

# REPUBLICANS' TAX RELIEF BILL WILL PROVIDE TAX RELIEF WHILE CUTTING FEDERAL GOV- ERNMENT WASTE AND FAT

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, the liberals who ran Congress for 40 years could never seem to get enough of the taxpayers' money. Every year they would come here and moan and complain that they just did not have enough money to do all those wonderful things that government does.

Since the Reagan tax cuts of 1981, there have been six major tax increases in this country: 1982, 1983, 1987, 1988, 1990, and 1993. With the passage of each of these, we were assured by the liberals that this was the tax hike that would put us on the road to fiscal recovery. Meanwhile, spending continued to spiral out of control and the debt continued to mount. No nation has ever taxed itself to prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough. The Committee on Ways and Means just reported a bill that will shift the balance away from the Government and back to the people. The bill provides tax relief for families, small businesses, and Social Security recipients targeted by the Clinton tax hikes.

To pay for these cuts, we cut the waste and the fat out of a bloated Federal bureaucracy and government that has completely lost touch with the American people. We are taking the power out of Washington and putting it back where it belongs, with the people.

□ 1015

## PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM TODAY UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 41

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 16, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 1995.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 244) "An Act to further the goals of the Paperwork Reduction Act to have Federal agencies become more responsible and publicly accountable for reducing the burden of Federal paperwork on the

public, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. NUNN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Senate Resolution 105, adopted April 13, 1989, as amended by Senate Resolution 280, adopted October 8, 1994, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, announces the appointment of Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. KYL as members of the Senate Arms Control Observer Group.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-138, the Chair on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, appoints Mr. HEFLIN as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group during the 104th Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-166, the Chair, on behalf of the majority and minority leaders, appoints Ms. SNOWE as a member of the Glass Ceiling Commission, vice Mr. COVERDELL, resigned.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 95-521, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Thomas B. Griffith as Deputy Senate Legal Counsel, effective March 13, 1995.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, the Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, the appointment of Mr. CRAIG to the Congressional Award Board.

## EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AP- PROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RE- SCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Pursuant to House Resolution 115 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1158.

□ 1015

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 15, 1995, amendment No. 66, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Two hours and 3 minutes remain for consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized on his preferential motion. Five minutes will be allowed on each side. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will control the other 5 minutes.

Is the gentleman from Louisiana opposed to the motion?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that I am moving to strike the enacting clause to give the House an opportunity to reconsider what it is about to do on this legislation today.

Everyone recognizes in this House that we need to save money. Let me stipulate again as I have throughout the process, I fully support cutting every dollar in the macro amount, in the total amount in this bill.

The only dispute that we have on the Democratic side of the aisle with those on the Republican side of the aisle is where you cut the dollars in this bill and where you do not. We think you ought to change the targets. We think you ought to cut more congressional pork, for instance. We think you ought to reconsider your decision to prevent the Coleman amendment from coming to the floor which would have allowed us to cut \$400 million in Members' highway pork. We think you ought to reconsider your decision to prevent us from offering an amendment which delays for 5 years the construction and purchase of the F-22 aircraft. The F-22 aircraft is meant to replace the F-15. The F-15 is the best fighter in the world. Nobody can come close to that fighter. For us to move to replace the F-15 with the F-22 when the F-15 clearly has a military life extending out to the year 2014, for us to decide we are going to buy the replacement plane at \$150 million a copy is budgetary nonsense.

We think that we ought to delay the construction of the F-15 for 5 years so that you can save \$7 billion so that you do not have to cut school lunches by \$7 billion. We think that is a better trade-off.

We think you ought to cut less in the programs that you have targeted that hit kids. We think we should not cut public broadcasting to the extent that you have cut it. We are willing to take

a small cut. We think you should not cut Healthy Start. We think you should not eliminate summer jobs for 610,000 kids around the country. We think you should not do what you are doing on the school lunch program. We think you should not cut 100,000 scholarships for kids who need it.

Our concern is that this bill mirrors what you are trying to do with the tax bill.

On the tax bill, you have a capital gains provision which provides 75 percent of the benefits to people who make more than \$100,000 a year. It is elitist. We think you should not in your tax bill have the provision which eliminates the requirement which we have had for years that requires Fortune 500 corporations to pay taxes. We do not think we ought to go back to the days when you had companies like AT&T, Du Pont, General Dynamics, Pepsico, Texaco, Greyhound, Panhandle East, W.R. Grace, et cetera, et cetera, who paid no taxes. We think this bill mirrors that mistake that you make in your tax package.

What I would simply say to you is this: We believe that this bill is warped and we believe there is no underlying sense of decency in the way the cuts are focused in this bill.

I would ask, in the words of Joseph Welch, the great counsel to the Army during the Army-McCarthy hearings, I would ask with respect to the targets you have selected in this bill, "Have you no sense of decency?"

Why on earth attack children? Why on earth say to 2 million senior citizens, "We are going to make you choose between paying your prescription drug bills and paying your home heating bills"? Why on earth do you do that?

Some of you say, well, seniors will still get their heating paid because the utilities will be required to provide that heat. The fact is an awful lot of seniors get their heat from fuels that are not publicly regulated. So there is no guarantee that they do not get shut off in 30-below-zero weather.

Why on earth would you say to 2 million seniors who make less than \$10,000 a year that you are not going to help them meet the cost of their heating bills so that they have to choose between food, prescription drugs, and heat. This is a merciless bill and you ought to go back to the committee and start over.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would just like to commend the gentleman both for the motion and for his statement, and I would like to point out to the gentleman and the Members of this body that on the home heating issue, I live in northeast Missouri. We have a lot of senior citizens all over northeast Missouri that are going to be impacted by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman's motion, and I urge this House to adopt this bill. Postponing the will of Congress, delaying this effort for another 10 minutes, half an hour or whatever is not going to have any effect. The American people have waited long and hard for some common sense and wisdom in congressional handling of their hard-earned money. For far too long, we have reached deeply into their pockets, and we have seized the cash they have worked so hard for, and we have consistently told them how it should be spent and why they should be happy that we are spending it that way.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have waited too long for fiscal sanity, and while this is only the first step, only the beginning, the fact is that this bill, the largest rescission bill in the history of this country, the largest rollback in previously appropriated funds by a liberal spendthrift Congress, is the first step toward fiscal sanity and a balanced budget and it must be taken. I urge that this motion be rejected, that we go forward, and that we adopt this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 228, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

#### AYES—187

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne

Cramer  
Danner  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Geddeson  
Gephardt

Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klecza  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos

Laughlin  
Levin  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Billbray  
Billirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brewster  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cunningham  
Davis  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing

Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter

#### NOES—228

Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach

Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traffant  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalfe  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen

Smith (MI)	Tauzin	Wamp
Smith (NJ)	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith (TX)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (WA)	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Solomon	Thornberry	Weller
Souder	Tiahrt	White
Spence	Torkildsen	Whitfield
Stearns	Upton	Wicker
Stockman	Vucanovich	Wolf
Stump	Waldholtz	Young (AK)
Talent	Walker	Young (FL)
Tate	Walsh	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—19

Baker (CA)	DeFazio	Murtha
Baldacci	Dooley	Nadler
Becerra	Dornan	Seastrand
Clinger	Johnson, E.B.	Shaw
Collins (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Zeliff
Collins (MI)	Mfume	
Cubin	Moran	

□ 1044

Messrs. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, EDWARDS, FOGLIETTA, and MEEHAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

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

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I was at a meeting with a delegation and missed rollcall No. 247. Had I been here, I would have voted in the negative.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained this morning and was not on the floor when rollcall vote 247 was taken. This was the motion offered by Mr. OBEY to strike the enacting clause. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment listed in the March 13 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as amendment No. 70.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAYS: Page 50, beginning on line 6, strike "\$186,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS;"

Conform the aggregate amount set forth on page 49, line 14, accordingly.

Page 54, line 18, strike "\$38,000,000" and insert "\$224,000,000".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] reserves a point of order.

Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment as well?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak in support of an amendment to restore \$186 million for people with AIDS, housing for people with AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore a cut that was made in the Committee on Appropriations that basically eliminated all 1995 appropriations for HOPWA. This is the funding that enables people throughout the country who are providing those with AIDS with housing.

We have Ryan White funds, and that provides services for people with AIDS, but HOPWA provides the housing for people with AIDS, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN].

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Shays amendment and commend my colleague, Congressman CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I have volunteered as a counselor for PWA's at the Howard Brown Memorial Center in Chicago. I have seen those suffering from this devastating disease die. I have seen those unfortunate enough to have contracted AIDS ostracized and abandoned by family and friends alike. I know the cruelty of AIDS and how that cruelty extends beyond the horrific parameters of the disease itself.

For many PWA's there is no place to turn, no place to go, no place to think of as home during their precious waning moments of time on Earth. Like victims of the Black Death in the 14th century, and those sent to leper colonies in the 19th and early 20th centuries, PWA's often are brutally ostracized by family and community alike.

The AIDS patients I have known and counseled did not want to be a burden to society. That was never their intent. But, many have been economically destroyed, and have seen the last of their financial resources, because of this crippling disease. AIDS patients are ravaged not just physically and economically, but mentally, socially, and politically as well. These are people truly in need.

When all else fails, and personal resources are exhausted, the Government has a proper role to play in assisting those in need, those who can no longer help themselves. It is for this reason that I truly believe it necessary to restore the \$186 million in funding for housing opportunities for PWA's. These are people who desperately need our help. They have nowhere else to turn.

A decade and a half ago AIDS was unknown. Now, we have just recently seen the latest statistics that show that today, AIDS is the No. 1 killer for all Americans aged 25 to 44. Among our younger population, it ranks as the sixth leading killer for those between ages 15 to 24. Among women, AIDS is

the fourth leading killer, but it is expected to rise some time in the next few years to the No. 2 position. Overall, AIDS has leapt up to become the eighth leading cause of death in America.

At the end of last year, the death toll from AIDS for the United States was 270,870. Although there is nothing that can be done for those who have already passed on, there is something that can be done for those who are still with us. We can help provide them with housing opportunities. We can support the Shays amendment.

PWA's suffer a lonely existence. Their inability to be institutionalized assures it. While it is difficult to know exactly what the total cost of institutionalization would be on a yearly basis, I am certain that moneys spent for housing opportunities for PWA's would be far less.

In fact, the statistics I have seen show that the average daily cost of an AIDS acute care bed is \$1,085. Providing housing and services to AIDS patients in a residential setting, however, costs between one-tenth to one-twentieth less than acute care. According to the Human Rights Campaign Fund, by using a residential setting, the use of emergency health care services is thereby cut by \$47,000 per person per year.

It is tragic to me that there are studies that show that about 30 percent of the people with HIV disease are in acute-care hospitals due to the fact that no community based housing alternative is available for them. Without restoration of the \$186 million for housing opportunities for people with AIDS, 50,000 more people could either wind up on the streets or also in costly acute care beds.

Homelessness and costly beds are not acceptable solutions to the housing problem for PWA's. The Shays amendment is.

To those who say there is not public support for helping people with AIDS, I suggest they look at the latest bipartisan poll, taken in late February 1995, by the highly respected Republican polling firm the Tarrance Group and the well regarded Democrat polling firm Lake Research. The results of their polling shows that an overwhelming 77 percent of the people want to maintain or increase Federal funding for the care of PWA's.

As a Republican, I was intrigued to find out that of the people polled, 66 percent of Republican men and over 70 percent of Republican women support Federal AIDS funding at the current levels or above. Rest assured, however, my interest in helping PWA's does not come as a consequence of any poll. My long record on this issue surely speaks for itself. By citing the Terrance-Lake poll I only wish to make the point that there is support for Federal assistance for PWA's among members of my party.

Based on my own experience in counseling AIDS patients, I firmly believe

that restoring the \$168 million for housing opportunities for PWA's is a necessity. It saves money for the American taxpayer. Equally as important, it saves dignity for those suffering from the cruel consequences of AIDS by giving them a home during their dwindling moments with us.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Shays amendment without hesitation or reservation. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The cuts in this bill to the HOPWA Program, which this amendment restores, will be devastating to thousands of individuals with AIDS and their families.

In New York City alone, almost 1,000 people living with AIDS would be in danger of being put out onto the streets if these funds are rescinded. And make no mistake, Mr. Chairman, the costs to society of throwing 1,000 persons with AIDS out onto the streets are far greater than the cost of providing them with housing. Hospitals are, by law, prohibited from denying emergency medical care, and it should come as no surprise that these individuals without housing will turn to hospitals. The average cost of hospital care for people with AIDS is 10 times the cost of home care.

AIDS is a public health emergency, and we should treat it as such. The HOPWA Program is cost-effective and humane, and its elimination will result in greater costs to our entire social network. It will tax our already overcrowded hospital system, and will leave members of one of our Nation's most vulnerable populations homeless.

It is estimated that while someone can live for 10 years with AIDS, the life expectancy for a person with AIDS who is homeless is 6 months. Mr. Chairman, eliminating this program would be cruel and unusual punishment to AIDS patients and their families who are already suffering immensely. The HOPWA Program will save money and keep families together. Support the Shays amendment.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shays amendment to restore vital assistance to one of our Nation's most vulnerable groups—people living with AIDS. In the absence of a cure or an effective treatment, the HOPWA Program provides what AIDS patients need most—a home, a place to restore their strength and hope.

In my own State of Connecticut, perhaps 25,000 people are HIV-positive; of these, close to 5,000 have AIDS. Yet decent affordable housing is in drastically short supply. In 1993, for example, there were 309 requests for housing in Hartford; yet only 21 individuals and 4 families with children were accommodated. Statewide, in the same year, only 141 of 1,000 requests for housing could be filled.

Mr. Chairman, I could argue against cutting HOPWA because the amount of money involved in vanishingly small in the vast sea of the budget deficit. I could argue against it on the grounds that it actually saves money, making it possible for people to leave hospitals and go to much less expensive housing. But the most telling argument, I believe, is that penalizing the most vulnerable in our society is simply wrong. We are a better country than that. We can do better than that. And I urge my colleagues to do so. Support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] wish to press or withdraw his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation. I would also withdraw my request to manage time against the amendment. I thought the gentleman was offering a different amendment, and I do not have an objection to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member insist on a point of order at this time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not make a point of order, but I would like to address a colloquy to the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Louisiana requesting time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am asking for the time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the 15 minutes. I would just like to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from Connecticut. I know he cares deeply about this subject, and he has struggled long and hard in an attempt to get this matter heard.

I know he has great reservations about the mark in subcommittee and full committee on this particular program. I have spoken with the subcommittee chair, and I know that he likewise feels strongly about his position.

I have to tell the gentleman that, in terms of research, aside from housing, but in terms of research, I looked at the figures recently on AIDS. I found that this country spends \$1,000 per afflicted patient on AIDS recipients, about \$500 per afflicted patient on cancer recipients, as little as \$25 per afflicted patient for those with Parkinson's disease, and a little bit more than that for those afflicted with Alzheimer's. So there is an imbalance on research.

I dare say that on housing and the like, AIDS patients get more than their share of money when compared to other afflicted patients.

Now, that does not intend to minimize the suffering that people undergo if they are afflicted with AIDS. It does not diminish the intensity of the concern that the gentleman from Connecticut and all those who support his bill feel for people who are truly in suffering.

I would suggest or I would ask the gentleman, if I might have the gentle-

man's attention, I would ask the gentleman to consider withdrawing this amendment at this time and I will assure the gentleman that he will get full representation and a full opportunity to discuss the matter with those of us in conference. While I cannot concede any position to the gentleman on the part of the conferees, I would just like to ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment, and I would simply assure the gentleman that I would be happy to discuss with the gentleman his points in favor of this provision, and I personally would be happy to bring it up at the conference.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

I want the Members to understand very clearly that this rescission did not reflect in any way, shape, or form a lack of concern for this problem. This Member takes no back seat to any Member regarding this issue.

