I also want to say one more thing about the Clinton administration. They deserve a great deal of credit for the excellent response they have given to disasters that have occurred in this country. Jamie Lee Whitten deserves our gratitude and the President our commendation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman because in the last day and a half we have learned a great deal about rescissions. We have seen one giant rescission on the floor of this House as our Republican colleagues rescinded their commitment to the millions of American seniors that are counting on Medicare.

And now we get three more lessons:

No. 1, when it comes to making a choice, a choice between locking in savings from these cuts to deficit reduction and using it for a tax cut for the privileged few, the choice was easy; this House voted overwhelmingly to lock in those savings. But it was not 24 hours later than across the street the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said, ''Oh, it is all just a big game.'' And it was just a big game because all along they needed every dollar of those cuts to give out tax breaks for their friends.

Lesson No. 2: When it comes time to chop, who gets chopped first? Well, it is the middle-class families that are struggling to get up that economic ladder, to get their children educated, because the place that this rescission begins rescinding is in education and the Federal commitment to back up our local schools with education.

Lesson No. 3: Loopholes last. The Senate approved language that would be part of this rescissions bill to condemn the atrocious practice where some Americans can actually go out and burn their citizenship card and at the same time burn the taxpayer. Is that loophole provision in here? No, sir, it is nowhere to be found in this conference report.

We have heard a lot about disasters today. Well, let me tell you, as long as the priorities are to cut education first and to cut tax loopholes for the privileged last, that is a disaster.

I am glad to have an opportunity to vote against that kind of a disaster by voting against this conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM.]

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Like many of my colleagues in the coalition and some beyond in my party, I believe in many of the rescissions included in this conference report.

I am absolutely dead set, however, against taking these spending cuts and using them for a tax cut or for other spending.

We had a way to guarantee that the cuts would go to deficit reduction. The Brewster-Minge lock box sealed up $66.2 billion over the next 5 years.

I am not only willing to make that sort of cut, I am eager to do so. But I am not going to give up Rural Health grants, AHEC money, Safe & Drug Free School money, funds for Vocational Education—and much more, just so that money can be used for tax cuts.

There has been a weakening of trust over the way the lock box in this bill was handled. An early understanding of $66 billion in savings disintegrated into something much smaller, $15.5 billion in this conference report.

I would love to vote for a rescission bill—but not for the sake of tax cuts. If the President vetoes this bill, I intend to support him in that veto for purposes of restoring the lock box.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to respond to the previous speaker.

All this discussion about a lock box and an agreement, the agreement was oral. There was no mention in the discussions with respect to future savings.

The past savings and current savings are in there in the Byrd amendment, which was passed in the Senate and agreed to in the conference. So that entire issue is by the boards. There is no savings going to tax cuts.

The Byrd amendment in the conference agreement makes sure that that is the case.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I wanted to make sure I heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations correctly. He said that was not an agreement; it was an oral agreement. Are we to conclude from that that an agreement, an oral agreement with the Republicans is not worth the paper it is written on?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There was no paper. When I engaged in negotiations with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], there was no mention of paper. We talked about saving of past efforts and current efforts. There was never any mention of future projected savings or future offsets.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman is saying the savings in the bill will not go for deficit reduction?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am saying the Byrd amendment covers exactly word for word the agreement that was made. The gentlewoman fully knows that.

Ms. PELOSI. No, I do not.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that CBO has no trouble figuring out what the Brewster language meant. Because the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Brewster lockbox would result in $66.5 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years.

The deficit reduction in this conference report is $15.48 billion. So it seems to me that the CBO, which is the neutral umpire which is supposed to keep all of us honest around here, understood what the Brewster amendment did. The Brewster amendment tried to dedicate all savings in the immediate year and out years for deficit reduction.

The conference report comes back and only dedicates $15 billion.

Now the chairman of the committee says, ''Oh, but that was the Byrd language.'' Let me make clear, Senator BYRD and I are in full agreement. Neither one of us wants to see these savings used to provide tax cuts for rich people. The difference is that Senator BYRD is in the other body, and the other body has a budget resolution that does not even contemplate using any of these savings for tax reduction. They contemplate using them all for deficit reduction, and so they never even dreamed that these funds would be used for a tax cut rather than for deficit reduction.

So do not try to say that the language in the conference report meets the test of the Brewster amendment. It does not.

CBO indicates the Brewster amendment would save $66 billion. This conference report only provides $15.48 billion for deficit reduction and makes available the rest for tax cuts.

Four hundred and four people in this institution voted not to do that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. We would not need this rule if we followed the rules of the House.

The fact of the matter is, besides being a bad bill in cutting youth employment and education programs and housing, this bill also puts our national forests up for sale. This bill, which left the House as a bad bill with the forest provision, mandates these cuts. It puts

a fire sale, of course, on our national forests. It goes into wilderness study areas. In fact, 40 Members of the House signed letters to the President asking for a veto because this bill destroys not only our national legacy but our children's national legacy.

This particular provision adds to the deficit, not cuts it.

There is a place, obviously, for deficit timber sales, but it is not in a bill that is a rescission bill, not a bill that destroys our national forests, that disregards forest health. In fact, our forests are more healthy than they have ever been. That is because we have been investing in watersheds and a variety of other projects. This flies in the face of science, flies in the face of good sound practices, overrides it all, simply to award special interests to the timber interests.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to our leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about sacrifice the past few days.

But I do not think the American people need any lectures about sacrifice.

The senior citizens who stood by this country during World War II, the working families who are struggling to make ends meet, the middle class parents who are working hard to put their kids through school, they know about sacrifice.

They do not need any lectures from Washington.

Every day in every way, the American people prove that they are willing to take responsibility and do their part.

The Republicans have come to this floor and talk about sacrifice. About how everybody must do their fair share.

But is it fair to cut Medicare and Social Security in order to give tax breaks to the privileged few?

Is it fair to cut student loans and school lunches, in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest corporations in our society?

Is it fair to target the middle class—when we are not even willing to close a loophole that lets billionaires renounce their citizenship to avoid paying taxes?

This debate today is not just about numbers and charts. It is not just about line items and budget marks.

It is about the real lives of flesh and blood people.

And that is really the difference between Democrats and Republicans.

Republicans look at this bill and see a $319 million cut to LIHEAP. Democrats see senior citizens who will be freezing in the winter.

You look at this bill and see a $20 million cut to WIC. We see children who will be born at low birthweight if they don't get the proper nutrition.

You see a $25 million cut in the school-to-work program. We see kids who will not get jobs because they do not have the skills to compete.

You see an $81 million cut to veterans benefits.

We see people who defended this country who won't get the medical care they need and deserve.

This debate is about the real lives of real people.

You want to talk about spending cuts?

What about the $200 billion we give away every year in corporate tax breaks?

What about the $1.2 billion we give to rich corporate miners?

What about the $4.3 billion we give to rich corporate agribusiness?

What about the $50 billion you want to spent on Star Wars? What about the bloated CIA budget?

Can we not cut those programs first?

Do we have to target women and children? Do we have to target seniors and working families?

And what about that billionaires loophole?

In this bill, you propose cutting $875 million from education programs.

Closing the loophole for billionaires will save us $3.6 billion, that's billion with a ''b,'' over the next 10 years.

Yet when Democrats offered a bill to close it, every Republican but five voted against it.

So do not come here today and lecture us about sacrifice, about everybody doing their fair share, about everybody doing their part.

Do not tell us that you are doing this for our kids.

Only Republicans in Washington would believe that we could cut programs that help teach our kids, train our kids, and provide jobs for our kids, and then say they are doing it for our kids.

And do not pretend that these cuts are being made to cut the deficit, or balance the budget.

The Brewster lockbox—which had overwhelming support in this House—which would have guaranteed that the cuts went to deficit reduction—was rejected by the Republicans in conference.

These cuts are being made for one reason and one reason only: to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few.

This is a defining issue for our Nation.

The president is determined to veto this bill.

And I am confident that we will have enough votes to sustain that veto.

In the end, this vote comes down to one simple question: do you really think it is fair to target senior citizens, to cut education, to cut school-to-work, to cut veterans benefits, to cut nutrition programs, and to cut senior housing and heating assistance, in order to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?

