarella	Velazquez
Kilpatrick	Pastor	Vento
Kind (WI)	Paul	Visclosky
Kleckza	Payne	Waters
Klink	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
LaFalce	Pickett	Weiner
Lampson	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lantos	Price (NC)	Weygand
Larson	Rahall	Wise
Lee	Reyes	Woolsey
Levin	Rivers	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez	Wynn
Lofgren	Roemer	

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Miller, George	Roukema
Cooksey	Moakley	Stark
Crowley	Murtha	Sununu
Diaz-Balart	Oxley	Towns
Houghton	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (PA)
Latham	Rangel	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Rogan	

□ 2032

Mr. SHOWS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HERGER and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WE MUST ACT ON EAST TIMOR
NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I woke up to read in the paper a high-level administration official comparing our choices in East Timor to whether he asked his daughter to clean up her room.

I find this comment offensive, offensive to the people of East Timor who are paying with their lives for trusting the international community; paying

with their lives by having 78 percent of the people vote for independence; offensive to the four priests I met on August 20 in Suai, East Timor, who are now rumored to be murdered; offensive from a representative of the United States which for the past quarter century has trained, armed and equipped the Indonesian police and military, who in turn organized and armed the militias now rampaging throughout East Timor.

Rather than talking about their kid's room, the Clinton administration should be announcing a cutoff of U.S. aid to Indonesia until the violence in East Timor stops and the people can return to their homes safely.

I am proud to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), in introducing legislation to oppose an immediate suspension of all U.S. assistance to the government of Indonesia. I urge all my colleagues to join us and send a message to the administration, as well as to Indonesia, that we will not stand by while East Timor burns.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 8, 1999.

WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY COHEN: I read today a summary of your position on the East Timor crisis in USA Today, which emphasized your absolute rejection of U.S. troops participating in any peacekeeping force. While I can understand your legitimate concerns regarding U.S. commitments already in place around the world, as well as for the safety of our troops, I was disappointed and dismayed that nothing was put forward about what the Pentagon might be willing to support to stop the slaughter in East Timor. Hopefully, this was the fault of the reporter and does not accurately reflect your complete views on East Timor.

Laying aside for the moment the participation of U.S. troops at some time as part of a multinational peacekeeping force in East Timor, I would hope that you would agree the U.S. could and should provide financial support to such an operation, as well as warships (similar to what Britain has already put in motion), helicopters, medical personnel, and other transport, logistical and communications support. A forceful public pledge of such support might provide the signal other nations in the region are looking for to move forward with their own commitments to such a peacekeeping mission.

The United States has been a strong and vocal supporter of the U.N.-brokered plebiscite that took place on August 30, where over 78% of the East Timorese voted for independence. What credibility will the United States and the international community have if the reward for embracing democracy is death and destruction? Is it not in the U.S. interest to help in stopping the current slaughter in East Timor?

Over the past quarter century, the Department of Defense spent considerable time and funds in training, equipping, and arming the Indonesian military and police, who in turn, organized and armed the militias currently rampaging in East Timor. Just as U.S. policy now supports the democratization of Indonesia and the referendum process in East Timor, so now should the Pentagon help to protect the vulnerable East Timorese people who embraced that process.

Time is of the essence. As you are well aware from your briefings, every hour, let

alone every day, increases the death toll and forcible displacement of the people of East Timor. I look forward to seeing more concrete, constructive and affirmative statements from you and the Pentagon on how to stop the killing and resolve the crisis in East Timor.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Member of Congress.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 9, 1999]
ONLY INTERVENTION CAN STOP THE VIOLENCE
EAST TIMOR: THE JAKARTA GOVERNMENT, UNABLE TO CONTROL ITS RENEGADE ARMY, HAS LOST LEGITIMACY

Jose Ramos-Horta shared the Nobel Peace Prize in 1996 with Roman Catholic Bishop Carlos Ximenes Belo, whose home was burned to the ground Tuesday by militias roaming Dili, the capital of East Timor. Ramos-Horta spoke with Global Viewpoint editor Nathan Gardels on Wednesday.

Question: Why is the violence taking place now, after the independence vote? Who is committing it?

Answer: The killing is a well-designed strategy prepared for a long time by the Indonesian Army intelligence and special forces. They have their own agenda, and it is very simple: They are not prepared to relinquish East Timor, regardless of the vote in favor of independence and regardless of the commitment by Indonesian President B.J. Habibie.

The so-called "militias" are a fiction. Most of these militia members are not East Timorese opposing autonomy but are Indonesians recruited from West Timor. Among the militias are special forces and Indonesian police in plain clothes. And it is not even these militias that are carrying out the main violence. They don't have the firepower to destroy buildings. And where on Earth would these local militias get the means to ship tens of thousands of people out of East Timor? The Indonesian army, like the Serbian army in Kosovo, arranged for this mass deportation of our people. They have provided the ships to take the people away.

Q: What is the objective of their campaign?

A: To overturn the vote. As far as the army is concerned, the vote is history. They know if they don't accept it, there is no one who will enforce it. Again, let me stress: The war is not being waged by the 20% of the East Timorese who voted for autonomy over independence. We had meetings with all their leaders and they were prepared to accept the vote and join us in a power-sharing arrangement. It is the Indonesian Army that is waging this war.

Q: The martial law that has been declared, then, will consolidate the military control of East Timor, not stem violence?

A: Absolutely. Martial law only strengthens the power of the military. Neither President Habibie nor the defense minister have the power to stop the army. In the context of a democratic country, the Indonesian Army is a renegade army. Along with the special forces, they are a law unto themselves in East Timor.

Q: What, then, is the solution?

A: The only solution is international intervention. If the United Nations Security Council does not fulfill its obligations and call for armed intervention, then countries that have a conscience and resources—Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the Europeans—should do it.

Q: Even if the government in Jakarta does not invite them in?

A: A government that cannot honor its international obligations because it cannot control its renegade army does not exist from the standpoint of international law.