I introduced the first resolution regarding evaluating strategies to deal with this problem in 1980 before most people knew what the problem was. I supported the first funding regarding research in this subject area years ago. The reality is that between 1992, in this program, and 1994, we accumulated \$306 million in this program. As of this moment, 86 percent of that money has not been spent.

It is a program in disarray because of a lack of effective management. Even with the rescission, money to meet fiscal year 1995 needs will remain available.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, and I think I control the time, I would like to yield to the gentleman, could the gentleman elaborate on that? Has the gentleman inquired why they have not adequately spent the money? Is the program not being administered properly?

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield further, it is suggested that HOPWA has complexities that cause time delays in the effective delivery of the money. The reality is that a whole array of programs for the disabled are mismanaged. There is duplication of management and an abundance of bureaucratic maneuvering.

We are simply in this amendment moving forward the President's proposal to eventually consolidate those efforts, and in turn recognizing that there is \$267 million in the pipeline that will not be spent in 1995. So it is a very appropriate time for us to force reexamination, and that truly is what this amendment is about.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I would only want to congratulate the gentleman from California for his statement. I know he has the utmost sensitivity. I know all of the members of the subcommittee and the

full committee have tremendous sensitivity for the subject at hand.

□ 1100

But we are in difficult times, and we have to understand that lots of people are suffering. There is much suffering in the world. We are doing the best we can to spread the resources that we have around to those who are afflicted. We would like to do it with an even hand.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve the balance of my time and tender back the opportunity to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] to control his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member insist on a point of order?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentlemen to insist upon or withdraw their points of order at this time in order to conserve debate time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] withdraws his point of order.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask of the Chair, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would recognize the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS]. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. SHAYS. No, I do not ask that. I have a parliamentary inquiry before I make that decision.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to be up front with every Member on both sides, even if I do not happen to agree with them.

I want the opportunity to use my 15 minutes to state the case on this issue. If the gentleman withdraws his point of order, is he allowed to bring it up in the future?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not insist upon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] insisting upon or withdrawing his point of order at this time. He may continue his reservation if he wishes.

With that ruling, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] on the remainder of his 15 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the Chair.

My understanding is that I have 9 minutes remaining. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 9 minutes remaining on his time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], and then to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], I would like to just point out that we are really talking about three issues. We are

talking about AIDS research. My colleague is right in saying that we have spent a great deal of money on AIDS research, without the kind of payback we would like. We then talk about AIDS services and the Ryan White funds, to respond to that in a very sincere and serious way. Where we have a deficiency is housing for people with AIDS. We are housing people in hospitals at \$1,000 a day instead of \$100 or less for people with AIDS in housing for people with AIDS. This is what this amendment is attempting to address. I want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], I do not know of any greater champion on this issue. He has taken a hit he does not deserve.

The purpose of this amendment brought forth by many people is in no way to embarrass Mr. LEWIS, because, frankly, he is not deserving of some of the criticism he has received.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make three or four quick points that people need to understand. The difference between AIDS and every other disease that has been mentioned is AIDS is the only infectious disease of all of these that was mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

But, second, I think we need to understand what HOPWA is all about.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is emergency housing for people, in most cases, in the final stages of AIDS who finally have been disowned by their parents, they have no place to go because of their sexual orientation. If you want to put these kinds of individuals on the street or in hospitals under Medicaid, it costs much greater. You need to understand what you are doing.

What we are pleading with the committee for is a commitment that we will not zero out fiscal year 1995 HOPWA funds. We can deal with the issue of emergency housing and Ryan White reauthorization for 1996 later on this year, but you cannot in good conscience zero out the fiscal year 1995 funds.

The gentleman from California said, "Well, there is some money in the pipeline." This is just exactly like the money that is in the pipeline in the Pentagon because this housing requires that the money be there, you then make the grant application, do the permits, you get the approval, you do the construction. So if we are going to say if you do not spend it all in 1 year you are not going to get it, we are going to have to—we have to totally revise the Pentagon budget. There is no difference systematically.

I plead with our colleagues, we have got to get a commitment we will not

zero out the fiscal year 1995 HOPWA funds.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I thank the gentleman not only for yielding the time but for his leadership on this issue.

HOPWA is an extremely important program, offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and myself several years ago. It has been remarkably successful.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, not only is it humane, these are people who are dying and who will be on the streets, but it is also cheaper. It is a lot cheaper to have someone in one of these HOPWA facilities than in a hospital where it costs far more, \$500, \$600, \$700, \$800 a day, to keep them. They are not treated in a way that is as humane, and it is more expensive.

As for the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS]—and I greatly respect his leadership on this issue—I would say to him that the reason the moneys are not expended is that 97 percent of the 1994 dollars have been authorized and appropriated. The reason they are not spent is because the groups have 3 years to do it, to build the housing and get the facility ready. It is like defense, any program with a long buildout. The money will be spent over the next few years. The 1995 moneys have not been allocated, because the Department of housing just put together a State-by-State analysis.

So I would appeal to him and others on his side to allow this amendment to go forward. It is a compassionate amendment. It saves dollars. This is not an issue of politics. This is a simple issue of compassion and decency, and I hope we could allow the vote to go forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] controls the time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I was yielding the remainder of my 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must remain standing.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is a vital amendment. The HOPWA Program providing funds for housing for people with AIDS, for people who are dying, not only will save money, does save money, as my colleague from New York says, it provides money for housing for people who are dying who would otherwise be on the streets.

In my district, which is probably the epicenter of the AIDS epidemic, it is absolutely vital, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman, my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, and I rise in support of this amendment. I understand the difficult job that my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations are laboring under in their effort to move toward a balanced budget, one that I share.

But I have to say this is one area we should not be cutting. In terms of HUD, there are 204 programs in HUD. And with the zeroing out of this program, there will be no other place for these people to receive funding. As my colleagues have said, there is a long spendout between authorization and construction to get these projects on line; they are completely correct.

At the same time, we are making dramatic reductions in the tenant-based section 8 program. So those people do not go on the waiting list and get a section 8 portable voucher to try to relieve their housing problem.

So my friends are right. Some of these people—families—are going to end up on the streets, they are going to die on the streets, and the other alternative is to have them in far more expensive institutional settings such as hospitals.

So I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] also for his leadership on this issue.

I would like to address my remarks to the Chair, noting that I am pleased the chairman of the full committee is here, because what the purpose of what we are doing in the rescission bill is to reduce the deficit. I contend and maintain that to cut these funds will increase the deficit.

Our colleagues have pointed out that the reason we found this situation, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and I, in the authorization was a number of years ago was to enable the private sector, the nonprofit sector, to minister to the needs of those with HIV and AIDS to prevent them from becoming homeless. Stress on the immune system is the worst possible thing you can do. Homelessness increases stress.

So this enables the continuum of services to be provided to people with HIV and AIDS; it keeps them out of hospitals, it eliminates the necessity for them to have other kinds of assistance, including income support.

I think if our goal is to reduce the deficit, we can do so by restoring these funds.

Mr. Chairman, it is also a compassionate thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman

from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the Chair. I appreciate the graciousness of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for letting us proceed, and also the majority whip.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD], a former Peace Corps volunteer.

Mr. WARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we need to support this. We need always to remember that we are not talking about some people whom we will never meet. These are our sons, our daughters, our uncles, our aunts, our uncles, sisters, our brothers.

It will cost more to do it without making the changes this amendment purposes.

I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by making a few very basic points.

I arrived in this House in 1987 at the death of Stewart McKinney. Stewart McKinney died of AIDS. There is a real hero in this country named Lucie McKinney.

Lucie McKinney has devoted her life to people with AIDS.

She was not a public person while her husband was a congressman. She became a very public person. She works tirelessly night and day on this issue of, not AIDS research, not AIDS services, but providing homes for people with AIDS.

This has not been an easy task for her, because we have so many people who are on our streets, without homes, dying of AIDS. Occasionally and quite often they find themselves spending their last days in a hospital, at \$1,000 a day.

Lucie McKinney provides this housing for them for one-tenth of that cost, with the help of the State, with the help of the Federal Government, and with the help of so many volunteers and people who contribute.

Mr. Chairman, this cause matters to me. It matters to many people in this Chamber. I sincerely believe cutting out the 1995 funds is a mistake, and it is a misunderstanding that this issue is continually being reviewed.

It is also my understanding that I could have had a Member, any Member here, raise a point of order at any time, and they had the graciousness to allow us to continue.

At this time I would just like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to clarify with me his request that I withdraw this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] maintains time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the chairman.

I would say to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] that if it is his intention to withdraw this amendment and if in fact he withdraws his amendment, that I would be happy to work with the gentleman and all of the people who have risen today to address this matter in conference.

Obviously, we cannot go forward today because I am confident that a point of order will be raised if in fact the gentleman persists in his motion. But should he withdraw it, I will work with him and work with the other body, and we will attempt to resolve the issue at least partially, if not in whole, to his satisfaction.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Louisiana had said before that he would not object, and I understand there may be other objectors on his side. But this is such an important issue, it is a program that has worked with so little waste. I would ask others on the other side not to object and to allow this amendment to go forward. It seems to me there was a real mistake here made when they zeroed out the entire program. I would hope that we could move this amendment forward in a bipartisan air of compassion and understanding as to what this is all about.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I have to tell the gentleman I have made my position clear. I cannot speak for all of the Members in the House. Any single Member has the right to make a point of order.

Therefore, I must again relay my offer to the gentleman. If he will withdraw, I will work with him. If he does not withdraw, then I cannot make the same offer.

Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to yield, but think we have to move this because we have two or three other amendments that we must address before time runs out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] desire to press or withdraw his point of order?

□ 1115

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, based on the dialog that has taken place in this instance with the chairman, and based on the courtesy of this House for allowing me to proceed on an amendment that could have been declared out of order, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I rise for two reasons: First of all, to commend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr.

SHAYS] who is carrying a very heavy burden in a very difficult place, and simply to remind Members that this is not a request for a proportionate share of bearing the burden of reductions amongst all our programs, that this is not a 2-percent, or a 5-percent, or a 10-percent cut. We are talking about people who are fatally ill and who have no home, and we are not asking them to share 2 percent or 5 percent of the pain we all have to share; we are asking them to go away and to die in the streets, and we are asking for zero funding.

Mr. Chairman, in Boston this means 244 people sick and homeless. That is unacceptable, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment seeks to amend a paragraph previously amended, and the procedures in the U.S. House of Representatives, chapter 27, section 27.1, states the following:

It is fundamental that it is not in order to amend an amendment previously agreed to. Thus the text of a bill perfected by amendment cannot thereafter be amended.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to amend text previously amended, and is, therefore, not in order. I respectfully ask the Chair to sustain my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that this is not out of order.

Mr. Chairman, what we have done here is in submission with the rule. We have taken money from an existing program. It is a program that was cut before. It is within the same walls, the VA-HUD appropriation. This is a narrowly restricted rule.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and I worked long and hard, and we checked over and over again with the Parliamentarian to make this amendment, even within the confines of that terribly restrictive rule, to be in order because of the urgency of this program, and I would say that if an amendment like this which, A, cuts the same amount of money as it adds; B, cuts it from a program within the VA-HUD authorization/appropriation; and, C, cuts it from a program that has already been cut, is not in order, then in God's name what is, in this body, on this bill?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order. I wish to state that if the point of order of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is in order, that just points to the ultra-restrictiveness of the rule under which this bill was brought to the floor because we did abide by—

Mr. DELAY. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California will state her objection.

Ms. PELOSI. My objection is, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] pointed out, that the amendment is in keeping with those criteria that were set out by the Committee on Rules that funds come from the same title and the same subcommittee allocation. The amendment does do that, and it would seem to me that it would be out of order to call a point of order against it on that score. If, in fact, it is so, it just again points to the restrictiveness of the rule when we are used to open rules on appropriations bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her point.

Mrs. LOWEY. This to me just seems so unreasonable. This was taken out of the budget, it was taken out of the appropriate account. Not to be allowed to take a vote on this issue, considering the devastating impact of this on cities, on people—

Mr. DELAY. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEREUTER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

Under the precedents recorded in section 31 in chapter 27 of Deschler's procedure, the point of order of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is sustained. It is consistent with the Chair's ruling yesterday on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chair:

If I am not mistaken, the last three amendments that have been offered to this bill have come from the majority side of the aisle. Would it be possible for me to call up an amendment at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, the members of the committee have precedence, and it would be the minority's turn for recognition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 25, line 12, strike "\$82,775,000" and insert "\$72,775,000".

Page 26, line 4, strike "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$60,000,000".

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] re-

serves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] who is the real author of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask at the appropriate time to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Louisiana insist on his point of order at this time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not at this time. I reserve my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to restore funding for the Healthy Start Program. This small, Federal program is a proven success story in saving the lives of our Nation's infants. Healthy Start provides critical funds to cut down on high infant death rates in urban and rural communities across the country, from Philadelphia to Pee Dee, SC, from Milwaukee to the Mississippi Delta. Healthy Start provides education, prenatal care, clinical services and home health visits to pregnant mothers and their new babies.

My colleagues, the important part about this program is that it works. In my district, infant mortality rates are as high as Mexico or Panama. Before Healthy Start began, 14.2 Philadelphia babies died for every 1,000. After just 1 year, the rate has fallen to 11.7, when the national average is 8.9.

The rescissions package takes away \$10 million of fiscal year 1995 funds for this life-saving program. Yet, every dollar makes the difference between life and death for babies in these communities. Not one baby's life should be scarified for the sake of paying for a tax cut package. We cannot let this happen.

I am proposing to restore funds for Healthy Start by taking an additional \$10 million from the Buildings and Facilities account of the National Institutes of Health. I am told that the funds in this account will not be used as intended. The rescissions package takes back \$50 million from this account. I am simply proposing to take an additional \$10 million to fully fund this Health Start Program. I emphasize that none of the lifesaving activities of the NIH will be hindered by this additional rescission.

In cities like New Orleans and Oakland, in places like Northern Plains, SD and the Mississippi Delta, Healthy



Start has just started to do the job. Let us finish the job of saving infants' lives by restoring this program of full funding.

I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment.

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is telling the Members of the House that this program, which to me in a very mean-spirited way is being cut by the majority, is actually to the benefit of infants and children.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. And, no question, by cutting it they are saying that it is all right to do this to the infants and children of people here in the United States; is that correct?

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I would not speak for the majority, but I assume that is what the bottom line is.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is what happens; is it not?

Mr. FOGLIETTA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. And there is no question in the gentleman's mind and my mind that somewhere along the line this very same committee is going to fund programs that are going to take care of infants and children in other parts of the world?

Mr. FOGLIETTA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. So it is all right to take care of them someplace else, but we cannot do it for our own people. We have got to cut them out. Our people have to make all these sacrifices, and no one else does. We are going to take care of the rest of them, but we are not going to take care of our own.

Is that correct?

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I believe we should be taking care of our own; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] has expired.

The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] if he intends to press or withdraw his point of order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has completed his time, I do intend to insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] because it seeks to amend the paragraphs previously amended. In the procedures in the U.S. House of Representatives, chapter 27, section 27.1, states—

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for just a second?

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman suspend his point of order so I can yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, with the Chair's consent I suspend my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may yield then for an inquiry.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania had expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana controls the time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Are there any other allocations of time asked for on the floor at the moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Only the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] control time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then at this point, Mr. Chairman, I reserve my point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA]. The program, the Healthy Start Program, has literally saved lives. There are children who are alive today who otherwise would not be alive. It is something that people on both sides of the choice question support. It is an effort to intervene in meaningful ways to provide care and information and education to would-be parents, particularly women who are about to conceive children. It is a program that has worked in Philadelphia.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the point of this exercise is to show how much we can cut out of this budget. It is interesting that we could not find any dollars from the military to cut even though we spend more than the rest of the world combined on our Armed Forces. We could not find in any of the billions in corporate welfare any room to cut, but somehow we have zeroed in on children, we have zeroed in on Healthy Start, on college scholarships, on summer job programs. Somehow we have made an aggressive effort to retard much of the progress being made in terms of intervening in the lives of young people, to make their lives more meaningful and more purposeful.