That is the question.

Is that what we mean by fair?

Is that what we mean by everyone doing their part?

I say no.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on final passage of this conference report, and when the President vetoes it and sends it back, to overwhelmingly endorse and sustain his veto.

□ 1715

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). All time has expired on the minority side.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I was contemplating yielding back the balance of my time so we can move ahead, but the speech that was just delivered compels me to yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for 6½ minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to me it is very sad that we have had to continue this same kind of rhetoric that has been going on for the past several days and weeks around here. I listened to my very dear friend say that Republicans see $319 million of savings by cutting the low-income heating energy assistance program and the Democrats seeing senior citizens freeze to death in the winter.

Now, the fact of the matter is:

Let's us look at the low-income heating energy assistance program; LIHEAP, it's called. It was put into place in 1979, when this country was in the midst of an energy crisis. It was a foreign policy issue, and the Federal Government stepped forward because of the escalating energy costs that existed and decided that people who were in those areas that would get very cold in the winter should get some kind of assistance.

Now, where do we stand in 1995 when it comes to those dramatically increasing energy costs juxtaposed to where we were in 1979?

The cost of heating oil today is lower than it was when we put this program into place, and so to determine that there are going to be people who will freeze because of our desire to try and bring about some kind of sanity in the area of Federal spending is tragic, and it is really demagoguery.

This program, this package that has come from the Committee on Appropriations, in no way deals with taxes. There are no tax implications to this whatsoever.

This package that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has brought forward from his committee, having labored for days and days along with members of his staff and other members of the committee, does two very simple and basic things. It is designed to meet the very important disaster needs that exist, not only in my State of California, but in 40 States across this country. It is designed to

rebuild, to rebuild that Federal building that the entire world saw devastated in Oklahoma City, and this bill is designed to cut Federal spending.

The very moving speeches that were just given over the past several hours here in looking at this balanced budget issue have underscored the need to address this. So, disaster assistance and cutting spending; that is what this bill does. It is very important for us to move ahead with this.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the rhetoric about all of these tax cuts for the rich, 75 percent of the benefits go to families earning less than $60,000, and I should not say benefits. All we are saying is that they should be able to keep some of their hard-earned dollars. Where do the rest go? They go to the very important job-creating mechanisms that this country desperately needs.

We have serious economic problems. My State of California has yet to recover from the defense and aerospace cuts. We need to have the kinds of tax incentives that are built into the budget that we just passed.

This is a very fair and balanced rule that will lead us toward passage of an important historic appropriations bill. As the chairman of the committee said to our Committee on Rules last night, this is the first time ever that we have been able to have this kind of rescission package built in to meet a very important need.

Vote ''yes'' for this rule, and ''yes'' for this important appropriation and rescission bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 151, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, May 16, 1995 at page H5013.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1158, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, just a little while ago we voted to balance the budget over the next 7 years. Mr. Speaker, what we are about to do in this bill is to take the first step, the first step toward that 7-year goal when we ultimately balance the budget.

I am very, very pleased and proud to bring to the House the conference agreement on H.R. 1158, the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill. The scope and size of this agreement is unprecedented. It will rescind over $16.4 billion. Let me stress that. It will rescind over $16.4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is the largest single rescissions bill in history, and I say to my colleagues, that if you add in the $3.9 billion that was already rescinded in the emergency defense supplemental that is now law, the rescissions brought forward by the Committee on Appropriations total, in this year of 1995, are over $20.3 billion for the 104th Congress. I do not believe you will find any comparable performance in any previous Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for those who are thinking about voting ''no'' on this bill, let me simply say you would effectively be voting not to save the American taxpayers some $9.1 billion in net savings.

Mr. Speaker, we started developing this bill in our subcommittees the first week in February. Today, over 3 months later, we have got a conference agreement.

It has been tough. Many people said we would not get this far, but we are here. The conference was intense, the issues were hard fought on all sides, and I want to thank all the conferees and all the staff on both sides of the aisle for their very long and hard work.

I want to thank our Senate counterparts, especially the chairman on that side, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. HATFIELD, for his collegial participation in this very difficult conference.

This conference agreement is critically needed so that we can begin to get our government's fiscal house in order. In order to be in a position to achieve the savings anticipated in the budget resolution that we have just passed, Mr. Speaker, we have to start the downsizing of government this year. This agreement does that.

The conference agreement also includes important supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance in the sum of $6.7 billion; for Oklahoma City recovery, $105.4 million; for anti-terrorism initiatives and enhanced security, $145.1 million; and for debt relief requested by the President for the country of Jordan the full sum of $275 million.

These supplemental appropriations are more than offset by the amount of the rescissions or cuts in this bill.

We have achieved the goals that, frankly, I as chairman, set out for the bill. We defunded unauthorized programs. We consolidated programs where duplication was so obvious that a meaningful service could not be developed or provided. We cut back on programs that received large increases in fiscal year 1995 appropriation bills; where we found programs that just do not work or are wasteful or inefficient, we stood up and said so; in other programs we flushed the pipeline, especially in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, where we eliminated those funds that are justifying around being unused.

This bill yields over $9 billion in savings, and none of these savings go for any tax cuts, contrary to what many of the arguers contended during debate on the rule just a little while ago. All of the savings in this bill, under the Byrd amendment, are required to go for deficit reduction.

Yesterday I regret to say, after 4 months of silence, after many, many pleas to come forward and share his thoughts with us, the President of the United States stated his intention to veto this bill when it reaches his desk. I believe that that would be a tragic mistake, Mr. Speaker. His expressed concerns are totally without merit. Over the last 5 months we have been begging the President for his input. His response was the sound of silence, which, unfortunately or fortunately, was broken yesterday with a suggestion of a patchwork of more social spending, and only then, after the conference on this bill was concluded did the President state his concerns and provide a general list of alternative offsets, all of which consist of token increases in programs in which he showed little or no interest as we went through the conference.

In fact, the only indication of a veto threat throughout this entire process was on the subject of striker-replacements, which has not been included in this bill. Apparently, the President needs to reach a little better understanding on conference procedures. If he wants his views considered, he should interject them at that time when they can be considered by the conferees, and I want to assure him that they would be considered as we did with his Oklahoma City request. Coming up with alternatives after the legislative process has already concluded frankly does not reflect a very good grasp of the job. Either that or his staff does not have a good grasp of theirs.

I might add the President still has not given us the courtesy of submitting a formal document to implement his own recommendations. He says he wants more money for Goals 2000. But even with our rescissions, Mr. Speaker, we will spend 300 percent more in fiscal year 1995 than we spent the previous

year, three times the amount, even after including the rescissions in the bill. He wants more money for safe drinking water, but he has not gotten that program authorized. The money can't be spent because the program has not been authorized, Mr. Speaker.

In the last 24 hours, he objects to the emergency salvage timber sales, but his Agriculture Department had actually signed off on the language and cooperated in the perfecting of that language.

He wants more money for Women, Infants, and Children, but his own bureaucrats admit they cannot spend what they have got in the pipeline now. And, finally, he complains about the pork. This is the same President who traveled halfway across America last month to support construction of an unbudgeted swine research facility, which the House was rescinded in the House passed bill.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, every ounce of pork in the Federal checkbook that was not rescinded in this bill has President Clinton's personal stamp on it because it was passed by his Congress, his majority in this House and in the other body, and he signed every bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, the President should indeed get off the sidelines. He should get in the game. We need to get on with our fiscal year 1996 bills. We have already taken too long with this bill.

This is the last shot, the last train leaving the station for fiscal year 1995. Every day that goes by, additional funds that are proposed for rescissions, for cuts, become obligated by the administration. So I hope that we will pass this conference report and begin the process of balancing the budget the old-fashioned way, by making real, specific cuts that appear in this bill, and let us send it to the President, and let us ask him not to veto it.

Now is the time to start balancing the budget. It will not get any better. The decisions will only get harder if we postpone them until fiscal year 1996. All of those causes will only be harder hit if we are going to truly work our way toward a balanced budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to vote for this conference report if they want to work toward a balanced budget.