□ 1130

Yes, it costs to care, and education is indeed expensive. I would argue that lack of caring and ignorance is more expensive, and that we should, in this case, support the Foglietta amendment and hopefully restore this cut to Healthy Start. Failing to do that, as I have indicated yesterday, we should vote against the entire rescissions package.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that we really ought to support and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] who has offered this amendment. Under this rescission funding for Healthy Start has been cut \$10 million. This program provides resources and assistance to rural and urban communities with high infant mortality rates.

A few days ago over on that same subcommittee we had six Nobel laureates who sat before us and talked about the state of health in America today. One of the things that they talked about to us was the high infant mortality rates in this country today. While infant mortality rates is a matter of being able to rate a nation in terms of its total health care, our Nation ranks about 17th in the world. Here we are, the top country in the world, yet we rank about 17th in the world in terms of infant mortality rates.

Under these cuts, what is going to happen is that about 2,200 pregnant women would not receive primary care, 33,000 prenatal visits would be eliminated, 3,000 pediatric appointments would be eliminated, 5,800 clients would not receive child care, 3,267 clients would not receive skill in job training.

This is an area in which many of our local and rural communities have been able to deal with one of the most pressing problems confronting their communities. I would hope that we would restore these funds and support the gentleman from Pennsylvania in this very important amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to emphasize, in the city of Philadelphia, before this program started, the infant mortality rate was 14.2 per thousand. After 1 year, 1 year of this program, it dropped from 14.2 per thousand to 11.7 per thousand.

On behalf of the children whose lives will be saved in the future with this program, I implore you to withdraw your point of order and let us pass this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the restoration of Healthy Start funding. The fact that the Republicans cut this program is cruel and shortsighted. This is, by far, the lowest, mean-spirited assault on the most vulnerable of our citizens—newborn babies and infants.

It is absolutely intolerable that the United States has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the entire world.

In fact, the United States ranks 21st out of 23 industrialized countries or infant mortality. The mortality rate for minority children in our inner cities ranks behind many third-world nations.



To combat this alarming rate of death among newborns, we developed the Healthy Start Program. The Healthy Start Program provides the only link to the health care system for countless pregnant women.

The severity of the Nation's infant mortality problem is evident in the city of Boston. African-American women experience infant mortality rates more than twice that of white women.

Fortunately, these Healthy Start programs work. We have already begun to see the results. In Boston, this program helped deliver over a 12 percent decrease in infant mortality from 1992 to 1993.

Boston's goal is to build on this progress and reduce the infant deaths by 50 percent by 1996.

We should not take away vital funds from cities that are saving lives.

Just last week, I visited a Healthy Start Program in my hometown of Boston. At Boston Children's Hospital, the Advocacy for Women and Kids in Emergencies—or the AWAKE Program—responds to the need for services for battered women who come to Children's Hospital to get care for their abused kids.

It is the only program of its kind nationwide providing a full range of advocacy and outreach services to battered women and their kids in a hospital setting.

Mr. Chairman, to see family violence through the eyes of a child is heartbreaking.

Every day, at least three children die because of abuse or neglect, often at the hands of a family member.

In 1993, nearly 3 million child abuse and neglect cases were reported.

It makes absolutely no sense to cut 10 percent of Healthy Start funding—funding that supports so many innovative programs like AWAKE that help save the lives of newborn babies and infants.

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. FOGLIETTA], which would restore \$10 million in funding for the Healthy Start Program. The Healthy Start Program is essential to combat the disturbingly high rate of infant mortality in this country. In Boston, where I represent, infant mortality is a significant health problem despite the presence of the world's best hospitals, medical schools, and academic health centers. This is a travesty that a rich, industrialized nation like the United States has an infant mortality rate that is equal or higher than some third-world countries.

If you are a young, black, pregnant woman in Boston, the odds of your baby being born prematurely or with low birth weight nearly doubles. The Boston Healthy Start initiative has been working in conjunction with community health centers throughout the city to reduce this alarming infant mortality rate. This program is crucial in that it provides pre- and post-natal care to pregnant women that are at risk. Healthy Start educates young mothers about proper nutrition for both them and their newborns. Healthy start also teaches mothers about appropriate health care. But, most important, Mr. Chairman, Healthy Start empowers women, families, and communities. This program is a modest investment from the Federal Government to building a healthier climate for all people in urban areas and the best way

to build that climate is to give our children a healthy start.

I find it ironic that my good friends from the other side of the aisle claim they want to cut waste and cut programs that don't work, but they never seem to bat an eye at throwing \$41 billion at some comic book weapons fantasy like star wars. I implore my Republican friends to have a little forethought, for once, and invest in our kids. I realize they don't vote or take you out for dinner or contribute to your campaigns, but children are the future of this country. Remember that, and vote in favor of the Foglietta amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] insist on his point of order?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes an eloquent case, which will be addressed in conference, but at this time I reluctantly make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment because it seeks to amend a paragraph previously amended. In the procedures in the U.S. House of Representatives, chapter 27, section 27.1, it states as follows: It is fundamental that it is not in order to amend an amendment previously agreed to. Thus the text of a bill perfected by amendment cannot thereafter be amended.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to amend text previously amended and is therefore not in order. I respectfully ask the Chair to sustain my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEREUTER). The Chair is prepared to rule, because it is exactly similar to the previous ruling. The gentleman's language attempts to amend further a figure changed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], yesterday. Under the precedents recorded at section 31 in chapter 27 of Deschler's Procedure, the point of order of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is sustained. It is consistent with the Chair's ruling on the DeLauro and Shays amendments.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Will I be able under these circumstances to ask the gentleman from Hawaii to withdraw his motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will allow the gentleman from Wisconsin to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me state I fully share the gentleman's outrage that this amendment is not in order, but I do not think that there is any useful purpose to be served by taking out on the Chair the fact that we

have a stupid rule. I think all the Chair is doing is enforcing an extremely stupid, ill-advised, vicious, and cruel rule. So I will recognize the justice in what the gentleman from Hawaii is trying to do, but I think it is good if we have the right target, which is the Republican leadership, and not the Member in the Chair.

I would urge the gentleman respectfully to withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] insist on his appeal?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my appeal. Respectfully, I am not targeting the Chair. The people of this country are being targeted.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to table the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to table is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

The question is "Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?"

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

#### [Roll No. 248]

Abercrombie	Borski	Condit
Ackerman	Boucher	Conyers
Allard	Brewster	Cooley
Andrews	Browder	Costello
Archer	Brown (CA)	Cox
Armey	Brown (FL)	Coyne
Bachus	Brown (OH)	Cramer
Baesler	Brownback	Crane
Baker (CA)	Bryant (TN)	Crapo
Baker (LA)	Bryant (TX)	Cremeans
Baldacci	Bunn	Cunningham
Ballenger	Bunning	Danner
Barcia	Burr	Davis
Barr	Burton	de la Garza
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Deal
Barrett (WI)	Callahan	DeFazio
Bartlett	Camp	DeLauro
Barton	Canady	DeLay
Bass	Cardin	Dellums
Bateman	Castle	Deutsch
Becerra	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Beilenson	Chambliss	Dickey
Bentsen	Chenoweth	Dicks
Bereuter	Christensen	Dingell
Berman	Chrysler	Dixon
Bevill	Clay	Doggett
Bilbray	Clayton	Dooley
Bilirakis	Clement	Doolittle
Bishop	Clinger	Dornan
Bliley	Clyburn	Doyle
Blute	Coble	Dreier
Boehlert	Coburn	Duncan
Boehner	Coleman	Dunn
Bonilla	Collins (GA)	Durbin
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Edwards
Bono	Combest	Ehlers

Ehrlich	Kim	Pombo
Emerson	King	Pomeroy
Engel	Kingston	Porter
English	Kleccka	Portman
Ensign	Klink	Poshard
Eshoo	Klug	Pryce
Evans	Knollenberg	Quillen
Everett	Kolbe	Quinn
Ewing	LaFalce	Radanovich
Farr	LaHood	Rahall
Fattah	Lantos	Ramstad
Fawell	Largent	Rangel
Fazio	Latham	Reed
Fields (LA)	LaTourette	Regula
Fields (TX)	Laughlin	Reynolds
Filner	Lazio	Richardson
Flake	Leach	Riggs
Flanagan	Levin	Rivers
Foglietta	Lewis (CA)	Roberts
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Roemer
Forbes	Lightfoot	Rogers
Ford	Lincoln	Rohrabacher
Fowler	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Fox	Lipinski	Rose
Franks (CT)	Livingston	Roth
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Roukema
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Frisa	Longley	Royce
Frost	Lowe	Rush
Funderburk	Lucas	Sabo
Furse	Luther	Salmon
Gallegly	Maloney	Sanford
Ganske	Manton	Sawyer
Gejdenson	Manzullo	Saxton
Gekas	Markey	Scarborough
Gephardt	Martinez	Schaefer
Geren	Martini	Schiff
Gibbons	Mascara	Schroeder
Gilchrest	Matsui	Schumer
Gillmor	McCarthy	Scott
Gilman	McCollum	Seastrand
Gonzalez	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McDade	Serrano
Goodling	McDermott	Shadegg
Gordon	McHale	Shaw
Goss	McHugh	Shays
Graham	McInnis	Sisisky
Green	McIntosh	Skaggs
Greenwood	McKeon	Skeen
Gunderson	McKinney	Skelton
Gutierrez	McNulty	Slaughter
Gutknecht	Meehan	Smith (MI)
Hall (OH)	Meek	Smith (NJ)
Hall (TX)	Menendez	Smith (TX)
Hamilton	Metcalf	Smith (WA)
Hancock	Meyers	Solomon
Hansen	Mfume	Souder
Harman	Mica	Spence
Hastert	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Stark
Hastings (WA)	Mineta	Stearns
Hayes	Minge	Stenholm
Hayworth	Mink	Stockman
Hefley	Moakley	Stokes
Hefner	Molinari	Studds
Heineman	Mollohan	Stump
Henger	Montgomery	Stupak
Hilleary	Moorhead	Talent
Hilliard	Moran	Tanner
Hinchey	Morella	Tate
Hobson	Murtha	Tauzin
Hoekstra	Myers	Taylor (MS)
Hoke	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
Holden	Nadler	Tejeda
Horn	Neal	Thomas
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Thompson
Houghton	Neumann	Thornberry
Hoyer	Ney	Thornton
Hunter	Norwood	Thurman
Hutchinson	Nussle	Tiahrt
Hyde	Oberstar	Torkildsen
Inglis	Obey	Torres
Istook	Olver	Torricelli
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Towns
Jacobs	Orton	Trafficant
Jefferson	Owens	Tucker
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Upton
Johnson (SD)	Packard	Velazquez
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Vento
Johnston	Parker	Visclosky
Jones	Pastor	Volkmer
Kanjorski	Paxon	Vucanovich
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)	Waldholtz
Kasich	Payne (VA)	Walker
Kelly	Pelosi	Walsh
Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (FL)	Wamp
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)	Ward
Kennelly	Petri	Waters
Kildee	Pickett	Watt (NC)

Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker

Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn

Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

□ 1157

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred twenty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for a recorded vote on his appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Does the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] insist upon his demand for a recorded vote?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. If not, the decision of the Chair stands sustained on the prior voice vote of the Committee of the Whole.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 23.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS: Page 22, line 13, strike "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that there will be 20 minutes of debate, 10 minutes on each side.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] will be recognized for 10 minutes to control the time on his amendment.

Does any Member stand in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I will indicate opposition to the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the 10 minutes in opposition be divided evenly between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

□ 1200

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I appreciate the opportunity to have this amendment finally. We have been waiting quite some time for it. I want to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] for all the hard work he has done on this amendment and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] who has also been instrumental in getting this amendment on the floor. I also want to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] who is the ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee. He and I have talked about this. He and I are good friends. We approach this particular amendment from different perspectives.

Mr. Chairman, many members have heard this discussion on the NEA ad infinitum. We could talk about it for hours. I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has plenty of people

on his side as I do on my side who feel strongly about this subject. But I can summarize this debate very quickly for all of us, because we do not have much time.

First the NEA is about \$167 million in expenditure. We have cut within the rescission bill \$5 million. This amendment simply asks for an additional \$10 million. That means a total of \$15 million would be cut from the NEA budget, less than 10 percent, approximately only 9 percent total.

My colleagues, remember, this has to go to the conference committee. Traditionally, historically, when it goes to the conference committee, they cut it even further down. So I say to my friends here in the House, let's make at least a modicum of a cut, 9 percent total, so if it goes to conference and it comes back, we will not be left like we did last year with a 2.5 percent reduction after we labored for hours on the House floor to get just a mere 5 percent.

At this point, I say to Members, this can be summarized, this is simply a 9-percent cut on a \$167 million project that under anybody's opinion we can cut that much if we intend to reduce the deficit.

I know the people on that side feel very strongly about this, and I respect that, but I am approaching this from a fiscal responsibility stand point and I urge the people on that side not to use hyperbole on this debate. We have heard this time and time again. This is simply a 9-percent cut.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. All we have to do is mention NEA and my friends, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], go into orbit. They are determined to immortalize Maplethorpe and Serrano, to make them as famous as Michelangelo in order to kill the NEA, which I think essentially is what they want to do.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] says his amendment is a 9-percent cut. On the contrary, for remainder of this year, with the time remaining and the amount of funds that are remaining, it amounts to a 17-percent cut, but really when they talk about Maplethorpe and Serrano, which is the fundamental stain that bases their amendments.

How many people saw the Maplethorpe and Serrano exhibit under NEA grants? Not many. Serrano was shown at one gallery, a South Carolina gallery. Maplethorpe at two galleries, three museums. How many people got to see these exhibits? And yet, because of Maplethorpe and Serrano, the sponsors of this amendment want to take NEA funds from hundreds of museums throughout the country serving millions of people from scores of symphony orchestras and theaters and

schools where children learn about art and about artists.

Let me read to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] an article from *The Washington Post* which occurred on February 12. It is about the executive director of the Shenandoah Shakespeare Express, a Shakespeare troupe that tours two-thirds of the United States.

Last year, the NEA gave the Shenandoah Shakespeare Express \$5,000 and the money helped take a fellow, "The Taming of the Shrew," "Much Ado About Nothing," to more than 100 high schools and colleges in more than 30 States.

It is true, most Americans do not associate the NEA with kids learning to love Shakespeare and that is because one Senator and others have created the compelling fiction that all the agency does is to fund kookie and depraved artists.

Well,

But here is the real story. Our little Shakespeare company, says the executive director, got \$5,000, not much, but 33 times more than the human Etch-A-Sketch and our grant, not his, is typical of the NEA. By far the majority of NEA money goes to local theater groups to, community orchestras, to regional museums, what you might call the traditional art. Conservatives often complain about the evils of popular culture, the sex in movies, the violence in rap, the profanity in rock lyrics, but they have targeted the NEA and that is the organization that most assures the continuation of the classical theater, the classical dance and the music in this MTV world. You have to wonder.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that NEA is part of the fabric of the people of this country, worn by the people of this country, and I think the people of this country are firm in the desire that NEA continue. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. I thank my colleague the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We just heard the eloquent plea for the arts from my distinguished colleague from my home State of Illinois. Yet it misses the point altogether. The fact of the matter is we have an arts bureaucracy in this government entity called the National Endowment for the Arts. That government bureaucracy only awards one recipient out of every four that makes an application.

If we look at where those applications or those grantees are, I can understand why a colleague from the State of New York might be for preservation of the NEA in perpetuity. I can understand why somebody from California might take the same position, and I understand why somebody from Washington, DC, especially, would want to see it preserved.

The fact of the matter is, I say to my colleague from Illinois, Washington, DC is, you probably do not realize this, a hub of artistic talent, and they get twice the grants that our whole State of Illinois gets. Yet they have fewer people in Washington, DC, than in your congressional district or my congressional district. In fact, Washington, DC, gets more in grants than Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wyoming combined. That goes to Washington, DC.

That is what goes to Washington, DC thanks to this arts bureaucracy and how they are manipulating public moneys and misallocating public moneys.

Keep in mind another thing, too. That last year the private sector anted up \$9.3 billion to fund the arts, in contrast to a \$167 million input at taxpayer expense through this wheeling and dealing operation I touched upon.

A single art auction up in New York, for example, brought in \$269.5 million. For all I know, some of my artistic colleagues from New York may have participated. In addition to that, a single painting alone last year managed to get \$82.5 million.

I submit to Members that this is an issue that needs to be addressed. I hope it will be addressed more fully when we get to the question of total funding. That is later in the year. But right now this is a very modest cut when we are asked to reallocate scarce resources and we have heard eloquent appeals as to where money should be going other than the way the committee has determined. I compliment the gentleman on his amendment and urge everyone to support it.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair announces that under the rule, we must rise at 12:18. We have 11½ minutes of allocated time. I advise the Members there will be insufficient time to have the entire quota.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we have 3 additional minutes to make the time.

The CHAIRMAN. That request is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, could we have the allocation of the time based upon the Chair's stipulation at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests and, without objection, will reduce the amount from the two sides equally, 1½ minutes from the gentleman from Florida and 1½ minutes from the two gentleman combined.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 50 seconds.

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

Mr. REGULA. I just want to advise Members of the situation. In the sub-

committee, we took out \$5 million from NEA, remembering last year we cut it 2 percent on the floor and sustained that in the conference. That \$5 million comes out of individual grants. There will be no money left in the NEA for individual grants which have been the problem. None. Zero.

If this amendment is passed, this will have to come out of the grants all over the United States to small communities with symphonies, ballet, and museums. It will mean the concert on the mall on the Fourth of July and Memorial Day. I hope many Members have seen it on C-SPAN, it is a great thing. Basically, if you vote for this amendment, you are voting against those small amounts that reach out across the United States for educational programs, for the small groups within the communities, for the grants to the State arts commissions. You are not voting against individual grants. We have already eliminated all the money for the individual grants in the subcommittee which was ratified by the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee on Educational and Economic Opportunities will have to hear the question of reauthorizing the NEA, so that is the place to deal with the problem. If we do not want NEA, we do not have to reauthorize it for fiscal year 1996 and prospectively. But let us not cut out that little bit of money that is being spread across the United States to many of the things that you cherish in each of your respective communities.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] who has worked on this amendment.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague from the State of Florida for yielding me time.

With regard to an earlier amendment last evening, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], said really what we are about here today is making choices on priorities. In the greater scheme of things, I think there are very few, at least I would hope there are very few in this Chamber that would disagree with the proposition that in the larger scheme of things, when we are looking at food and when we are looking at national defense and when we are looking at the whole range of priorities that are reflected in this rescission bill, funds for the NEA do not rank as high as the other provisions.

That is one reason, one of many reasons why I rise in support of this amendment which I have coauthored. I would also point out to my distinguished colleague from the State of Illinois that the NEA does fund works of so-called art that have titles that cannot even be repeated on the floor of this Chamber. We do not need that. The citizens of this country and my district do not need that. They do not want that.

□ 1215

That is why I think it is very appropriate in the larger scheme of things and based on the merits of this rescission that this amendment be adopted.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that he is going to allocate the time based upon the time reduction, a slight deduction equally shared, one-half minute for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], 1 minute for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], and three-quarters of a minute for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As David McCullough said, it is like getting rid of the Navy because of the Tailhook scandal.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I find it tragically ironic that in this era of fiscal belt-tightening some are trying to slash one of the wisest and cost-effective investments the Federal Government makes in its citizens.

Eliminating funding for the NEA is a classic case of being pennywise and pound-foolish. The total budget for the NEA costs each citizen only 65 cents a year, and yet it leverages more than \$1 billion every year from private donors.

The activity generated by the NEA produces a huge economic and cultural impact on our society. In fact, a study by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey found that the total impact of the arts in the New York metropolitan region was more than \$10 billion a year.

All over America, artists, musicians, orchestras, dance companies, theaters, and public schools rely on the National Endowment for the Arts for essential support. Their work has enriched our communities and our quality of life. This amendment will undermine many of these organizations and do damage to our cultural heritage. It will take funds out of our schools and away from our children.

I urge my colleagues to heed the words of two witnesses at a recent hearing before the Interior Appropriation Subcommittee: Ken Burns, producer of the highly acclaimed "Civil War" and "Baseball series" on PBS, and David McCullough, Pulitzer Prize winning author of the biography on Harry Truman.

Ken Burns declared emphatically that his Civil War series would not have been possible without the Endowment's support. And David McCullough pointed out that abolishing the NEA just because of a few ill-conceived or offensive programs would be like abolishing the U.S. Navy because of the Tailhook scandal. I couldn't have said it better myself.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will harm our Nation's schools and damage our cultural heritage. It must be defeated.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Stearns amendment to slash funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

In many ways the Contract on America is a declaration of war. A war on children, a war on consumers, a war on the environment, a war on senior citizens. In their budget-cutting zeal, the new majority has proposed \$17 billion in rescissions for 1995, almost entirely from programs that make the lives of ordinary Americans a little safer, a little brighter.

The Republicans have structured this rescission bill to eliminate any chance that we could even debate cuts to the bloated Defense budget. The Pentagon, of course, has returned to its exalted status as a sacred cow.

While they have taken defense off the cutting board, they're making mincemeat out of the arts. The new leadership invests in that which destroys, but destroys that which creates. The contract may sound good on the surface, but its cost cutting rhetoric masks policies that are heartless and mean-spirited.

And the contract's war on the arts is nothing short of primitive.

The NEA budget for this year is \$167 million. Cultural funding is a mere two ten-thousandths of 1 percent of the Federal Government's \$1.5 trillion budget. Arts funding costs approximately 64 cents per capita, or the same amount as two postage stamps.

According to a recent Lou Harris poll, 60 percent of the American people believe that "the Federal Government should provide financial assistance to arts organizations." According to the same poll, more than half the American people would support paying up to \$15 a year to support Federal arts funding.

Speaker GINGRICH has attacked the NEA as providing patronage for an elite group. In fact, the NEA increases access to arts and culture for all citizens. In the 30 years since the endowments were created, the number of theater, dance, and opera companies across America has increased from 120 to 925.

NEA grants work as seed money. They make it easier for recipients to raise money from other sources.

Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader DICK ARMEY have both stated that the Federal Government has no business making grants to artists and artistic organizations.

They say this at a time when violence continues to increase and, in our inner cities, human lives are cheaper by the dozen. I cannot imagine a worse time to cut programs that exalt the human experience, when all around us we see it degraded. Arts advocates who visited my office this week described NEA grants they had received which were used to create arts programs for inner city children.

We should be celebrating the contributions of the arts endowments to our country today, rather than trying to destroy them. We should be congratulating the endowments for encouraging creative ideas that help poor children rise above their cruel circumstances.

As Christopher Reeve said Tuesday in his speech at the Arts Advocacy Breakfast:

There is no leading nation in the world that does not support the arts, usually two, three, ten times as much as we do. Why

should we be different? Public arts funding is a concept that stands beside public education as an obligation a government has to its people and to history.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida which would rescind \$15 million, in addition to the \$5 million rescission already in the bill, from the National Endowment for the Arts' meager but important fiscal year 1995 budget. We should increase or maintain current levels of Federal support for the arts and humanities, not pull the foundation out from under cultural projects in most communities throughout the Nation, which benefit virtually every American.

I introduced an amendment to restore the \$5 million to the NEA and \$5 billion to the NEH which would be rescinded by this bill. With an unreasonably restrictive rule and a mere 10 hours of debate on a bill covering every Federal expenditure, my colleagues will not have the opportunity to discuss the merits of maintaining the NEA and NEH budgets. Some may say that during a time of drastic Federal cutbacks, we should expect and accept reduced funding for the arts and humanities. Drastic reductions in fiscal year 1995 appropriations to the valuable programs funded through the NEA have already been made. It is now time to look for somewhere else to cut.

The NEA exemplifies successful public-private cooperation, impressive returns on a Federal investment, and an efficient and productive Federal agency on a skeleton budget. With a budget totaling only a fraction of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget each year since 1965, when the NEA was established, the Endowment has made a substantial contribution to promoting art and culture in America. Since the NEA was established, the number of symphony orchestras has grown from 110 to 220, dance companies have shot up from 37 to over 250, opera companies have increased from 56 to 420, and state arts agencies are up from 5 to 565.

Congress should continue its important role of supporting arts, culture and the humanities in America. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and any other attempts to undermine Federal commitment to the arts.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1158, the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill. While I wholeheartedly support the emergency supplemental to provide the Federal Emergency Management Agency with additional funds necessary to fulfill its mission—much of it for rebuilding in the aftermath of the Northridge

earthquake—I cannot support the massive reductions in domestic Federal spending contained in this legislation.

A little over a year has passed since Congress recognized the dire need for the Federal Government to intervene in the wake of the Northridge earthquake. Less than a month following the quake, emergency supplemental appropriations cleared both houses and was signed by the President. Congress recognized the need to treat this funding as it had in the past—as a national emergency, off-budget, and in bipartisan fashion. What a difference a year makes.

The majority has now drastically altered the treatment of emergency appropriations, requiring offsets in funding—even when those offsets, as they do in this bill—cynically pit the general well-being of one group of Americans against the well-being of another. While the majority recognizes that further emergency expenditures are necessary to rebuild Los Angeles' public infrastructure and respond to other emergencies across the Nation, they now direct that this should be done by undercutting programs which also serve those communities.

We are establishing a system under which a national disaster will have devastating impacts on two distinct groups of Americans—the one suffering the disaster and the one asked to pay for the disaster. It is a perverse system.

Is there a need to reform the way in which we respond to natural disasters in this country? Certainly, there is. The Bipartisan Task Force on Disasters acknowledged as much in proposals to expand the availability of disaster insurance, create a reinsurance fund, and initiate a public-private partnership to finance disaster relief. Those are the issues we should be debating, not funding disaster relief on the backs of poor and low-income Americans.

The bulk of the rescissions in this bill do not go to covering the needs of FEMA. They will now go to deficit reduction. While this is preferable to their original intention to pay for tax cuts, it is unconscionable that the majority in this House has sought to ask the least able to make the greatest sacrifice.

The committee cuts \$1.7 billion from the summer youth employment program over the next 2 years—eliminating the program. While the majority says that Americans should move off welfare and into the workplace, that same majority contradicts itself by decimating programs which encourage work experience.

The committee report states that "this program is a lower-priority Federal activity that we can no longer afford." What we cannot afford is to defund a program which gives 600,000 kids per year their first exposure to the workplace and a work ethic. It would seem to me that the first step in achieving jobs-based welfare reform is exposing underprivileged youth to their first job.

The Republican mayor of Los Angeles recognizes the importance of this program. According to Mayor Riordan, "the elimination of the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program would have devastating consequences for the children and youth of Los Angeles." Those consequences include eliminating employment opportunities for more than 30,000 low-income youth in our city. To quote from the mayor's letter to Chairman LIVINGSTON, "the elimination of \$22 million in fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996 is cost ineffec-

tive, poses significant challenges to our public safety goals and will ripple through our city in a grim fashion."

Forty-three percent of the cuts contained in this legislation fall on programs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Public housing funding is cut by \$3 billion—nationally, 40 percent of these units are occupied by the elderly. A \$2.7 billion rescission in rental assistance translates to a reduction of 70,000 rental vouchers and certificates and 12,000 of those certificates had been reserved for homeless women with children.

In its fiscal year 1996 budget submission, HUD has clearly indicated its intention to dramatically reinvent the agency. Indeed that reinvention is based on moving primarily to "tenant-based" rather than "project-based" assistance. Yet over \$1 billion in public housing modernization funds are cut—funds critical to improving the condition of units to enable HUD to implement its reforms.

In their zeal to cut, the majority bypasses the opportunity to have a meaningful debate on the future of Federally assisted housing in this country, including access to affordable housing, and housing for the homeless.

Throughout this legislation there are reductions in funding and elimination of programs in education, job training, veterans benefits, and low-income fuel assistance which will cause severe hardship to great numbers of Americans. Is there duplication and overlap in Federal programs? Is there need for reform? Is there waste and inefficiency in government bureaucracy? There may well be, but millions of Americans have come to rely on those programs—some for the basic necessities of life, others for their first shot at opportunity in this society.

In a reasonable and rationale atmosphere the American people would be well-served by debating true consolidation and true reform. Reducing and defunding these programs in this haphazard manner will only serve to exacerbate the situation of low-income Americans, increase tensions in our communities, and in the end, serve nothing but a political agenda based on the devolution of the Federal Government. I urge defeat of this legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. My colleagues, I ask you to oppose this amendment. The National Endowment for the Arts not only nurtures America's cultural inheritance, but it also expands on our Nation's cultural activities.

Let me give examples. Before the National Endowment for the Arts, there were 37 dance companies in America, now there are more than 400. Before the NEA, there were 27 opera companies, now there are 120. The list goes on. The NEA works. Resist these cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for the final 1 minute.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we know what we are about today is the rescission package. A rescission package is what do we

take out of the budget because it is extra. But it is beyond that today. What we really need to talk about is the fact that we cannot charge this.

You see, we spend \$200 billion extra a year and we are charging this to my grandchildren. Let us take the high moral ground and say no to extra spending for the nice things, but they are not necessary.

It is time to say yes to this amendment and get about what the people told us to do, and that is get rid of the deficit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for the final 25 seconds.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, a point of information: Do I have the opportunity to close the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is defending the committee position, and he will have the opportunity to close. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] may proceed for 25 seconds.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, for this amendment to pass, it is going to require conservative Democrats to help out with the Members on this side of the aisle. The question is can we cut a Federal Government program by 9 percent, realizing that within \$167 million, \$26 million is for Federal administration.

Surely we can cut the money within this program when it only adds up to 9 percent. So the Members on both sides of the aisle, I appeal to their fiscal responsibility and sanity, let us cut this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for the final 1 minute.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a correction of the gentleman's statement, and that is that the real effect of this is a 26-percent cut.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say this: that I have been in business for 40 years, and business is a cost-cutting process. I have cut and I have cut, but the one thing you do not cut is those things that are quintessential to the very essence of the community in which you live. Everything tends to drag us down to the lowest common denominator.

Please do not cut the National Endowment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cripples the National Endowment for the Arts.

Before my colleagues think about cutting funding for the NEA I want to remind you that

Federal arts funding benefits every district in the country. The national endowment benefits every region in the United States through State grants, arts education, and anticrime programming.

Thirty-five percent of NEA funding goes to each State's art agency in the form of a block grant. This amendment automatically reduces the size of each States grant.

Of this 35 percent each State must spend 7.5 percent of these dollars on projects that serve rural, urban, and underserved communities.

In New Mexico—for the last 7 years State grant moneys have funded the churches project. Over 100 communities have restored their historic churches because of the cultural and artistic symbolism they represent.

Voting in favor of this amendment means no arts education for our children.

Last year a \$22,000 grant to the chamber music residencies pilot project which placed chamber music ensembles in rural communities for a school year. The chamber ensembles taught children in public schools in Tifton, GA; Jesup, IA, and Dodge City, KS, who would not have otherwise had any music education.

Voting in favor of this amendment means reduced funding for crime control programs. A youngster with a paint brush or learning lines for a play is a lot less dangerous than one with a gun.