□ 1730

But if you vote ''no,'' in the final analysis, you will be voting not to take the first step towards a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I will insert a table reflecting the conference agreement.

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE I - SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
.....	Agricultural Research Service (by transfer)	.....	.....	(2,218,000)	(2,218,000)	(+2,218,000)	.....
	Food Safety and Inspection Service						
104-4	Salaries and expenses	9,082,000	9,048,000	9,082,000	9,082,000	+34,000	.....
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	10,000,000	.....	5,000,000	-5,000,000	+5,000,000
	Commodity Credit Corporation						
104-4	Commodity Credit Corporation Fund: Food for progress	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	.....	.....
	General Provisions						
104-4	Section 715 (increase in limitation)	(24,500,000)	.....	(24,500,000)	(24,500,000)	(+24,500,000)	.....
	Total, Department of Agriculture	9,082,000	19,048,000	9,082,000	14,082,000	-4,966,000	+5,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
.....	Office of the Secretary	.....	-31,000	-31,000	-31,000	.....	.....
.....	Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization	.....	-3,000,000	.....	-1,500,000	+1,500,000	-1,500,000
	Agricultural Research Service:						
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-12,678,000	-1,500,000	-1,400,000	+11,278,000	+100,000
.....	Cooperative State Research Service	.....	-1,051,000	-958,000	-1,051,000	.....	-93,000
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-20,994,000	.....	-2,184,000	+18,810,000	-2,184,000
	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	.....	-6,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+4,000,000
	Farmers Home Administration						
	Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
.....	Rental housing (sec. 515) (loan subsidy)	.....	-115,500,000	.....	-15,500,000	+100,000,000	-15,500,000
.....	Local technical assistance and planning grants	.....	-1,750,000	-1,750,000	-1,750,000	.....	.....
.....	Alcohol Fuels Credit Guarantee Program Account (FY93)	.....	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Farmers Home Administration	.....	-126,250,000	-10,750,000	-26,250,000	+100,000,000	-15,500,000
	Rural Electrification Administration						
	Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account:						
.....	Loan subsidies: Telephone 5%	.....	-3,000,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	+1,500,000	.....
	Food and Nutrition Service:						
.....	Special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	.....	-25,000,000	.....	-20,000,000	+5,000,000	-20,000,000
	Food stamp program:						
	Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico:						
104-28	Cattle tick eradication	-2,900,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Public Law 480 Program Account:						
	Title I - Credit sales:						
104-28	Program level	(-60,200,000)	.....	(-60,200,000)	.....	.....	(+60,200,000)
104-28	Ocean freight differential	-6,135,000	.....	-6,135,000	.....	.....	+6,135,000
	Title III - Commodity grants:						
104-28	Program level	(-92,500,000)	(-20,000,000)	(-92,500,000)	(-40,000,000)	(-20,000,000)	(+52,500,000)
104-28	Appropriation	-92,500,000	-20,000,000	-92,500,000	-40,000,000	-20,000,000	+52,500,000
104-28	Loan subsidies	-43,865,000	.....	-43,865,000	.....	.....	+43,865,000
	Total, Public Law 480 program account	-142,500,000	-20,000,000	-142,500,000	-40,000,000	-20,000,000	+102,500,000
	Total, Chapter I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-136,318,000	-192,956,000	-154,157,000	-81,834,000	+111,122,000	+72,323,000
	Appropriations	(9,082,000)	(19,048,000)	(9,082,000)	(14,082,000)	(-4,966,000)	(+5,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-145,400,000)	(-212,004,000)	(-163,239,000)	(-95,916,000)	(+116,088,000)	(+67,323,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(2,218,000)	(2,218,000)	(+2,218,000)	.....
	CHAPTER II						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	RELATED AGENCY						
104-4	National Bankruptcy Review Commission (by transfer)	(1,500,000)	.....	(1,500,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(-500,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	International Organizations and Conferences						
104-4	Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (emergency)	672,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	RELATED AGENCY						
	United States Information Agency						
104-4	International broadcasting operations	7,290,000	7,290,000		7,290,000		+7,290,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Office of Justice Programs						
	Drug courts (crime trust fund)		-27,750,000	-17,100,000	-22,100,000	+5,650,000	-5,000,000
	Ounce of Prevention Council (crime trust fund)			-1,000,000			+1,000,000
	General Administration						
	Working capital fund 1/		-1,500,000	-5,000,000	-5,500,000	-4,000,000	-500,000
	Legal Activities						
	Assets forfeiture fund			-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
	Immigration and Naturalization Service						
	Salaries and expenses: General fund appropriation		-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000		
	Federal Prison System						
104-59	Salaries and expenses	-28,037,000			-28,037,000	-28,037,000	-28,037,000
	Total, Department of Justice	-28,037,000	-30,250,000	-29,100,000	-61,637,000	-31,387,000	-32,537,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	National Institute of Standards and Technology						
	Scientific and technical research and services		-16,500,000	-19,500,000	-17,000,000	-500,000	+2,500,000
	Industrial technology services		-27,100,000	-3,100,000	-16,300,000	+10,800,000	-13,200,000
	Construction of research facilities			-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
	Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology		-43,600,000	-52,600,000	-63,300,000	-19,700,000	-10,700,000
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
	Operations, research, and facilities		-37,000,000	-23,100,000	-24,200,000	+12,800,000	-1,100,000
	Construction			-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
	GOES satellite contingency fund			-2,500,000	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration		-37,000,000	-40,600,000	-41,700,000	-4,700,000	-1,100,000
	Technology Administration						
	Salaries and expenses		-3,300,000		-1,750,000	+1,550,000	-1,750,000
	National Technical Information Service						
	NTIS revolving fund		-4,000,000	-7,600,000	-1,000,000	+3,000,000	+6,600,000
	National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
	Information infrastructure grants		-30,000,000		-4,000,000	+26,000,000	-4,000,000
	Economic Development Administration						
	Economic development assistance programs		-7,500,000	-40,000,000	-25,000,000	-17,500,000	+15,000,000
	Emergency appropriations		-37,584,000	-7,384,000	-5,250,000	+32,334,000	+2,134,000
	Total, Department of Commerce		-162,984,000	-148,184,000	-142,000,000	+20,984,000	+6,184,000
	THE JUDICIARY						
	United States Court of International Trade						
	Salaries and expenses			-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
104-62	Defender services	-5,400,000	-1,100,000	-4,100,000	-9,500,000	-8,400,000	-5,400,000
104-62	Fees of jurors and commissioners	-5,000,000			-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
	Total, The Judiciary	-10,400,000	-1,100,000	-5,100,000	-15,500,000	-14,400,000	-10,400,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Small Business Administration						
104-28	Salaries and expenses	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000		+15,000,000	+15,000,000
	Business loans program account			-15,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	+9,000,000
	Total, Small Business Administration	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-30,000,000	-6,000,000	+9,000,000	+24,000,000

1/ $1,500,000 requested to be transferred to National Bankruptcy Review Commission. House Subcommittee denied request and rescinded the amount.