NEA anticrime funds provide for programs like Arizona's APPLE Corps which uses arts programs with antidrug messages as after-school alternatives. Other anticrime projects the endowment funds include: Voices of Youth throughout Vermont, First Step Dance Co. in Lawrence, KS, Boise Family Center project in Boise, ID, Arts in Atlanta project, Alternatives in L.A. Program, and the Family Arts Agenda in Salem, OR.

Instead of targeting programs that are wasteful and bloated, this amendment targets programs that improve the quality of life for every American.

And it cuts these dollars not to go for deficit reduction but—to a windfall for the richest 10 percent of our Nation.

What voting for this amendment ensures is that the richest 10 percent of our country will be the only ones that can ever be able to afford to see an opera, a Shakespeare play, to hear an orchestra.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong opposition to the Crane amendment. As chair of the arts caucus, I have watched in amazement year after year, as the pittance that the National Endowment for the Arts receives from the Federal budget is consistently denigrated, incorrectly characterized, and almost always cut. And all this from an agency whose entire budget is below what is allocated for military bands.

While Federal funding for the arts, and art agencies like the National Endowment for the Arts, make up a mere 0.02 percent of the national budget, for each \$1 the NEA spends, \$11 of activity results. The nonprofit arts industry alone contributes \$36.8 billion to the U.S. economy and provides over 1.3 million jobs to Americans nationwide. Business, tourism, restaurants, and hotels strive on the arts. The annual audience for nonprofit theaters serve an audience that has grown from 5 million in 1965 to over 20 million in 1992. More Americans attend art events annually than

they attend professional sports events. A 1992 poll sponsored by the American Council on the Arts showed 60 percent of the American people favored Federal support of the arts. Further reductions in funding for the NEA would have adverse implications on both constituents and the cultural agencies in our districts. The author of this amendment must be aware of the ramifications his amendment would have on his own district. The \$181,000 received by the Illinois Art Council in past years to support artists residing in Mr. CRANE's district would be eliminated. This money made it possible for writing, crafts, theater, dance, and visual arts projects to exist in Palatine and Elk Grove Village, IL—both of which are represented by Congressman CRANE. In my district of Rochester, NY, the National Association of Local Arts Agencies found that nonprofit arts organizations spent approximately \$124 million annually and supported more than 4,000 full-time jobs.

Discussion about our national priorities begin and end with children—they are our future, our legacy, and our greatest resource. What the arts can do in the lives of our Nations children cannot be underestimated. The arts have the power to change a child's life. Children that create do not destroy. Access to art assists in keeping kids in school and off the streets. Art has a positive impact on a child, it enriches their lives and empowers them with a strong sense of self-worth. The NEA stresses that arts education may be the only way to reach at-risk children, deter them from violence, and increase their ability in every academic area giving them a sense of identity and discipline. Children who have art in education are better students with stronger analytical skills and higher esteem. The NEA's Arts in Education Program places 14,500 artists in schools in every State to work with children. Arts education is integral to school curriculum as it affects virtually all areas of learning. Children who learn through the arts improve in every academic area, have better attendance, and have increased motivation to learn. In 1993 the college entrance examination reported that students who studied the arts more than 4 years scored 53 points higher on the verbal portion of the exam and 37 points higher on the math portion of the exam than students with no course work or experience in the arts. This makes it essential for the NEA to be able to continue to provide support to our Nations children.

The NEA provides equal access and opportunity to the people of our Nation, many of whom would otherwise be deprived from experiencing the arts in American society. The arts serve as a medium of documentation, the essence of the American experience is recorded through art. Art remains a living record of civilization and society. Every civilization judges the civilization before it by the art it has left behind. Are we going to leave anything behind?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 260, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

#### AYES—168

Allard	Frisa	Packard
Archer	Funderburk	Parker
Armey	Gallegly	Paxon
Bachus	Gekas	Petri
Baker (CA)	Geren	Pombo
Barr	Gillmor	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Pryce
Bartlett	Goss	Quillen
Barton	Graham	Radanovich
Bass	Hall (TX)	Riggs
Bateman	Hancock	Roberts
Bilirakis	Hansen	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Hastert	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Roth
Bono	Hayworth	Royce
Browder	Hefley	Salmon
Brownback	Heineman	Sanford
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Scarborough
Bunning	Hilleary	Schaefer
Burton	Hoekstra	Seastrand
Buyer	Hostettler	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Hunter	Shadegg
Calvert	Hutchinson	Shays
Canady	Hyde	Shuster
Chabot	Inglis	Skelton
Chambliss	Istook	Smith (MI)
Chapman	Johnson, Sam	Smith (NJ)
Chenoweth	Jones	Smith (TX)
Christensen	Kasich	Smith (WA)
Coble	Kim	Solomon
Coburn	King	Souder
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Spence
Combest	Largent	Stearns
Condit	Latham	Stenholm
Cooley	Laughlin	Stockman
Cox	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Cramer	Lightfoot	Talent
Crane	Linder	Tanner
Crapo	Manzullo	Tate
Cremeans	McCollum	Tauzin
Cunningham	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Deal	McIntosh	Thornberry
DeLay	McKeon	Tiaht
Diaz-Balart	Metcalf	Vucanovich
Dickey	Mica	Waldholtz
Doolittle	Miller (FL)	Walker
Dornan	Molinari	Wamp
Dreier	Montgomery	Watts (OK)
Duncan	Moorhead	Weldon (FL)
Dunn	Myers	Weller
Emerson	Myrick	White
Everett	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	Neumann	Wicker
Foley	Ney	Young (FL)
Forbes	Norwood	Zeliff
Fowler	Orton	Zimmer

#### NOES—260

Abercrombie	Clay	Ewing
Ackerman	Clayton	Farr
Andrews	Clement	Fattah
Baessler	Clinger	Fawell
Baker (LA)	Clyburn	Fazio
Baldacci	Coleman	Fields (LA)
Ballenger	Collins (IL)	Filner
Barcia	Collins (MI)	Flake
Barrett (WI)	Conyers	Flanagan
Becerra	Costello	Foglietta
Beilenson	Coyne	Fox
Bentsen	Danner	Frank (MA)
Bereuter	Davis	Franks (CT)
Berman	de la Garza	Franks (NJ)
Bevill	DeFazio	Frelinghuysen
Bilbray	DeLauro	Furse
Bishop	Dellums	Ganske
Blute	Deutsch	Gejdensen
Boehlert	Dicks	Gephardt
Bonilla	Dingell	Gibbons
Bonior	Dixon	Gilchrest
Borski	Doggett	Gilman
Boucher	Dooley	Gonzalez
Brewster	Doyle	Goodling
Brown (CA)	Durbin	Gordon
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Green
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Greenwood
Bryant (TX)	Ehrlich	Gunderson
Bunn	Engel	Gutierrez
Camp	English	Gutknecht
Cardin	Ensign	Hall (OH)
Castle	Eshoo	Hamilton
Chrysler	Evans	Harman

Hastings (FL)	McCrery	Roybal-Allard
Hayes	McDade	Rush
Hefner	McDermott	Sabo
Hilliard	McHale	Sanders
Hinchey	McInnis	Sawyer
Hobson	McKinney	Saxton
Hoke	McNulty	Schiff
Holden	Meehan	Schroeder
Horn	Meek	Schumer
Houghton	Menendez	Scott
Hoyer	Meyers	Serrano
Jackson-Lee	Mfume	Shaw
Jacobs	Miller (CA)	Sisisky
Jefferson	Mineta	Skaggs
Johnson (CT)	Minge	Skeen
Johnson (SD)	Mink	Slaughter
Johnston	Moakley	Spratt
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Stark
Kaptur	Moran	Stokes
Kelly	Morella	Studds
Kennedy (MA)	Murtha	Stupak
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Taylor (NC)
Kennelly	Neal	Tejeda
Kildee	Nussle	Thomas
Klecza	Oberstar	Thompson
Klink	Obey	Thornton
Klug	Olver	Thurman
Knollenberg	Ortiz	Torkildsen
Kolbe	Owens	Torres
LaFalce	Oxley	Torricelli
LaHood	Pallone	Towns
Lantos	Pastor	Trafigant
LaTourette	Payne (NJ)	Tucker
Lazio	Payne (VA)	Upton
Leach	Pelosi	Velazquez
Levin	Peterson (FL)	Vento
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Lincoln	Pickett	Volkmer
Lipinski	Pomeroy	Walsh
Livingston	Porter	Ward
LoBiondo	Poshard	Waters
Lofgren	Quinn	Watt (NC)
Longley	Rahall	Waxman
Lowey	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
Lucas	Rangel	Williams
Luther	Reed	Wilson
Maloney	Regula	Wise
Manton	Reynolds	Wolf
Markey	Richardson	Woolsey
Martinez	Rivers	Wyden
Martini	Roemer	Wynn
Mascara	Rogers	Yates
Matsui	Rose	Young (AK)
McCarthy	Roukema	

## NOT VOTING—6

Burr	Ford	Johnson, E. B.
Cubin	Frost	Lewis (GA)

□ 1237

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Cabin for, with Mr. Frost against.

Mr. MARTINEZ changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SMITH of Michigan, SMITH of Texas, BASS, WHITFIELD, CRAMER, POMBO, and KINGSTON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] and urge Members to oppose rescissions which would pull the plug on this valuable service.

Millions of Americans—including countless members of the bay area community in California—have come to rely on public broadcasting for quality programming on a wide range of issues.

Yet some have argued that Federal funds for public broadcasting must be eliminated in order to help balance the budget, and others claim that CPB should be abolished because it is a bastion of liberal propaganda.

While I certainly favor serious steps to reduce the deficit, and have voted accordingly in Congress, the truth is each dollar of Federal support for public broadcasting attracts \$5 in support from private sector sources. CPB is a good investment.

Furthermore, the assertion that CPB propagates liberal political ideals is unfounded. The last time I checked, “Sesame Street,” “Mr. Roger’s Neighborhood,” and “Barney” were not overtly political shows. And when did William Buckley’s “Firing Line” become a hotbed for liberalism?

Mr. Chairman, as a mother who raised two children, I relied on public broadcasting and learned the value of noncommercial television. I never worried about leaving the room while my kids were watching Ernie and Bert or Fred Rogers because I knew they were in safe hands.

These are shows which emphasize the values of respect, honesty, and good citizenship. I’m certain my children, who have gone on to achieve superb educations, got a head start in their academic careers from the lessons they learned on public broadcasting. And as young adults, they still tune in.

I strongly urge Members to consider the economic and educational benefits of CPB when casting their votes today. This is not a political vote. It’s a vote for our children. It’s a commonsense investment in our future.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the bill, H.R. 1158, emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions.

I am extremely disappointed with the rule under which H.R. 1158 has been brought to the floor. It is unfortunate that my colleagues and I have been denied the opportunity to offer alternative cuts to restore funding for programs we support.

Cutting programs like the Low Income Home Energy Program [LIHEAP] is not the way to get our fiscal house in order. We should not totally eliminate the funding for a critical program which targets the very poor and helps them stay off other forms of welfare. In a time when we were trying to get individuals off welfare, we are eliminating a program which really goes to the heart of the problem and offers preventive measures.

In North Dakota, one-third of all LIHEAP recipients receive no other government assistance. LIHEAP makes the difference between families becoming homeless or dependent on more costly welfare programs.

For many senior citizens, the winter months force the heartbreaking decision of eat or heat. The high cost of heating their home forces some seniors to enter a nursing home, spend down their resources, and then become dependent on Medicaid.

In the view of these concerns and the fact that eliminating Federal funding for heating assistance places yet another financial burden on the States, I cannot support this rescission measure.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill, and in support of Citizens like Annie Coleman of my district who will turn 73 on April 30. This bill pulls the rug out from under her. Let me tell you her story.

Annie lives on Oakwood Avenue in Toledo, OH, and worked all her life for Superior Laundry. She saved to own her own home and raised four children. She took care of a dying mother and husband after her retirement.

She now survives by picking up odd jobs, at age 72, because her Social Security checks of \$640 a month are simply not enough to make ends meet. She pays nearly \$200 a month for health insurance and prescriptions. Her heating bills are \$180 a month and she receives \$117 a month in winter heating assistance and emergency heating assistance in the winter. Even with this helping hand, she is left with \$90 a week on which to live. Without it, she must make a choice between food and heat. No one who has lived through below zero Midwestern winters should be forced to make that choice.

The bill before us will eliminate the winter heating assistance [LIHEAP] Program. It will hurt Annie and 25,000 other citizens in northwest Ohio; it will hurt over 2 million elderly citizens across America. I cannot support a bill which puts the most vulnerable people in our society at risk.

Over the past 2 days we have engaged in a major debate on the worthy goal of balancing our budget by cutting \$17.3 billion. Reducing the deficit and balancing the budget is a must and I have worked hard and continue to work hard to achieve that. But this is not the way to do it.

As we try to plug the red ink dike, the holes in the dike of our increasing debt, this \$17.3 billion exercise is fruitless because at the same time there are billions of dollars flowing out the other side of the dike that are not under consideration and we are told are completely off the table.

Why not get rid of tax breaks for corporate welfare? We hear a lot about welfare for ordinary citizens. What about corporate welfare? Why not eliminate the tax breaks that give \$5 billion for pharmaceutical companies to leave the United States and manufacture offshore; why not eliminate \$30 billion worth of transfer pricing that rewards all these foreign corporations operating in the United States that do not pay a dime of taxes; why not auction off the rights to manufacture the space station and exact continuing royalties that will result in \$40 billion in savings?

This rescission bill before us today makes none of these cuts. The bill before us today is irresponsible fiscal policy. No one should swallow the line that this bill will really result in deficit reduction. While it hurts our seniors and cuts out the summer jobs for our teenage sons and daughters, it also bankrolls the money for a future tax cut for America’s wealthiest citizens. Thus, not only is the money being cut from our children and seniors, but it then is shifted to pay for capital gains and other tax cuts for the wealthiest among us as well as disaster relief largely for one State, California, which has the resources to pay for its own costs. In fact, the Governor of California has announced he wants to cut taxes in his State by \$7 billion while asking the Federal Government to pick up \$5 billion in disaster assistance.

The cuts in this bill will severely impact my community. I am especially worried about the impact of these cuts on the elderly and children.



## SUMMER YOUTH JOBS

Over my strong objections, the summer jobs for teenagers will be eliminated by this bill, which will eliminate nearly 2,000 jobs over 2 years in my district. In fact, 20 percent of the entire savings in this bill—\$33 billion in all—comes from cuts in the various programs to move teenagers into the world of work. The rescission package completely eliminates summer jobs which employs about 600,000 young people nationwide. Youth, job training, Job Corps, and school-to-work accounted for \$500 million in cuts.

In my district, 1,683 youth enrolled in the program and participated in jobs that were not make work jobs last summer. They worked at community centers and nonprofits throughout the community. The cut jeopardizes several innovative programs. The city of Toledo used summer youths to remove graffiti. The Arts Commission of Greater Toledo provided them with the opportunity to prepare public artwork, and learn skills at the same time. The Community Development Center—Spencer Township—uses summer youth to run a nutrition program to make up for school lunches that disadvantaged children do not get in the summer. The Red Cross and Catholic Club run recreation/day camp programs so that younger children have some place constructive to go during the summer months.

In addition, hundreds of other youth work at area nonprofit communities performing vital maintenance, upkeep and support functions that would go undone if not for summer youth workers.

## WINTER HEATING ASSISTANCE [LIHEAP]

This bill will eliminate heating assistance to help pay for gas and utility bills for over 13,700 seniors and a total of 25,000 low income families in my district. This includes 12,531 seniors in Lucas County, 521 seniors in Wood County, 383 seniors in Ottawa County, and 266 seniors in Fulton County. Nationwide, 2 million elderly households are helped each year through LIHEAP. The rescission package would completely eliminate the program. This cut will force low-income elderly to choose between heat and medicine or heat and food. No one in our Nation should be forced to make this choice.

## PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Quality educational programming at our public television stations WBGU and WGTE will also be affected by cuts of over 30 percent in funding that will accelerate over the next 3 years. With the increase of violence and degrading television programs, CPB continues to fund marvelous children's educational and entertaining programs such as "Sesame Street," "Reading Rainbow," and "Square One TV." Educating children, especially preschoolers is one of the most important goals of public television and where public television performs best.

## MEDIGAP INSURANCE SCAMS

The rescission package cuts in half Federal assistance to help senior citizens in all income groups being victimized by so-called Medigap insurance scams. Literally billions are spent by seniors each year on health insurance and while much of it is needed, it is estimated that a major portion of the total is either duplicative or coverage that seniors already have or is written in a way as to provide most seniors with very little added coverage.

During committee consideration, we attempted to meet deficit targets using cuts in

programs that did not adversely affect children and the elderly. We tried to convert disaster assistance to California from grants to loan guarantees in order to minimize the budget impact and reprogram dollars to people's needs.

We must not put the most vulnerable people in our society at risk, to provide disaster assistance to States who can afford to pay for their own problems or to provide a tax cut for the wealthiest in our Nation. This bill is wrong-headed and deserves rejection.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, the GOP rescissions bill we are debating today is wrong headed. Worse, it sets a dangerous precedent, by laying waste to education and nutrition programs in order to finance a tax bailout for America's wealthiest individuals and corporations.

Although the bill we are debating would extend necessary aid to communities in California damaged in the Northridge earthquake, the bill targets programs that help many of our most vulnerable citizens—schoolchildren, the elderly, and working Americans trying to adapt to a changing economy.

The American people have begun to express their profound unease with elements of the Contract With America. Recent polls in the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times indicate a growing sense of discontent and ambivalence toward many of the major proposals put forth by the Republican leadership.

The American people are not misinformed. They don't need another lecture from a talk-radio host. They don't need to read a campaign manifesto that bills itself as "A Job Creation and Wage Enhancement Act." They don't need to pay for a series of lecture tapes.

Sadly, they are all too familiar with a governing philosophy that puts the wealthiest few ahead of the working family.

The American people want their representatives to speak honestly. The GOP promised much of the same just a few years ago. Tax breaks for the wealthy. Savings down the road. The result was deficit spending at a record rate and a trillion dollar debt for our children.

The Republican's have, so far, failed to present a budget to the American people that spells out their commitment to hard-working families, children, the elderly, and the disadvantaged. What they have presented, in detailed fashion, is a bill to slash care for expectant mothers and newborn children; a bill to strip schools of the resources they need to provide a safe, drug-free environment for learning; a bill to deny young people the opportunity to work this summer and next summer.

Instead, they had the temerity to announce a new round of tax relief that does little for middle-class working Americans.

By eliminating the alternative minimum tax, the Republicans have given large corporations the opportunity to shirk their tax obligation.

50 percent of the total benefits of the GOP tax plan would benefit those earning \$100,000 or more. The capital gains provision would also disproportionately benefit upper-income taxpayers—76 percent of the benefits would go to the same group of upper-income Americans.

Ninety-two dollars. That's what the capital gains tax cut would mean for families that take home less than \$30,000 a year.

A \$92 break—at the expense of a safe, drug-free classroom, or a balanced diet for a newborn infant, or a summer job for a young father. That sounds more like a con-job than a contract.

The Republicans offer little relief to the vast segment of our work force that has seen real incomes decline. Between 1979 and 1993, 60 percent of Americans experienced no real income growth.

Despite the explosive growth of overall household income in the same period, most benefits were concentrated among upper-income families.

Restoring opportunity and providing the foundation for income growth for every working American—that is my commitment.

It is with regret that I cannot support final passage of the disaster assistance. However, as immediate needs can be met through existing funds in FEMA, Congress still has the opportunity to make responsible choices in offsetting this spending. It is unfortunate that the Republicans have chosen to go forward with vital disaster aid as part of a controversial package of spending cuts.

Not only have the Republicans suddenly decided to set a precedent and offset disaster assistance retroactively, they make three times as many cuts as necessary. In order to solve a disaster, they create another disaster for many of the very people in need.

They target those cuts to people who have paid the price in the past and who are the most vulnerable, seniors and children, while exempting other programs that should be considered and cannot be touched under the rule. If the Republicans wanted to deal seriously with the budget, they would not have jeopardized disaster assistance or resisted initial efforts to link the offset to deficit reduction.

This bill is dishonest and should not be supported. Disaster assistance should be considered on its own merits and not as part of some back-room deal to provide a tax cut to upper-income people and America's largest corporations, the very folks who really don't need it. Even if these cuts are put toward deficit reduction, the pending tax cuts will still have to be paid for in the future. It is evident what the Republican Members are saying—no matter what it is we are paying for, it is those at the lower end of the income scale who will pay for it.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the proposed elimination of the Summer Youth Program. I fully support the program and will fight to restore its funding when the rescissions bill is sent to the conference committee later this year.

At the same time, I encourage private sector businesses to contribute to the Summer Youth Program so they may make a contribution to the communities in which they do business. In these times of tight budgetary constraints, it is my hope that local businesses can assist in ways that the Government can no longer afford.

Although I support the Summer Youth Program, I also saw the need for reducing the deficit. If we continue to spend money we don't have, we will be passing the financial burden on to our children.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues, especially the members of the Appropriations

Committee, to work to restore the funds necessary to continue the Summer Youth Program.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the rescissions of appropriations for public broadcasting included in H.R. 1158. These shortsighted cuts will have a serious impact on the broadcasting of high-quality educational and cultural broadcasting.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1158 would rescind a total of \$141 million from advance appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. These rescissions amount to a 15-percent cut in the fiscal year 1996 appropriation, and a 30-percent cut in the fiscal year 1997 appropriation.

Like many of the rescissions included in this bill, the CPB rescission would unfairly hurt middle-income working Americans the most—all to pay for the coming Republican tax-cut bill that will mostly benefit wealthy Americans.

Opponents of public broadcasting have often commented that Federal funding for the CPB benefits primarily the cultural elite. A close study of those who view or listen to public broadcasting shatter this myth. Of the more than 15 million people who listen to public radio, 41 percent earn less than \$30,000 annually. More than half the over-18 million regular viewers of PBS stations are from households with incomes of less than \$40,000.

Mr. Chairman, 99 percent of the country receives at least one public broadcast signal—for free. This broad reach is especially important for our cities. Public broadcasting is more than a broadcast service for these areas. Public TV provides instructional services to 30 million students and 2 million teachers in three-quarters of the Nation's schools. It provides approximately 1,600 hours of free, non-commercial programming each year for off-air taping and classroom use.

Public broadcasting also offers Americans flexible opportunities for lifelong learning. About 88,000 adults, each year, use public television to study for the high school equivalency examination.

In short, Mr. Chairman, public broadcasting serves every segment of our society. We should not cut its Federal funds to provide tax breaks for wealthy Americans. I will oppose these short-sighted cuts and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak about a portion of the rescission package currently before the House, one that has more to do with policy than with cutting funds.

Included in the rescission package is wording that concerns one of public housing's greatest difficulties—one-for-one replacement requirements. These requirements make it almost impossible for a public housing authority to tear down old, expensive, often totally abandoned buildings because of misguided laws and regulations.

The distinguished member from California and chairman of the HUD/VA Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, correctly focuses on this issue as one of many impediments to rebuilding our Nation's neighborhoods.

Clearly, as chairman of the authorizing subcommittee on this matter, it is my responsibility to set the course on important policy matters. Mr. LEWIS' repeal of section 18(b)(3) of the Housing Act is a temporary measure for fiscal year 1995 aimed at alleviating immediate pressures on local PHA's who want to

get rid of these boarded-up eyesores. It falls on the authorizing subcommittee to enact the serious policy changes that can make this happen.

Even before this rescission bill came up, the distinguished Member from Louisiana, RICHARD BAKER, and I were working to draft legislation that will address the full range of issues surrounding this requirement. Mr. BAKER championed this issue in last year's housing bill.

I am glad to see this issue addressed and I assure this body that the permanent authorizing language addressing the entire range of problems relating to the demolition of vacant public housing is forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Appropriations VA/HUD Subcommittee chairman and his actions to send a message to HUD—this is not business as usual. I look forward to continuing this process in the months ahead.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the bill before us, which attacks many of the programs that assist our Nation's neediest citizens. I am particularly disturbed by the fact that this bill deals a devastating blow to the millions of American households that depend upon fuel assistance provided by the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program to get through each winter by eliminating all funding for this program.

LIHEAP recipients are some of the poorest among us—in fact, 70 percent of those people who receive LIHEAP funds have annual incomes of less than \$8,000. They include working families with young children, the disabled, and the many senior citizens who live on limited, fixed incomes.

This program is especially critical for people in New England, who must wage a battle on two fronts, for survival during winters that can be bitterly cold, and for economic stability in a recovering, but by no means robust, economy.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spent considerable time and energy earlier this year professing their commitment to protecting our Nation's elderly from financial insecurity. When we debated the balanced budget amendment, the Republicans told us that they would not raid the Social Security Program to bring down the deficit. They were unwilling to write this guarantee into their amendment, to enshrine this protection in the Constitution, and yet they asked us to take their word for it that they would protect Social Security.

And now, a few short weeks later, the Republican leadership of this House has brought before us a bill that completely eliminates funding for LIHEAP. Of the 144,000 people from Massachusetts who receive assistance from LIHEAP, 40,000 of them are over the age of 60. What kind of financial security is the House GOP providing to those 40,000 low-income seniors by taking their heating assistance away? A study conducted by the University of Massachusetts has shown that our senior citizens must sometimes sacrifice food in order to pay for fuel to heat their homes in winter. Making it even harder for these people to afford home heating energy will only make our seniors less financially secure in what is meant to be their golden years.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak to an issue of utmost importance to my district in western New York.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud congressional efforts to trim Federal spending and reduce our deficit. We are making some bold and difficult decisions. The rescissions bill before this body makes many steps in the right direction.

It is an injustice, however, to eliminate programs—which unlike the Small Business Administration's tree planting program—people depend upon to meet their basic needs.

I am referring to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program or LIHEAP. I know this might not be a big concern to citizens in Florida or Arizona—but to those who live in areas like Buffalo, NY, it can be a matter of life or death.

LIHEAP provides fuel assistance to disabled, working poor, and low-income senior citizens who can not meet their own total energy needs. Fifty-five percent of households receiving assistance have at least one child under age 18 and 43 percent include senior citizens.

Some argue that LIHEAP was conceived in a time of energy crisis and that is no longer needed. We must remember, however, that energy is still not affordable to everyone.

LIHEAP recipients have an average income of \$8,257 per year—without some assistance their heat could be cut off. Eighteen percent of their incomes are spent on energy needs.

LIHEAP is a vital program which is certainly not pork or luxurious Federal spending.

I am very worried about the families and seniors from my district and districts across the Nation who may be unable to properly heat their homes next winter. I hope that the good and bad aspects of eliminating the LIHEAP program will be more properly addressed during the appropriations process.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I believe deficit reduction is critical to our Nation's future. I supported the balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto. I will support efforts across the board to cut unnecessary spending.

But I am particularly troubled by the provision in the pending rescissions bill that completely eliminates the summer youth jobs program for both 1995 and 1996. Mr. Chairman, this is not just a cut, it's not just holding the line at current levels, it kills the initiative entirely.

I agree that we must reform and consolidate job training programs, but this is the worst means to achieve that end.

The Summer Youth Jobs Program is not pork or welfare. It's work and common sense.

When told of these cuts, Janet Ames, Summer Youth Jobs Program coordinator in Washington County in my congressional district said:

Elimination of the Summer Youth Jobs Program is a terrible mistake. By denying opportunity to our young people, we will send a signal that work doesn't matter. That is the worst message we can send them. These funds must be restored.

The people I represent are deeply concerned about rising crime in our suburban areas.

As Ron Nicholas, the chief of police of Blaine, MI, stated when told of these cuts: "The Summer Youth Jobs Program is the best tool local law enforcement has seen that reduces youth-related crime. It doesn't make any sense to eliminate it."

If the proposed cuts go into effect, 1,200 young people in my congressional district in

Anoka, Washington, and Dakota Counties of Minnesota will have less hope, less opportunity, and less chance for a positive work experience to shape their lives this summer.

Let's be honest with ourselves—many at-risk young people simply don't have what most of us had in our own lives—a requirement to get up in the morning, a person to show them how to work, or someone to appreciate their accomplishments and build their self-confidence and self-esteem.

Let's rise above politics today and give our young people an alternative to despair and hopelessness—because there is no denying that as predictable as the sun rises every morning, despair and hopelessness will result in young lives with unlimited potential being forever lost to the tragedy of criminal behavior. We cannot afford to let that happen.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1158, the omnibus rescissions and disaster supplemental appropriations bill.

I don't argue with the need to make the tough choices that will lead to a balanced Federal budget. That's why I'm sponsoring a balanced budget bill with Congressman BOB WISE.

But I am deeply troubled by what this bill says about our priorities as a nation.

We aren't making tough choices here. We're taking shots at the most vulnerable among us: our children and senior citizens.

We're cutting deeply into the greatest investments we can make in our country's future prosperity: education and job training.

Where is our commitment to investing in the future potential of our young people and American workers?

Let me point out one example.

This bill eliminates 5 programs that help 60 million American adults who are functionally illiterate become productive and self-sufficient citizens.

Literacy programs aren't a drain on Federal and State treasuries. Illiteracy is.

According to the Ohio Literacy Resource Center, low literacy levels cost \$224 billion a year in lost productivity, welfare payments, and crime-related costs.

The proponents of this bill have said that we are eliminating programs that don't work. I submit unequivocally that these literacy programs do work.

This bill eliminates all funding for State Literacy Resource Centers.

These centers provide "one-stop shopping" for State and Federal literacy services needing assistance with research and curriculum development. They eliminate the need for overlapping functions at the State level. They promote public/private partnerships by linking educational institutions with information about improved literacy techniques developed by private organizations and researchers.

This bill eliminates all funding for the National Institute for Literacy.

The Institute coordinates efforts to reach the sixth national education goal: that all Americans will be literate by the year 2000. It also provides technical assistance to literacy providers.

The Institute is in its 2nd year of operation. It has launched important new initiatives to promote adult literacy across the country. This is a service that works. It's not broke. It doesn't need to be fixed. So for goodness' sake, let's not break it!

I had hoped to offer an amendment to restore the funding for literacy programs.

But under the current rule, the only way to do that would be to take more money from: educationally disadvantaged children; or from programs that help teachers improve their skills; or from job training programs for young people.

That's not a rational choice at all.

That's not just robbing Peter to pay Paul. It's robbing our Nation of its future.

Perhaps we should heed the words of a prominent and much-admired American: "Parents with literacy problems are more likely to raise children who will have problems themselves."

Ladies and gentlemen, Barbara Bush is right. The greatest predictor of a child's future academic success is the literacy level of the child's mother.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude with a disturbing observation.

The Republican leadership is trying to amend the Constitution of the United States for the 2nd time in 100 days.

Experts say that it takes an 11th grade education to read and understand the Constitution. Yet, 60 million American adults can't read or write beyond the eighth grade level.

I am appalled that we would try to amend the fundamental document of our system of governance, yet deny all funding to programs that help millions of Americans fulfill the promise of that democracy.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, the action proposed by the House Appropriations Committee would completely eliminate funding for: library literacy grants—\$8 million; the National Institute for Literacy—\$4.9 million; State literacy resource centers—\$7.8 million; workplace literacy partnership grants—\$18.7 million; literacy training for homeless adults—\$9.5 million; and literacy programs for prisoners—\$5.1 million. A total of \$54 million in cuts. Of that amount, \$35 million is direct services to students.