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Legal Services Corporation						
	Payment to the Legal Services Corporation		-5,849,000			+5,849,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	Administration of Foreign Affairs						
	Diplomatic and consular programs		-2,000,000	-2,500,000	-2,250,000	-250,000	+250,000
	Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad		-23,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-7,000,000	
	Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs		-25,000,000	-32,500,000	-32,250,000	-7,250,000	+250,000
	International Organizations and Conferences						
	Contributions for international peacekeeping activities		-14,617,000	-14,617,000	-14,617,000		
	Total, Department of State		-39,617,000	-47,117,000	-46,867,000	-7,250,000	+250,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
	Arms control and disarmament activities		-3,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-1,000,000	
	Board for International Broadcasting						
	Israel relay station		-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000		
	United States Information Agency						
	Educational and cultural exchange programs		-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000		
	International broadcasting operations			-27,710,000			+27,710,000
	Radio construction		-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-16,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
	Radio Free Asia			-6,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	+1,000,000
	Total, United States Information Agency		-11,000,000	-44,710,000	-26,000,000	-15,000,000	+18,710,000
	Total, Chapter II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	625,653,000	-263,510,000	-310,211,000	-296,714,000	-33,204,000	+13,497,000
	Emergency appropriations	(672,000,000)					
	Emergency rescissions		(-37,584,000)	(-7,384,000)	(-5,250,000)	(+32,334,000)	(+2,134,000)
	Appropriations	(7,290,000)	(7,290,000)		(7,290,000)		(+7,290,000)
	Rescissions	(-53,437,000)	(-233,216,000)	(-302,827,000)	(-298,754,000)	(-65,538,000)	(+4,073,000)
	(By transfer)	(1,500,000)		(1,500,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(-500,000)
	CHAPTER III						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
	General investigations		-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000		
	Construction, general		-40,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-20,000,000	
	Total, Department of Defense - Civil		-50,000,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-20,000,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Reclamation						
	Operation and maintenance		-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000		
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
	Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities.		-116,500,000	-71,500,000	-74,000,000	+42,500,000	-2,500,000
	Atomic Energy Defense Activities:						
	Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management		-26,000,000	-13,000,000		+26,000,000	+13,000,000
	Materials Support and other Defense programs			-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
	Departmental Administration		-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000		
	Power Marketing Administrations						
	Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration			-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
	Total, Department of Energy		-164,500,000	-149,500,000	-139,000,000	+25,500,000	+10,500,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Appalachian Regional Commission		-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000		
	Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund		-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000		
	Total, Chapter III:						
	Rescissions		-239,500,000	-244,500,000	-234,000,000	+5,500,000	+10,500,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER IV						
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
104-4	Development assistance fund	18,000,000					
104-4	Economic support fund	82,300,000					
104-4	Debt restructuring: Debt relief for Jordan	275,000,000	50,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	+225,000,000	
	Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	375,300,000	50,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	+225,000,000	
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
104-4	Peacekeeping operations	27,200,000					
	Total, Foreign Operations	402,500,000	50,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	+225,000,000	
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
	Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs			-125,000,000			+125,000,000
	MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	International organizations and programs		-25,000,000		-15,000,000	+10,000,000	-15,000,000
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Agency for International Development						
	Development assistance fund		-45,500,000		-41,300,000	+4,200,000	-41,300,000
	Population, development assistance		-9,000,000		-19,000,000	-10,000,000	-19,000,000
	Development fund for Africa				-21,000,000	-21,000,000	-21,000,000
	Debt restructuring under the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative		-2,400,000		-2,400,000		-2,400,000
	Economic Support Fund		-42,975,000		-25,000,000	+17,975,000	-25,000,000
	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development		-5,000,000		-2,000,000	+3,000,000	-2,000,000
	Assistance for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union		-47,700,000		-25,000,000	+22,700,000	-25,000,000
	Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance		-152,575,000		-135,700,000	+16,875,000	-135,700,000
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
	Peacekeeping operations		-4,500,000		-3,000,000	+1,500,000	-3,000,000
	EXPORT ASSISTANCE						
	Export-Import Bank of the United States						
	Subsidy appropriation		-5,000,000			+5,000,000	
	Trade and Development Agency						
	Trade and development		-4,500,000		-4,000,000	+500,000	-4,000,000
	Total, Export Assistance		-9,500,000		-4,000,000	+5,500,000	-4,000,000
	Total, Chapter IV:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	402,500,000	-141,575,000	150,000,000	117,300,000	+258,875,000	-32,700,000
	Appropriations	(402,500,000)	(50,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(+225,000,000)	
	Rescissions		(-191,575,000)	(-125,000,000)	(-157,700,000)	(+33,875,000)	(-32,700,000)
	CHAPTER V						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	National Park Service						
104-4	Construction	5,500,000					
104-4	Land acquisition and State assistance	1,300,000					
	Total, National Park Service	6,800,000					
	Bureau of Land Management						
	Management of lands and resources		-70,000	-70,000	-70,000		
	Construction and access		-4,500,000	-2,100,000	-900,000	+3,600,000	+1,200,000
	Payments in lieu of taxes		-5,000,000		-2,500,000	+2,500,000	-2,500,000
	Land acquisition		-1,997,000	-1,497,000	-1,497,000	+500,000	
	Total, Bureau of Land Management		-11,567,000	-3,667,000	-4,967,000	+6,600,000	-1,300,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
.....	Resource management	.....	-2,000,000	.....	.....	+2,000,000	.....
.....	Construction	.....	-14,390,000	-13,215,000	-12,415,000	+1,975,000	+800,000
.....	Land acquisition	.....	-7,345,000	-3,893,000	-1,076,000	+6,269,000	+2,817,000
	Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	.....	-23,735,000	-17,108,000	-13,491,000	+10,244,000	+3,617,000
	National Biological Survey						
.....	Research, inventories, and surveys	.....	-16,680,000	-12,544,000	-14,549,000	+2,131,000	-2,005,000
	National Park Service						
.....	Construction	.....	-22,831,000	-25,970,000	-20,890,000	+1,941,000	+5,080,000
.....	Urban park and recreation fund	.....	-7,480,000	-7,480,000	-7,480,000	.....	.....
.....	Land acquisition and State assistance	.....	-16,509,000	-9,983,000	-13,634,000	+2,875,000	-3,651,000
	Total, National Park Service	.....	-46,820,000	-43,433,000	-42,004,000	+4,816,000	+1,429,000
	Minerals Management Service						
.....	Royalty and offshore minerals management	.....	.....	-814,000	-514,000	-514,000	+300,000
	Bureau of Indian Affairs						
.....	Operation of Indian programs	.....	-4,046,000	-11,350,000	-4,850,000	-804,000	+6,500,000
.....	Construction	.....	-10,309,000	-9,571,000	-9,571,000	+738,000	.....
.....	Indian direct loan program account	.....	.....	-1,900,000	-1,700,000	-1,700,000	+200,000
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	.....	-14,355,000	-22,821,000	-16,121,000	-1,766,000	+6,700,000
	Territorial and International Affairs						
.....	Administration of territories	.....	-2,438,000	-1,900,000	-1,938,000	+500,000	-38,000
.....	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	.....	-32,139,000	-32,139,000	-32,139,000	.....	.....
.....	Compact of Free Association	.....	.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	.....
	Total, Territorial and International Affairs	.....	-34,577,000	-35,039,000	-35,077,000	-500,000	-38,000
	Departmental Offices						
.....	Office of the Secretary	.....	.....	-150,000	.....	.....	+150,000
	Total, Department of the Interior	6,800,000	-147,734,000	-135,576,000	-126,723,000	+21,011,000	+8,853,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Forest Service						
.....	Forest research	.....	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	.....	.....
.....	State and private forestry	.....	-12,500,000	-6,250,000	-7,800,000	+4,700,000	-1,550,000
.....	International forestry	.....	-1,000,000	-3,000,000	-2,000,000	-1,000,000	+1,000,000
.....	National forest system	.....	-3,327,000	.....	-1,850,000	+1,477,000	-1,850,000
.....	Construction	.....	-4,919,000	-7,824,000	-6,072,000	-1,153,000	+1,752,000
.....	Land acquisition	.....	-3,974,000	-3,720,000	-1,429,000	+2,545,000	+2,291,000
	Total, Forest Service	.....	-31,720,000	-26,794,000	-24,951,000	+6,769,000	+1,843,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
.....	Fossil energy research and development	.....	-18,850,000	-20,750,000	-18,100,000	+550,000	+2,650,000
.....	Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	.....	-21,000,000	-11,000,000	.....	+21,000,000	+11,000,000
.....	Energy conservation	.....	-59,928,000	-48,628,000	-49,628,000	+10,300,000	-1,000,000
	Total, Department of Energy	.....	-99,578,000	-80,378,000	-67,728,000	+31,850,000	+12,650,000
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Indian education	.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	.....	.....
	OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
	Smithsonian Institution						
.....	Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Construction	.....	-31,012,000	-11,237,000	-11,512,000	+19,500,000	-275,000
	Total, Smithsonian Institution	.....	-32,012,000	-12,237,000	-12,512,000	+19,500,000	-275,000
	National Gallery of Art						
.....	Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	.....	-407,000	-407,000	-407,000	.....	.....
	John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
.....	Construction	.....	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	.....	.....