Current funding levels—prerescission fiscal year 1995—provide \$4 per eligible person per year. The proposed cuts would mean 600,000 individuals will be cut from individual instruction and classes.

While it is true the President's fiscal year 1996 budget also proposes to eliminate all these programs as line items in the budget, his plan shifts current spending for them to basic State grants and to National Programs in the case of the National Institute for Literacy.

Savings from this rescission may help pay for a middle class tax cut. Estimates suggest that the tax cut being considered would add approximately \$4 a week to the paycheck of an individual earning \$40,000. Is such a tax cut really cost effective when compared against corresponding cuts in adult education which helps those who are most educationally disadvantaged to get jobs, pay taxes and get off public assistance.

The Republican Contract With America claims to be about personal responsibility. These programs are the very vehicles by which many Americans are attempting to take personal responsibility for their lives and for their families.

An individual attempting to improve their life and increase the opportunities for their family who doesn't have basic reading skills is up

against insurmountable odds. He/she can't read the want ads. They can't fill out a job application. They can't pass a basic skills test required by potential employers. They can't, for that matter, help their children with their homework, read them a bedtime story, or even interpret the instructions on a bottle of medicine. How does cutting off educational opportunities to these people increase their ability to assume personal responsibility?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, this rescissions package is more of the same old story. Let's steal from the poor to give to the rich.

These cuts will hit some of the most vulnerable people in our society—our children, seniors, veterans, and the poor—to pay for their contract on America which is nothing more than a contract for big business and the wealthy in this country.

We are all in agreement that we must cut wasteful and unnecessary spending. However, this bill takes a meat ax to some of this country's most successful programs including the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, veterans assistance, summer jobs, WIC, and a host of others that benefit the needy.

The total elimination of LIHEAP is a particularly unfair hit on Illinois and entire Northeast/Midwest regions of our country where winters are particularly severe. Just last year, President Clinton was faced with declaring a natural disaster in these regions due to the dangerously low temperatures. LIHEAP was able to rescue millions of families from last year's unbearable harsh weather.

This rescission package also says to our country's veterans that we don't appreciate their years of dedicated service. This package rescinds \$206 million from the already beleaguered veterans budget. It axes out funds intended for much-needed medical equipment, and ambulatory care facilities.

Finally, the majority continues with its unjust assault on our children by slashing moneys for Women, Infants, and Children Program, education programs for disadvantaged youth, drug-free school zones, and children and family services programs.

Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to assist the helpless and the needy in our society. Let's not abandon them to provide unjustifiable tax cuts for wealthy individuals and corporations in this country.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

This House has been filed with misstatements, insupportable allegations, and outright fabrications about OSHA and the worker safety laws which have saved millions of workers lives and billions of dollars for employers throughout the United States.

Now we find proposals that are designed to defeat rules and regulations that major industry groups, including the poultry, health care, and auto industries, among others, are looking forward to.

It is said that OSHA does not know how much this new rule will cost industry, or whether those costs will outweigh the benefits that might accrue from this rule.

One thing that we all know is that muscle and skeletal injuries resulting in loss work, workmen's compensation, increased health care costs, and so forth. Are the most significant and fastest growing work-related problems industry and commerce currently face,

totaling perhaps 60 percent of the new occupational illness reported.

Studies also show that, very frequently, the specific causes of those injuries, once isolated, can be cured by very inexpensive changes in the work site.

For instance, in some food processing plants, merely increasing the height of the table on which the product was prepared resulted in a dramatic lessening of incidence of worker complaint, and savings—direct savings—to the employer of more than enough money to refit the entire processing line.

As the saying goes: You can pay me now or pay me later.

Employers can continue to ignore the pleas of their workers, continue to see their workers' compensation and health care costs rise, continue to see their taxes rise to pay unemployment and disability benefits or they can work within the OSHA ergonomic rules and make the adjustments to the work station or other changes, make the investment and reap the rewards of a more productive and healthier work force.

To deny the businesses in the United States the guidance that these regulations will provide may make the Republicans feel good, but, in the long run they will simply continue the increasing costs our businesses are now faced with.

Do the right thing for American business.

Do the right thing for American workers.

Defeat the DeLay amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Over the last 7 weeks, in fact over the last 7 years, I have traveled thousands of miles across my district explaining, as best I can, why we need to stop deficit spending and why we need to balance the budget. Let me state again for the record; deficit spending is the biggest threat to our veterans' health care, education loans, child care, transportation improvements, or any other public need which we must attempt to meet.

If we do not slow the growth in spending and operate on a pay-as-you-go basis, we will soon have no money for anything but paying interest on the debt and perhaps some basic entitlement programs.

I have a strong record on voting to control spending. I have twice made the Concorn Coalition Honor Roll, and have been cited by groups such as the Citizens Against Government Waste and National Taxpayers Union for my willingness to make the tough choices on spending. I have voted for the Penny-Kasich amendment to cut over \$90 billion in Federal spending, and have supported the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Having said all of that, I will vote against this bill. It is seriously flawed in a number of specific instances.

This rescission bill is attempting to cut Federal spending in a very unfair, unbalanced way. These cuts are in fiscal year 1995 appropriations. These are moneys that have already been guaranteed to veterans, children, the elderly, and other people who are the most vulnerable in our society. Not one big ticket item in the budget, including defense, is cut at all. I will vote at any time to restrict the growth of Federal spending as long as all programs are subject to the same considerations, not just subjecting some programs to deep cuts and leaving others entirely alone or even increas-

ing them, because the opposition party doesn't agree philosophically with the program.

Only at the 11th hour have we been told the cuts contained within this package will go to deficit reduction. That is something which I have supported and which I encouraged the committee to adopt. But I am not convinced that the \$12 billion or so in this package will in fact be put against the deficit.

There are major tax cut proposals being advanced in this Congress which may do more harm than good to our efforts to balance the budget. Proponents of tax cuts will have to find a way to pay for those cuts, and even as we debate this bill, we are told that the really big cuts are still to come.

Supporters of the bill we consider today were originally considering using these savings as a downpayment on those tax cuts. Now we are told it will be put in a deficit-reduction lock box. Even if they siphon off \$12 billion in spending and supposedly put it toward deficit reduction, it will still be necessary to find nearly \$200 billion to finance those tax cuts.

What we should be doing is making the tough choices on spending and putting all of it toward deficit reduction. Anything less, and I will be obligated to vote "no."

Deficit reduction is not going to be easy. I am prepared to make the tough choices. But I am not going to cut today simply to make it easier for others to borrow tomorrow.

Let me also indicate another strong objection to this bill. I represent Decatur, IL, the Pride of the Prairie, a good town with good people. Right now, Decatur is weathering a tremendous storm of labor-management conflict. At three major industries we have disputes which have thousands of people off the production lines. More to the point of this debate, at the Bridgestone-Firestone plant, members of the United Rubber Workers union are being permanently replaced.

This bill includes a ban on the President's executive order to deny Federal contracts to companies hiring permanent replacements for striking employees. I support the President and oppose the ban. I do not take sides in any of the three labor situations. I urge everyone to use the collective-bargaining process to reach agreements which put people back to work. But I do support the right of workers to strike without being permanently replaced.

For these reasons I cannot support the bill and urge a "no" vote.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I stand before the American people and this body in absolute shock at this bill. The attack on the poor, the old, our children, our cities, and working families continues and intensifies today.

It is hard to exaggerate just how serious this is.

Let us start with housing. This bill is an attack on homeless children; 12,000 children living on America's streets or in its shelters would have gotten real housing this year. They are being cut.

In Massachusetts, funding for the homeless is so tight that the State is going to start sheltering the homeless in mental hospitals. Yet, the Republicans stand ready to add to the homeless population.

Five thousand drug addicted or mentally disturbed residents of supposedly senior-only public housing could have been moved out so that our seniors could once again feel safe in

their elevators and hallways, and secure in their apartments.

This bill kills that funding.

Fourteen thousand elderly households would have been able to stay in the apartments they have lived in for years through the Affordable Housing Preservation Program.

This bill will put them on the streets because their landlords will turn these buildings into luxury condos, and the Republicans are cutting every new dollar for assistance to help them find affordable alternatives.

Two thousand young people would have been able to earn their high school degrees while apprenticing in the building trades—these are innercity kids who could have straightened out their lives and become working, productive members of our society through an innovative program called Youthbuild.

This bill closes the door to the economic mainstream for these young men and women.

Six hundred thirty thousand children and 530,000 seniors will be forced to live in public housing that is substandard, unsafe, and falling apart because of this bill.

The Republicans roll out Nancy Reagan to complain about the fight the Democrats are waging against drugs. But it is the Republicans that are cutting \$32 million from drug elimination grants that could prevent innocent children from being gunned down in their homes or on their playgrounds.

Republicans talk about economic opportunity, yet they decimate the summer jobs program.

They want to cut Healthy Start, a successful program that reduces infant mortality in our innercities, where a higher percentage of babies die than in many Third World nations.

The Republicans are eliminating the entire Energy Assistance Program. This will force our senior citizens to choose between buying the prescription drugs they need and heating their homes. It will mean tens of thousands of children around the country will suffer from malnutrition because their parents cannot both buy enough food and keep their homes warm.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans are sentencing 3,000 homeless people with AIDS to an early death by denying them the housing aid they would have otherwise qualified for. With stable homes, many AIDS victims could expect to live 10 more years. But on the streets, they are more likely to die within 6 months. Another 50,000 people with AIDS will never be assured of housing because this bill completely eliminates the housing for people with AIDS funding.

By any measure of good policy, by any measure of decency, this bill is a bad bill. We must balance our budget, and we can balance our budget, but we must not and need not balance it on the backs of children and old people.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for the rescissions bill before us today.

There is nothing like a rescission bill to get the Washington special interest lobbying machine cranking.

I have a stack of letters and faxes in my office from people who are opposed to this bill. They all say something like this: "I know we have to cut spending, but please save this or that program because it costs so little and helps so many people."

I also have a pile of very serious-looking analyses from the Clinton administration which say that children will starve—senior citizens will be thrown out on the streets—and businesses will cease to be competitive if we cut this or that program.

But you know what? I have yet to receive a letter from someone who says, "I don't have any ties to these programs. I do not receive my salary from them. I do not receive other monetary benefit from them, but I think you should continue to fund them anyway."—not a single one.

Folks, the American people are not buying into the ratings of Washington's spendoholics.

They know that a nation's compassion is not measured by the amount of money it spends.

They know that the effectiveness of government programs cannot be judged solely by the goodness of their names or their intentions.

Above all, they know that the most compassionate thing this Congress can do is lift the heavy burden of government debt off the back of their kids and grandkids.

So Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues: Listen closely to the arguments against this bill. You will find the pleadings for compassion have the hollow ring of self-interest.

Then, remember the silent majority. Remember the Americans who pay the bills and their children and grandchildren who will pay them for decades to come.

And cast your votes for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LINDER] having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 115, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1158, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

1. Disaster Assistance: On page 2 line 15, strike "\$5,360,000,000" and insert "\$536,000,000".

2. WIC, Women, Infants and Children: On page 6, strike lines 17 through 22.

3. Training & Employment Services: On page 23 line 10, strike "\$1,601,850,000" and insert "\$939,350,000". On page 23 lines 13 & 14, strike "\$12,500,000 for the School-to-Work Opportunities Act.". On page 23, strike lines 23 through 25.

4. Community Services Employment for Older Americans: On page 24 strike lines 1 through 9.

5. Health Resources and Services: On page 25 line 12, strike "\$53,925,000" and insert "\$43,925,000".

6. Low Income Energy Assistance: On page 27, strike lines 2 through 6.

7. Education Reform: On page 28 line 14, strike "\$186,030,000" and insert "\$103,530,000". On page 28 line 15, strike "\$142,000,000" and insert "\$83,000,000". On page 28 line 16, strike "\$21,530,000" and insert "\$10,530,000". On page 28 line 19 after the word "Act" strike all through the word "partnerships" on line 23.

8. Education for the Disadvantaged: On page 29 line 4 strike all after "103-333," through line 7 and insert "\$8,270,000 from part E, section 1501 are rescinded."

9. School Improvement: On page 29 line 16, strike "\$747,021,000" and insert "\$327,021,000". On page 29 line 18, strike "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$80,000,000". On page 29 line 18, strike "\$471,962,000" and insert "\$71,962,000".

10. Student Financial Assistance: On page 31 line 6, strike "\$187,475,000" and insert "\$124,100,000". On page 31 line 7 & 8, strike "part A-4 and".

11. Corporation for Public Broadcasting: On page 33 line 20, strike "\$47,000,000" and insert "\$31,000,000". On page 33 line 22, strike "\$94,000,000" and insert "\$34,000,000".

12. Assisted Housing: On page 49 line 14, strike "\$5,733,400,000" and insert "\$5,018,400,000". On page 49 line 17, strike "\$1,157,000,000" and insert "\$467,000,000". On page 50 line 4, strike "\$90,000,000" and insert "\$65,000,000". On page 50, strike lines 22 through 26.

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill unfairly and without precedent ties disaster assistance for California's flood and earthquake victims to cuts in programs for low-income seniors and children. Because of that—in spite of how the Northridge Earthquake pounded my congressional district—I must oppose this bill.

But I also oppose the motion to recommit.

FEMA needs this money to repair earthquake damage to over 200 public schools, to libraries and hospitals, to

police stations, museums, and homeless shelters.

More victims applied for Federal assistance from the Northridge Earthquake than from Hurricanes Hugo and Andrew, and the floods in the Midwest, Georgia, and Texas combined.

After the fact, it is wrong to shift funding from grants to loan guarantees, and shift the entire responsibility onto California's back without regard to its ability to pay. This is the mother of all unfunded mandates.

Do not take out—on my constituents and those of Representatives McKEON, BEILENSON, FARR, WOOLSEY, RIGGS, and others—your anger at Pete Wilson's failure to do what he should have done for disaster victims—and your anger at watching the Governor try to launch his Presidential campaign by blasting Washington while shirking his own responsibility to the victims of earthquakes and floods. Being victimized by Mother Nature is bad enough. We should not be victimized anew by Congress.

That is why I oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is simple. This House can choose to provide 100 percent of the aid to disaster victims contained in this bill and still at the same time reduce by about one-third the hit that most State and local governments will take as a result of the rescissions proposed in this bill. We can do that and at the same time increase the total savings contained in the bill.

You ask how. You simply ask California and other States receiving disaster aid to assume the paper in the transaction instead of the Federal Government. Somebody has to borrow money to pay the victims of disasters. The committee is proposing that the Federal Government do it. We are proposing that the State governments do it.

As those on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying, we are in a new era. The old system of disaster aid is no longer viable. We cannot provide the aid outside of the budget targets, and we cannot have Uncle Sam picking up 98 percent of the tab.

What this motion would mean is that a lot of victims of other things in this society, namely, a lot of children and old people who live at the margins throughout the United States, will not have to pay for the California disaster.

This recommittal motion means big bucks for kids and seniors. It means big bucks for your Governor, your mayor, your local schools. We can restore Healthy Start and WIC, PBS for preschoolers, half a billion to help protect quality in elementary and secondary schools, we can restore drug-free schools, we can restore job training and school-to-work and the summer jobs programs. For the elderly we can restore fuel assistance, housing programs, and older-worker programs.

This motion will mean \$400 million to the State of New York, \$80 million for

Wisconsin, \$85 million for North Carolina, it means \$200 million for Ohio, \$240 million for Pennsylvania, \$87 million for Tennessee, \$130 million for Texas, \$180 million for Illinois, about \$80 million for Indiana, et cetera, et cetera. This can happen. You can make it happen. You can take this money and put it back in your home States.

It is up to you. All it takes is a decision on your part to put your State ahead of national politics, a decision to put your standing with your constituents ahead of your standing with the Republican caucus, I would say to my friends on this side of the aisle. In fact, this amendment saves \$200 million more than the committee bill.