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-2,300,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	+1,300,000	.....
	National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
	National Endowment for the Arts						
.....	Grants and administration	.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	.....	.....
	National Endowment for the Humanities						
.....	Grants and administration	.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter V:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,800,000	-328,751,000	-271,392,000	-248,321,000	+80,430,000	+23,071,000
	Appropriations	(6,800,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Rescissions	.....	(-328,751,000)	(-271,392,000)	(-248,321,000)	(+80,430,000)	(+23,071,000)
	CHAPTER VI						
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
	Employment and Training Administration						
.....	Training and employment services	.....	-2,284,132,000	-1,308,720,000	-1,399,115,000	+885,017,000	-90,395,000
.....	Community service employment for older Americans	.....	-14,440,000	-14,440,000	-14,440,000	.....	.....
.....	State unemployment insurance and employment service operations	.....	-12,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-8,000,000	.....
104-4 104-39	Limitation on trust fund transfer	-40,700,000	-47,700,000	-67,700,000	-67,700,000	-20,000,000	.....
	Total, Employment and Training Administration	-40,700,000	-2,358,272,000	-1,410,860,000	-1,501,255,000	+857,017,000	-90,395,000
	Employment Standards Administration						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-2,487,000	.....	.....	+2,487,000	.....
	Occupational Safety and Health Administration						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-19,572,000	.....	.....	+19,572,000	.....
	Bureau of Labor Statistics						
104-28	Salaries and expenses	-1,100,000	.....	-1,100,000	-700,000	-700,000	+400,000
	Compliance Assistance Activities						
.....	Compliance assistance activities (sec. 602)	.....	.....	-8,975,000	.....	.....	+8,975,000
	Total, Department of Labor	-41,800,000	-2,380,331,000	-1,420,935,000	-1,501,955,000	+878,376,000	-81,020,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Health Resources and Services Administration						
104-28	Program operations	-29,147,000	-53,925,000	-42,071,000	-41,350,000	+12,575,000	+721,000
	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention						
104-28	Disease control, research, and training	-1,300,000	-8,883,000	-1,300,000	-2,300,000	+6,583,000	-1,000,000
	National Institutes of Health						
104-28	National Center for Research Resources	-1,000,000	-20,000,000	.....	-10,000,000	+10,000,000	-10,000,000
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-50,000,000	-79,289,000	-60,000,000	-10,000,000	+19,289,000
	Total, National Institutes of Health	-1,000,000	-70,000,000	-79,289,000	-70,000,000	.....	+9,289,000
	Assistant Secretary for Health						
.....	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health	.....	-1,400,000	-2,320,000	-1,400,000	.....	+920,000
	Agency for Health Care Policy and Research						
.....	Health care policy and research	.....	-3,132,000	-3,132,000	-3,132,000	.....	.....
	Health Care Financing Administration						
104-4	Program management	-20,000,000	-26,200,000	-15,700,000	-19,700,000	+6,500,000	-4,000,000
	Social Security Administration						
.....	Supplemental security income program	.....	.....	(-87,000,000)	.....	.....	(+87,000,000)
.....	Limitation on administrative expenses	.....	.....	(-88,283,000)	.....	.....	(+88,283,000)
	Administration for Children and Families						
.....	Job opportunities and basic skills	.....	.....	-330,000,000	-330,000,000	-330,000,000	.....
.....	Low income home energy assistance (advance appropriation, 1996)	.....	-1,319,204,000	.....	-319,204,000	+1,000,000,000	-319,204,000
.....	State legalization impact assistance grants	.....	.....	-6,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+4,000,000
.....	Child care and development block grant	.....	.....	.....	-8,400,000	-8,400,000	-8,400,000
.....	Community services block grant	.....	-26,988,000	-12,888,000	-15,287,000	+11,701,000	-2,399,000
.....	Children and families services programs	.....	-25,900,000	.....	-25,900,000	.....	-25,900,000
.....	Payments to States for foster care and adoption assistance (indefinite)	.....	-150,000,000	.....	.....	+150,000,000	.....
	Total, Administration for Children and Families	.....	-1,522,092,000	-348,888,000	-700,791,000	+821,301,000	-351,903,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Administration on aging	.....	-899,000	-899,000	-899,000	.....	.....
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Policy research	.....	.....	-4,018,000	-4,018,000	-4,018,000	.....
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services	-51,447,000	-1,688,531,000	-497,617,000	-843,590,000	+844,941,000	-345,973,000
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Education reform	.....	-186,030,000	-10,100,000	-104,030,000	+82,000,000	-93,930,000
.....	Education for the disadvantaged	.....	-146,570,000	-7,900,000	-4,606,000	+143,964,000	+3,294,000
.....	Impact aid	.....	-16,293,000	.....	.....	+16,293,000	.....
.....	School improvement programs	.....	-735,921,000	-111,317,000	-391,840,000	+344,081,000	-280,523,000
.....	Crime trust fund	.....	-11,100,000	-11,100,000	-11,100,000	.....	.....
.....	Bilingual and immigrant education	.....	-38,500,000	-34,580,000	-38,500,000	.....	-3,920,000
	Special Institutions for Persons With Disabilities:						
.....	National Technical Institute for the Deaf	.....	-799,000	.....	.....	+799,000	.....
.....	Gallaudet University	.....	-1,298,000	.....	.....	+1,298,000	.....
	Total	.....	-2,097,000	.....	.....	+2,097,000	.....
104-28	Vocational and adult education	-43,888,000	-119,544,000	-54,566,000	-90,607,000	+28,937,000	-36,041,000
.....	Student financial assistance	.....	-187,475,000	-10,000,000	-85,000,000	+102,475,000	-75,000,000
.....	Howard University	.....	-4,300,000	-3,300,000	-1,800,000	+2,500,000	+1,500,000
104-28	Higher education	-26,903,000	-102,246,000	-42,159,000	-54,672,000	+47,574,000	-12,513,000
104-28	College housing and academic facilities loans program	-166,000	-490,000	-490,000	-432,000	+58,000	+58,000
104-28	Education research, statistics, and improvement	-750,000	-55,250,000	-15,200,000	-30,925,000	+24,325,000	-15,725,000
104-28	Libraries	-12,942,000	-26,716,000	-2,916,000	.....	+26,716,000	+2,916,000
.....	Program administration	.....	.....	-4,424,000	.....	.....	+4,424,000
	Total, Department of Education	-84,651,000	-1,634,532,000	-308,052,000	-813,512,000	+821,020,000	-505,460,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Corporation for Public Broadcasting:						
.....	Advance appropriation, 1996	.....	-47,000,000	-26,360,000	-37,000,000	+10,000,000	-10,640,000
.....	Advance appropriation, 1997	.....	-94,000,000	-29,360,000	-55,000,000	+39,000,000	-25,640,000
	Railroad Retirement Board:						
.....	Dual benefits payments account	.....	-5,000,000	-7,000,000	-7,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Federal direct student loans	.....	-47,000,000	-95,000,000	-61,000,000	-14,000,000	+34,000,000
	Total, Chapter VI: Rescissions	-177,898,000	-5,896,394,000	-2,384,324,000	-3,319,057,000	+2,577,337,000	-934,733,000
	CHAPTER VII						
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH						
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
	Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
.....	Gratuities, deceased Members	.....	133,600	133,600	133,600	.....	.....
	JOINT ITEMS						
.....	Joint Economic Committee	.....	-460,000	-460,000	-460,000	.....	.....
.....	Joint Committee on Printing	.....	-418,000	-238,137	-238,137	+179,863	.....
	Total, Joint items	.....	-878,000	-698,137	-698,137	+179,863	.....
	OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-650,000	-650,000	-650,000	.....	.....
	CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-187,000	-187,000	-187,000	.....	.....
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL						
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds						
.....	Capitol buildings	.....	-2,500,000	.....	.....	+2,500,000	.....
.....	Senate office buildings	.....	.....	-850,000	-850,000	-850,000	.....
.....	Capitol Power Plant	.....	.....	-1,650,000	-1,650,000	-1,650,000	.....
.....	Capitol complex security enhancements (transfer from Botanic Garden)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(+3,000,000)
	Total, Capitol Buildings and Grounds	.....	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	.....	.....

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE						
.....	Congressional printing and binding	.....	-3,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
	Office of Superintendent of Documents						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000	.....	.....
	Total, Government Printing Office	.....	-3,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-2,000,000	.....
	BOTANIC GARDEN						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-4,000,000	-7,000,000	-4,000,000	.....	+3,000,000
	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	.....	.....
.....	Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses	.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	.....	.....
	Total, Library of Congress	.....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000	.....	.....
	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-8,867,000	-8,867,000	-2,617,000	+8,250,000	+8,250,000
	Total, Chapter VII:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	-20,798,490	-25,618,537	-18,368,537	+4,429,863	+9,250,000
	Appropriations	.....	(133,600)	(133,600)	(133,600)	.....	.....
	Rescissions	.....	(-20,932,000)	(-25,752,137)	(-18,502,137)	(+4,429,863)	(+9,250,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(+3,000,000)
	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
.....	Military construction, Army	.....	.....	-10,000,000	.....	.....	+10,000,000
.....	Military construction, Navy	.....	.....	-13,050,000	.....	.....	+13,050,000
104-4	Emergency appropriation	18,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Military construction, Air Force	.....	.....	-33,250,000	.....	.....	+33,250,000
.....	Military construction, Air National Guard	.....	.....	-1,340,000	.....	.....	+1,340,000
	Total, Military Construction	.....	.....	-57,640,000	.....	.....	+57,640,000
.....	North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure	.....	.....	-69,000,000	.....	.....	+69,000,000
	Base realignment and closure accounts:						
.....	Part II	.....	.....	-10,628,000	.....	.....	+10,628,000
.....	Part III	.....	.....	-93,566,000	.....	.....	+93,566,000
	Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	.....	.....	-104,194,000	.....	.....	+104,194,000
	Total, Military Construction:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	18,000,000	.....	-230,834,000	.....	.....	+230,834,000
	Emergency appropriations	(18,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Rescissions	.....	.....	(-230,834,000)	.....	.....	(+230,834,000)
	CHAPTER VIII						
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Coast Guard						
104-4	Operating expenses (emergency)	28,297,000	28,197,000	.....	.....	-28,197,000	.....
	Federal Railroad Administration						
104-4	Office of the administrator (by transfer)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	.....	.....
	Federal Transit Administration						
.....	Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	.....	.....	.....	(350,000,000)	(+350,000,000)	(+350,000,000)
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Transportation, planning, research, and development	.....	-1,293,000	.....	.....	+1,293,000	.....
.....	Working capital fund	.....	-8,000,000	-4,000,000	-6,000,000	+2,000,000	-2,000,000
104-28	Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	-7,680,000	.....	-5,300,000	-5,300,000	-5,300,000	.....
	Total, Office of the Secretary	-7,680,000	-9,293,000	-9,300,000	-11,300,000	-2,007,000	-2,000,000
	Coast Guard						
.....	Operating expenses	.....	-6,440,000	-3,700,000	-4,300,000	+2,140,000	-600,000
	Acquisition, construction, and improvements:						
.....	Hurricane Andrew/Iniki supplemental (emergency)	.....	-4,400,000	-4,400,000	-4,400,000	.....	.....
.....	Vessels	.....	-12,333,000	-12,133,000	-12,133,000	+200,000	.....
.....	Aircraft	.....	-3,400,000	.....	.....	+3,400,000	.....
.....	Other equipment	.....	-6,155,000	-2,000,000	-2,500,000	+3,655,000	-500,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Shore facilities and aids to navigation	.....	-18,281,000	-15,765,000	-18,281,000	.....	-516,000
	Subtotal	.....	-42,569,000	-34,298,000	-35,314,000	+7,255,000	-1,016,000
.....	Environmental compliance and restoration	.....	-3,500,000	-400,000	-2,500,000	+1,000,000	-2,100,000
	Total, Coast Guard	.....	-52,509,000	-38,398,000	-42,114,000	+10,395,000	-3,716,000
	Federal Aviation Administration						
.....	Operations	.....	.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	.....
.....	Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	.....	-69,825,000	-31,850,000	-24,850,000	+44,975,000	+7,000,000
.....	Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	.....	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	.....	.....
104-59	Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	-94,000,000	.....	-2,000,000,000	-2,094,000,000	-2,094,000,000	-94,000,000
	Total, Federal Aviation Administration	-94,000,000	-77,325,000	-2,040,350,000	-2,127,350,000	-2,050,025,000	-87,000,000
	Federal Highway Administration						
.....	Limitation on general operating expenses	.....	(-42,500,000)	(-45,950,000)	(-54,550,000)	(-12,050,000)	(-8,600,000)
	Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):						
.....	(Limitation on obligations)	.....	(-70,140,000)	(-123,590,000)	(-132,190,000)	(-62,050,000)	(-8,600,000)
.....	Rescission	.....	.....	.....	-132,190,000	-132,190,000	-132,190,000
104-4	(Bonus obligations)	(-208,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Emergency relief program	.....	-351,000,000	-50,000,000	-100,000,000	+251,000,000	-50,000,000
104-4	Federal-aid highways	-356,154,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
104-4	Miscellaneous highway trust funds	-8,890,000	.....	-140,638,074	.....	.....	+140,638,074
104-4	Miscellaneous appropriations	-36,956,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total, Federal Highway Administration	-400,000,000	-351,000,000	-190,638,074	-232,190,000	+118,810,000	-41,551,926
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
.....	Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)	.....	.....	-20,000,000	.....	.....	+20,000,000
	Federal Railroad Administration						
.....	Northeast corridor improvement program	.....	-7,768,000	-7,768,000	-9,707,000	-1,939,000	-1,939,000
.....	National MAGLEV prototype development (Highway Trust Fund)	.....	.....	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	.....
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration	.....	-7,768,000	-257,768,000	-259,707,000	-251,939,000	-1,939,000
	Federal Transit Administration						
.....	Transit planning and research	.....	-8,800,000	.....	-7,000,000	+1,800,000	-7,000,000
	Discretionary grants:						
.....	(Limitation on obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)	.....	(-131,651,000)	(-67,293,000)	(-33,911,500)	(+97,739,500)	(+33,381,500)
.....	Rescission	.....	.....	.....	-33,911,500	-33,911,500	-33,911,500
	Total, Federal Transit Administration	.....	-8,800,000	.....	-40,911,500	-32,111,500	-40,911,500
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-20,000,000	-10,000,000	-15,000,000	+5,000,000	-5,000,000
	Total, Chapter VIII:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-473,383,000	-498,498,000	-2,566,454,074	-2,728,572,500	-2,230,074,500	-162,118,426
	Emergency appropriations	(28,297,000)	(28,197,000)	.....	.....	(-28,197,000)	.....
	Emergency rescissions	.....	(-355,400,000)	(-54,400,000)	(-104,400,000)	(+251,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-501,680,000)	(-171,295,000)	(-2,512,054,074)	(-2,624,172,500)	(-2,452,877,500)	(-112,118,426)
	(Limitations on obligations)	(-208,000,000)	(-201,791,000)	(-190,863,000)	(-166,101,500)	(+35,689,500)	(+24,761,500)
	(By transfer)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	.....	.....
	CHAPTER IX						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
	United States Customs Service:						
.....	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	.....	.....	(13,200,000)	(13,200,000)	(+13,200,000)	.....
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
.....	Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	.....	.....	500,000	.....	.....	-500,000
	Office of Personnel Management:						
104-4	Government payment for annuitants, employee life insurance benefits	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	.....	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
.....	Departmental offices	.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	.....	.....
	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	11,000,000	+11,000,000	+11,000,000
.....	Acquisition, construction, improvements, and related expenses	.....	-11,000,000	.....	-11,000,000	.....	-11,000,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Financial Management Service	.....	-160,000	-160,000	-160,000	.....	.....
.....	Bureau of the Public Debt	.....	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	.....	.....
.....	Internal Revenue Service: Information systems	.....	-1,490,000	-1,490,000	-1,490,000	.....	.....
	Total, Department of the Treasury	.....	-14,250,000	-3,250,000	-3,250,000	+11,000,000	.....
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT						
.....	The White House Office	.....	-171,000	-171,000	-171,000	.....	.....
	Federal Drug Control Programs:						
.....	Special Forfeiture Fund	.....	.....	13,200,000	13,200,000	+13,200,000	.....
.....	Rescission	.....	-13,200,000	-13,200,000	-13,200,000	.....	.....
	Total, Executive Office of the President	.....	-13,371,000	-171,000	-171,000	+13,200,000	.....
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	General Services Administration:						
.....	Federal Buildings Fund: Rescissions	.....	-136,593,000	-1,894,840,000	-580,412,000	-443,819,000	+1,314,428,000
.....	Operating expenses	.....	-2,065,000	.....	.....	+2,065,000	.....
	Total, General Services Administration	.....	-138,658,000	-1,894,840,000	-580,412,000	-441,754,000	+1,314,428,000
.....	Federal Election Commission	.....	-2,792,000	.....	-1,396,000	+1,396,000	-1,396,000
	Office of Personnel Management:						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-3,140,000	-3,140,000	-3,140,000	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter IX:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	9,000,000	-163,211,000	-1,891,901,000	-579,369,000	-416,158,000	+1,312,532,000
	Appropriations	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(22,700,000)	(33,200,000)	(+24,200,000)	(+10,500,000)
	Rescissions	.....	(-172,211,000)	(-1,914,601,000)	(-612,569,000)	(-440,358,000)	(+1,302,032,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(13,200,000)	(13,200,000)	(+13,200,000)	.....
	CHAPTER X						
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY						
104-4	Disaster relief (emergency)	6,700,000,000	5,360,000,000	1,900,000,000	3,350,000,000	-2,010,000,000	+1,450,000,000
.....	Advance appropriation, FY 1996 (emergency)	.....	.....	4,800,000,000	3,350,000,000	+3,350,000,000	-1,450,000,000
104-4	National flood insurance fund (by transfer)	(5,331,000)	.....	(5,331,000)	(5,331,000)	(+5,331,000)	.....
	Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency..	6,700,000,000	5,360,000,000	6,700,000,000	6,700,000,000	+1,340,000,000	.....
	CORPORATIONS						
	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
.....	Bank Enterprise Act	.....	.....	.....	36,000,000	+36,000,000	+36,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
	Veterans Health Administration						
.....	Medical care	.....	.....	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	.....
	Departmental Administration						
.....	Construction, major projects	.....	.....	-50,000,000	-31,000,000	-31,000,000	+19,000,000
	Total, Department of Veterans Affairs	.....	.....	-100,000,000	-81,000,000	-81,000,000	+19,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Housing Programs						
.....	National homeownership trust demonstration program	.....	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	.....	.....
104-28	Annual contributions for assisted housing	-439,200,000	-5,733,400,000	-3,721,289,000	-5,031,400,000	+702,000,000	-1,310,111,000
.....	(Deferral)	.....	.....	(465,000,000)	(405,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(-59,100,000)
.....	Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts	.....	.....	-1,050,000,000	-1,177,000,000	-1,177,000,000	-127,000,000
104-28	Congregate services	-37,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Payments for operation of low-income housing projects	.....	-404,000,000	.....	.....	+404,000,000	.....
.....	Severely distressed public housing	.....	-523,000,000	.....	.....	+523,000,000	.....
.....	Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	.....	-32,000,000	.....	.....	+32,000,000	.....
.....	Youthbuild program	.....	-38,000,000	.....	-10,000,000	+28,000,000	-10,000,000
.....	Housing counseling assistance	.....	-38,000,000	-38,000,000	-38,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Flexible subsidy fund	.....	-8,000,000	.....	-8,000,000	.....	-8,000,000
.....	Nehemiah housing opportunities fund	.....	-19,000,000	-17,700,000	-10,500,000	+8,500,000	+7,200,000
.....	Total, Housing Programs	-476,200,000	-6,845,400,000	-4,876,989,000	-6,324,900,000	+520,500,000	-1,447,911,000
	Homeless Assistance						
.....	Homeless Assistance grants (deferral)	.....	(297,000,000)	.....	(297,000,000)	.....	(+297,000,000)