You can take that money and totally eliminate the cut made in the next fiscal year by the Human Resources Committee in the school lunch program and still have the same amount of money left to pay down the deficit. It is up to you.

□ 1245

It is up to you. I would ask you to make war on the status quo rather than making war on kids and old folks. This simply sets up a loan guarantee system under which States will finance disaster programs. It fully assures that every victim of disasters will get the full amount due to them, but it shares that burden much more equitably. It is an idea whose time has come.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] himself, as the Speaker, indicates there will have to be offsets in the future. This creates a way to provide those offsets in a much more humane way than the bill. It helps you to help your own States.

I understand some Members from California may be opposed to it. But if you are from any other State, you are cutting off your own State's interest if you vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Is the gentleman opposed to the motion to recommit?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to say that FEMA comes under our responsibility in my subcommittee. We look closely at all of those agencies in the committee process. Halfway through the process, there came forward a request from FEMA for a supplemental to meet the

disasters across the country in which some 40 States are effected, California indeed being among them.

The request was originally for \$6.7 billion. We examined it and trimmed it back 20 percent. Indeed, having done that, I now see my State, essentially, under water one more time and I wonder about the rescission we made.

The fact is, however, that this country, for years, has reflected the best of the work of the House by standing together in support of the regions of the country which have faced disaster. This is such a time, and we urge the House to stand together one more time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. It is similar to, but different from, that offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] in committee, which lost 20 to 35 in the committee. It eliminates \$4.8 billion of emergency funding which we have paid for in this bill, the first time an emergency supplemental has ever been paid for in history.

This amendment redistributes \$4.6 billion back into programs which we decided were low priority, duplicative, unnecessary from excessive growth in 1995 and 1994, and which were flushed in the pipeline from unobligated balances. It is based on the assumption that the authorizing committees will create a loan guarantee trust fund for disasters.

What happens if they do not? The fact is we will have redistributed \$4.6 billion in emergency funds, the money will be gone, the FEMA money will not get to California and the other 40 States that need money now. This is a gutting amendment. It upsets the balance that is carefully crafted in this whole bill. It denies money promised to those people most in distress, as exemplified by the floods in California this year. And finally, I would only say to my friends that this shortens the first major step toward our reformation and reliance on common sense.

I urge all of the body, for the future of America's children and their prosperity, vote "no" to the motion to recommit. Vote "aye" on this first significant step to a balanced budget on the largest rescission in history. Vote "aye" on the bill and final passage.

We have heard a lot of wailing and gnashing of teeth and seen much beating of breasts by drug store liberals who never saw a program they did not like, or a victim they did not wish to champion.

For 63 years, since the inception of the New Deal, they have bombasted their way through history, bleating for the poor, the hungry, the infirm, the elderly, the afflicted, the impaired, and the disadvantaged, as well as the obnoxious, the loud, the boisterous, the most obtrusive, and the most squaking of wheels.

In the beginning, they had a strong case that life had overwhelmed the ability of the truly deserving to help themselves, but as time passed their case became weaker, less convincing, and more disingenuous.

Government became larger, more encompassing, more costly, less efficient, more demanding and intrusive, and yes, even less compassionate.

Redundancy of programs, waste, inefficiency, abusiveness, and even symptoms of totalitarian intolerance became the order of the day as we woke to the news of an energy shortage which was fabricated, endangered species which were not really endangered, environmental and tax cases which bankrupted good hard-working families for failure of technical fulfillment, and atrocities like the Weaver case and Waco.

Under the so called liberal Democrat domination of the House of Representatives, we saw Government move from the role of servant of the people, to become a master, which often dictates without recourse or recompense.

Those liberal Members of Congress, who so badly ran their own affairs, witnessed by the restaurant, post office and bank scandals, became arrogant and insensitive in 63 years of almost unfettered domination of the political scene, and they lost sight of the real victims of today's society.

The poor, average, working stiff, the 9 to 5'er who often has to moonlight to supplement his or her income; whose spouse so often has to work one or two jobs as well to help raise their kids, to pay tuition, and medical bills; who support their parents, or their church, their Scout troop, or their favorite charity.

Where is the liberal bleating for the honest, hard working, law abiding, uncomplaining, struggling average person, in whose pockets, wallets, and purses dig the liberal who wears his compassion on his sleeve as long as he can take someone else's money to buy a few extra votes to remain in power? Where is the compassion for that most deserving of people who asks for nothing but to be left to raise his family without a Government handout, subsidy, or enticement?

When will we in Congress have the guts to admit to the American citizens that "We have 'helped' you enough and now it is time for us to help you help yourselves?"

We should stop increasing Governments' role, raising taxes, increasing regulations, and reducing freedom and liberty, and start doing that which at the very least we should have done in all common sense long ago. We should rein in our uncontrolled spending, reduce our deficit, balance our budget, stop borrowing against the future of our children and grandchildren, and bring an end to the modern tyranny of the do-gooders.

We can indeed help those who are truly in need by maintaining a slimmer, more efficient, less redundant, more effective safety net. We can have a Government which is leaner, not meaner, but we must do so in a smarter, more thoughtful fashion than merely throwing taxpayers dollars at every cause.

Compassion has become a weapon in the hands of the obtuse and uninformed, and its victims are the people whom we should most wish to help—the average American working citizen and his or her family.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

This is a 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 242, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

YEAS—185

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Parker
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Payne (NJ)
Baesler	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Barcia	Hayes	Peterson (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hilliard	Pickett
Bentsen	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Bevill	Holden	Poshard
Bishop	Hoyer	Rahall
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Borski	Jacobs	Reed
Boucher	Jefferson	Reynolds
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Rose
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Clay	Kennelly	Sabo
Clayton	Kildee	Sanders
Clement	Kleckza	Sawyer
Clyburn	Klink	Schroeder
Coleman	LaFalce	Schumer
Collins (MI)	Laughlin	Scott
Conyers	Levin	Serrano
Costello	Lincoln	Sisisky
Coyne	Lipinski	Skaggs
Cramer	Lowe	Skelton
Danner	Luther	Slaughter
de la Garza	Maloney	Spratt
Deal	Manton	Stark
DeFazio	Markey	Stenholm
DeLauro	Martinez	Stokes
Dellums	Mascara	Studds
Deutscher	McCarthy	Stupak
Dicks	McDermott	Tanner
Dingell	McHale	Tauzin
Doggett	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	McNulty	Tejeda
Durbin	Meehan	Thompson
Edwards	Meek	Thornton
Engel	Menendez	Thurman
Eshoo	Mfume	Torres
Evans	Miller (CA)	Torricelli
Fattah	Minge	Towns
Fields (LA)	Mink	Trafficant
Filner	Moakley	Velazquez
Flake	Mollohan	Vento
Foglietta	Montgomery	Visclosky
Ford	Moran	Volkmer
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Ward
Frost	Nadler	Waters
Furse	Neal	Watt (NC)
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Williams
Gephardt	Obey	Wilson
Geren	Oliver	Wise
Gibbons	Ortiz	Wyden
Gonzalez	Orton	Wynn
Gordon	Owens	Yates
Green	Pallone	

NAYS—242

Allard	Fox	Moorhead
Archer	Franks (NJ)	Morella
Armey	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Bachus	Frisa	Myrick
Baker (CA)	Funderburk	Nethercutt
Baker (LA)	Gallegly	Neumann
Ballenger	Ganske	Ney
Barr	Gekas	Norwood
Barrett (NE)	Gilchrest	Nussle
Bartlett	Gillmor	Oxley
Barton	Gilman	Packard
Bass	Goodlatte	Paxon
Bateman	Goodling	Petri
Beilenson	Goss	Pombo
Bereuter	Graham	Porter
Berman	Greenwood	Portman
Bilbray	Gunderson	Pryce
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Quillen
Bliley	Hancock	Quinn
Blute	Hansen	Radanovich
Boehlert	Harman	Ramstad
Boehner	Hastert	Regula
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Riggs
Bono	Hayworth	Roberts
Brewster	Hefley	Rogers
Brown (CA)	Heineman	Rohrabacher
Brownback	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Roth
Bunn	Hobson	Roukema
Bunning	Hoekstra	Royce
Burr	Hoke	Salmon
Burton	Horn	Sanford
Buyer	Hostettler	Saxton
Callahan	Houghton	Scarborough
Calvert	Hunter	Schaefer
Camp	Hutchinson	Schiff
Canady	Hyde	Seastrand
Castle	Inglis	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Istook	Shadegg
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chenoweth	Jones	Shays
Christensen	Kasich	Shuster
Chrysler	Kelly	Skeen
Clinger	Kim	Smith (MI)
Coble	King	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (WA)
Combest	Knollenberg	Solomon
Condit	Kolbe	Souder
Cooley	LaHood	Spence
Cox	Lantos	Stearns
Crane	Largent	Stockman
Crapo	Latham	Stump
Creameans	LaTourette	Talent
Cunningham	Lazio	Tate
Davis	Leach	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Thornberry
Dickey	Lightfoot	Tiahrt
Dixon	Linder	Torkildsen
Dooley	Livingston	Upton
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Vucanovich
Dornan	Lofgren	Waldholtz
Dreier	Longley	Walker
Duncan	Lucas	Walsh
Dunn	Manzullo	Wamp
Ehlers	Martini	Watts (OK)
Ehrlich	Matsui	Waxman
Emerson	McCollum	Weldon (FL)
English	McCrary	Weldon (PA)
Ensign	McDade	Weller
Everett	McHugh	White
Ewing	McInnis	Whitfield
Farr	McIntosh	Wicker
Fawell	McKeon	Wolf
Fazio	Metcalf	Woolsey
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Young (AK)
Flanagan	Mica	Young (FL)
Foley	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Forbes	Mineta	Zimmer
Fowler	Molinari	

NOT VOTING—7

Collins (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Tucker
Cubin	Johnson, E.B.	
Franks (CT)	Lewis (GA)	

□ 1312

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mrs. Cubin against.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MINETA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr.

LANTOS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. WILSON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House ought to know before the vote that we have just been informed that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, has indicated that, despite the passage of the Brewster amendment yesterday, that he intends to use the savings in this bill in his assumptions for the tax cut that he has presented to the Committee on the Budget. It seems to me Members ought to know that before they vote.

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

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

The Chair reminds Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 200, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

YEAS—227

Allard	Crane	Hansen
Archer	Crapo	Hastert
Armey	Creameans	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Cunningham	Hayworth
Baker (CA)	Davis	Hefley
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Heineman
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Barr	Dickey	Hilleary
Barrett (NE)	Dooley	Hobson
Bartlett	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Barton	Dornan	Hoke
Bass	Dreier	Horn
Bateman	Duncan	Hostettler
Bereuter	Dunn	Houghton
Bilbray	Ehlers	Hunter
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Bliley	Emerson	Hyde
Blute	English	Inglis
Boehner	Ensign	Istook
Bonilla	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bono	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Brewster	Fawell	Jones
Brownback	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Bryant (TN)	Flanagan	Kelly
Bunn	Foley	Kim
Bunning	Forbes	King
Burr	Fowler	Kingston
Burton	Fox	Klug
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Calvert	Frisa	Largent
Camp	Funderburk	Latham
Canady	Gallegly	LaTourette
Castle	Ganske	Laughlin
Chabot	Gekas	Lazio
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Leach
Chenoweth	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Christensen	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Chrysler	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Clinger	Goodling	Linder
Coble	Goss	Livingston
Coburn	Graham	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Longley
Combest	Gunderson	Lucas
Cooley	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Cox	Hancock	Martini



McCollum	Quinn	Spence
McCrery	Radanovich	Stearns
McDade	Ramstad	Stockman
McHugh	Regula	Stump
McInnis	Riggs	Talent
McIntosh	Roberts	Tate
McKeon	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
Metcalf	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Mica	Roth	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Upton
Molinari	Royce	Visclosky
Montgomery	Salmon	Vucanovich
Moorhead	Sanford	Waldholtz
Morella	Saxton	Walker
Myrick	Scarborough	Walsh
Nethercutt	Schaefer	Wamp
Neumann	Schiff	Watts (OK)
Norwood	Seastrand	Weldon (FL)
Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Oxley	Shadegg	Weller
Packard	Shaw	White
Parker	Shuster	Whitfield
Paxon	Skeen	Wicker
Petri	Smith (MI)	Wolf
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Porter	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Portman	Smith (WA)	Zeliff
Pryce	Solomon	Zimmer
Quillen	Souder	

## NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Owens
Ackerman	Gordon	Pallone
Andrews	Green	Pastor
Baesler	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Bentsen	Hayes	Pomeroy
Berman	Hefner	Poshard
Bevill	Hilliard	Rahall
Bishop	Hinchev	Rangel
Boehlert	Holden	Reed
Bonior	Hoyer	Reynolds
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Richardson
Boucher	Jacobs	Rivers
Browder	Jefferson	Roemer
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rush
Cardin	Kaptur	Sabo
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Sawyer
Clayton	Kennelly	Schroeder
Clement	Kildee	Schumer
Clyburn	Klecicka	Scott
Coleman	Klink	Serrano
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Shays
Condit	LaHood	Sisisky
Conyers	Lantos	Skaggs
Costello	Levin	Skelton
Coyne	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cramer	Lofgren	Spratt
Danner	Lowey	Stark
de la Garza	Luther	Stenholm
Deal	Maloney	Stokes
DeFazio	Manton	Studds
DeLauro	Markey	Stupak
Dellums	Martinez	Tanner
Deutsch	Mascara	Tauzin
Dicks	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McCarthy	Tejeda
Dixon	McDermott	Thompson
Doggett	McHale	Thornton
Doyle	McKinney	Thurman
Durbin	McNulty	Torkildsen
Edwards	Meehan	Torres
Engel	Meek	Torricelli
Eshoo	Menendez	Towns
Evans	Mfume	Traficant
Farr	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Fattah	Mineta	Velazquez
Fazio	Minge	Vento
Fields (LA)	Mink	Volkmer
Filner	Moakley	Ward
Flake	Mollohan	Waters
Foglietta	Moran	Watt (NC)
Ford	Murtha	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Williams
Franks (CT)	Neal	Wilson
Frost	Ney	Wise
Furse	Oberstar	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Obey	Wyden
Gephardt	Olver	Wynn
Geren	Ortiz	Yates
Gibbons	Orton	

## NOT VOTING—7

Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E.B.	Myers
Collins (IL)	Lewis (GA)	
Cubin	Lincoln	

□ 1323

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Cubin for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to recommit was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote 251 on H.R. 1158, the rescission bill, I was unavoidably detained during that 5-minute vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on the rescission package.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected to indicate that the vote on final passage was automatically and a yea and nay vote under the new rule XV, clause 7.

There was no objection.

# AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 1158 the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross references, and to make other conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House today.

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

There was no objection.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-83) on the resolution (H. Res. 117) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

# CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1, UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1) to curb the practice of impos-

ing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local, and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been reading.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Monday, March 13, 1995, at page H3053.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

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

State and local governments can sleep safer tonight because we are about to put the menace of unfunded mandates behind lock and key. Congress has recognized, on a bipartisan basis, that its penchant for passing the costs of programs on to States and localities is a threat to our system of government. It has mustered the courage to say: Please, stop us before we mandate again.

It is an enormous relief to know that we are in the final stage of House consideration of S. 1, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. The conference committee that negotiated the differences between the House and the Senate was the first conference committee of the 104th Congress to complete action.

I believe it set an excellent precedent for bipartisan, thoughtful negotiation in the interest of producing the best conference report possible.

Mr. Speaker, no blood was shed; no voices were raised. It was a model of civility and comity as we deliberated on these matters that are going to mean so much to States and local governments throughout this country.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act is a better and stronger piece of legislation as a result of the conference committee. It makes historic changes in the way the Federal Government does business with its State and local partners. It ensures Congress and Federal agencies have—

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, point of order. The House is not in order. There are conferences taking place. This is the first conference in 40 years from a Republican House of Representatives.