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Community Planning and Development						
.....	Community development grants	.....	-349,200,000	.....	.....	+349,200,000	.....
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	-478,200,000	-7,194,600,000	-4,876,989,000	-6,324,900,000	+869,700,000	-1,447,911,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
104-26	Salaries and expenses	-500,000	-500,000	-500,000	-500,000	.....	.....
	Community Development Financial Institutions						
.....	Community development financial institutions fund program account	.....	-124,000,000	-88,000,000	-124,000,000	.....	-36,000,000
	Corporation for National and Community Service						
.....	National and community service programs	.....	-416,110,000	-105,000,000	-210,000,000	+206,110,000	-105,000,000
	Environmental Protection Agency						
104-26	Research and development	-3,635,000	-14,635,000	-9,635,000	-14,635,000	.....	-5,000,000
104-26	Abatement, control, and compliance	-4,806,805	-4,806,805	-9,806,805	-9,806,805	-5,000,000	.....
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-25,000,000	-83,000,000	-83,000,000	-58,000,000	.....
.....	Hazardous substance superfund	.....	.....	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	.....
104-26	Water infrastructure / State revolving fund	-3,200,000	-1,303,200,000	-1,242,095,000	-1,302,200,000	+1,000,000	-60,105,000
	Total, Environmental Protection Agency	-11,641,805	-1,347,641,805	-1,444,536,805	-1,509,641,805	-162,000,000	-65,105,000
	National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
.....	Science, aeronautics and technology	.....	-75,000,000	-68,000,000	-52,000,000	+23,000,000	+16,000,000
104-26	Construction of facilities	-27,000,000	-27,000,000	-76,000,000	-34,000,000	-7,000,000	+42,000,000
104-26	Mission support	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-6,000,000	-32,000,000	-31,000,000	-26,000,000
104-59	Space flight, control and data communications	-10,000,000	.....	.....	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
	Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	-38,000,000	-103,000,000	-150,000,000	-138,000,000	-35,000,000	+12,000,000
	National Science Foundation						
104-26	Academic research infrastructure	-131,867,000	-131,867,000	-131,867,000	-131,867,000	.....	.....
	CORPORATIONS						
	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
.....	FDIC affordable housing program	.....	-11,281,034	-11,281,034	-11,281,034	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter X:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,041,791,195	-3,968,999,839	-208,173,839	-1,795,189,839	+2,173,810,000	-1,587,016,000
	Emergency appropriations	(6,700,000,000)	(5,360,000,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(+1,340,000,000)	.....
	Appropriations	.....	.....	.....	(36,000,000)	(+36,000,000)	(+36,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-658,208,805)	(-9,328,999,839)	(-6,908,173,839)	(-8,531,189,839)	(+797,810,000)	(-1,623,016,000)
	(By transfer)	(5,331,000)	.....	(5,331,000)	(5,331,000)	(+5,331,000)	.....
	(Deferrals)	.....	(297,000,000)	(465,000,000)	(702,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(+237,900,000)
	Total, Title I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,316,345,195	-11,714,193,239	-8,137,565,450	-9,182,125,878	+2,532,067,363	-1,044,560,428
	Emergency appropriations	(7,416,297,000)	(5,388,197,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(+1,311,803,000)	.....
	Emergency rescissions	.....	(-392,984,000)	(-61,784,000)	(-109,850,000)	(+283,334,000)	(-47,866,000)
	Appropriations	(434,672,000)	(85,471,600)	(306,915,600)	(365,705,600)	(+280,234,000)	(+58,790,000)
	Rescissions	(-1,536,623,805)	(-16,794,877,839)	(-15,082,697,050)	(-16,138,181,478)	(+656,696,363)	(-1,055,484,428)
	(Increases in limitations on obligations)	(24,500,000)	.....	(24,500,000)	(24,500,000)	(+24,500,000)	.....
	(Reductions in limitations on obligations)	(-206,000,000)	(-201,791,000)	(-279,168,000)	(-166,101,500)	(+35,689,500)	(+113,064,500)
	(By transfer)	(7,442,950)	(3,611,950)	(22,860,950)	(25,360,950)	(+21,749,000)	(+2,500,000)
	(Deferrals)	.....	(297,000,000)	(465,000,000)	(702,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(+237,900,000)
	TITLE II - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	Emergency two-year salvage timber sale program (Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management):						
.....	Salvage costs/payments	.....	3,831,000	3,831,000	3,831,000	.....	.....
.....	Receipts	.....	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Federal administration and travel expenses	.....	.....	-342,500,000	.....	.....	+342,500,000
	Total, Title II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	-31,169,000	-373,669,000	-31,169,000	.....	+342,500,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE III						
	EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES OKLAHOMA CITY RECOVERY						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Office of Justice Programs						
104-62	Justice assistance	4,000,000					
	General Administration						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	8,700,000			34,220,000	+34,220,000	+34,220,000
	Legal Activities						
104-62	Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys	4,034,000			2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
104-62	Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service	2,521,000					
	Total, Legal activities	6,555,000			2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
	Federal Bureau of Investigation						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	49,200,000			77,140,000	+77,140,000	+77,140,000
	Drug Enforcement Administration						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	3,000,000					
	Total, Department of Justice	71,455,000			113,360,000	+113,360,000	+113,360,000
	THE JUDICIARY						
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
104-62	Court security	10,400,000			16,640,000	+16,640,000	+16,640,000
	Total, Chapter I: New budget (obligational) authority	81,855,000			130,000,000	+130,000,000	+130,000,000
	CHAPTER II						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
104-62	Departmental offices	300,000					
104-62	Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	300,000					
104-62	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	1,100,000			1,100,000	+1,100,000	+1,100,000
104-62	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms	16,207,000			34,823,000	+34,823,000	+34,823,000
	United States Customs Service:						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	1,200,000			1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
	Internal Revenue Service:						
104-62	Administration and management	1,000,000					
104-62	United States Secret Service	3,875,000			6,675,000	+6,675,000	+6,675,000
	Total, Department of the Treasury	23,982,000			43,598,000	+43,598,000	+43,598,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	General Services Administration:						
	Federal Buildings Fund:						
	Limitations on availability of revenue:						
104-62	Construction and acquisition of facilities	(2,300,000)			(2,300,000)	(+2,300,000)	(+2,300,000)
	Alfred P. Murrah Federal Office Building				(40,400,000)	(+40,400,000)	(+40,400,000)
104-62	Repairs and alterations	(3,300,000)			(3,300,000)	(+3,300,000)	(+3,300,000)
104-62	Rental of space	(8,300,000)			(8,300,000)	(+8,300,000)	(+8,300,000)
104-62	Real property operations	(12,500,000)			(12,500,000)	(+12,500,000)	(+12,500,000)
	Total, limitations	(26,400,000)			(66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)
	Total, Chapter II:						
	Budgetary resources available	50,382,000			110,398,000	+110,398,000	+110,398,000
	Emergency appropriations	(23,982,000)			(43,598,000)	(+43,598,000)	(+43,598,000)
	(Limitations on availability of revenue)	(26,400,000)			(66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)
	CHAPTER III						
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Management and Administration						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	3,200,000			3,200,000	+3,200,000	+3,200,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	3,523,000	.....	.....	3,523,000	+3,523,000	+3,523,000
104-62	Emergency management planning and assistance	3,477,000	.....	.....	3,477,000	+3,477,000	+3,477,000
	Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	7,000,000	.....	.....	7,000,000	+7,000,000	+7,000,000
	Total, Chapter III:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	10,200,000	.....	.....	10,200,000	+10,200,000	+10,200,000
	Total, Title III:						
	Budgetary resources available	142,437,000	.....	.....	250,598,000	+250,598,000	+250,598,000
	Emergency appropriations	(116,037,000)	.....	.....	(183,798,000)	(+183,798,000)	(+183,798,000)
	(Limitations on availability of revenue)	(26,400,000)	.....	.....	(66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)
	Grand Total:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	8,432,382,195	-11,745,382,239	-8,511,234,450	-9,029,496,876	+2,715,885,363	-518,262,426
	Emergency appropriations	(7,534,334,000)	(5,388,197,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(6,883,798,000)	(+1,495,601,000)	(+183,798,000)
	Emergency rescissions	.....	(-392,984,000)	(-61,784,000)	(-109,650,000)	(+283,334,000)	(-47,866,000)
	Appropriations	(434,672,000)	(54,302,800)	(275,746,800)	(334,536,800)	(+280,234,000)	(+58,790,000)
	Rescissions	(-1,536,623,805)	(-16,794,877,839)	(-15,425,197,050)	(-16,138,181,476)	(+656,696,363)	(-712,984,426)
	(FY 1995)	(-1,536,623,805)	(-15,334,673,839)	(-15,369,477,050)	(-15,726,977,476)	(-392,303,637)	(-357,500,426)
	(FY 1996)	.....	(-1,366,204,000)	(-26,360,000)	(-356,204,000)	(+1,010,000,000)	(-329,844,000)
	(FY 1997)	.....	(-94,000,000)	(-29,360,000)	(-55,000,000)	(+39,000,000)	(-25,640,000)
	(Increases in limitations on obligations)	(50,900,000)	.....	(24,500,000)	(91,300,000)	(+91,300,000)	(+66,800,000)
	(Reductions in limitations on obligations)	(-208,000,000)	(-201,791,000)	(-279,166,000)	(-166,101,500)	(+35,689,500)	(+113,064,500)
	(Total, appropriations and increases in limitations on obligations)	(8,019,906,000)	(5,442,499,800)	(7,000,246,800)	(7,309,634,800)	(+1,867,135,000)	(+309,388,000)
	(Total, rescissions and reductions in limitations on obligations)	(-1,744,623,805)	(-17,389,652,839)	(-15,766,147,050)	(-16,413,932,976)	(+975,719,863)	(-647,785,926)
	(By transfer)	(7,442,950)	(3,611,950)	(22,860,950)	(25,360,950)	(+21,749,000)	(+2,500,000)
	(Deferrals)	.....	(297,000,000)	(465,000,000)	(702,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(+237,900,000)

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, this debate is the not about spending levels. The President in his message yesterday indicated he wants to spend $50 million less than the amount provided in the conference report. There are some other very good reasons to vote against this bill.

First of all, this bill cuts programs for kids and old folks, and despite the denials on the Republican side of the aisle, it does so to pay for tax gifts for the wealthy and the well-connected. We just passed a budget resolution which slashed Medicare to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. Under that proposal, we are going to go back to the ''good old days,'' such as we had between 1982 and 1985, when 47 Fortune 500 corporations, even though they made hundreds of millions of dollars in profits, paid not one dime in Federal taxes.

Even President Reagan recognized that was wrong, closed the loophole in 1985. Under the tax proposals passed by this House and endorsed by the budget resolution passed today, we are going to go back to those ''good old days.'' And this bill is going to help pay for that new loophole. We should not be doing that.

Let me trace for you the history of what has happened on so-called deficit reduction in this bill. When this bill was first in the committee, as the gentlewoman from California pointed out, the committee chairman said that the cuts in this bill were going to be used at least in part to pay for those tax cuts. Then that rhetoric was softened.

During the debate in the committee, we said we thought it was wrong to cut Healthy Start for preborn kids; we said we thought it was wrong to cut school nutrition; we said we thought it was wrong to cut public broadcasting for preschool kids; we said we thought it was wrong to cut education and training funds; we said we thought it was wrong to cut fuel assistance and housing for the elderly all in order to give somebody who was making $200,000 a year a tax cut.

The Republicans in committee voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], which tried to dedicate all cuts to deficit reduction. On the floor, after pressure on that subject, the Republican majority said: ''OK, we changed our mind.'' They voted for the Brewster amendment, and so did we, which said that all of the funds that were saved in the bill would be used for deficit reduction.

One day after that amendment passed the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, said that well, they could not afford to live with that language because they wanted to have the out-year savings used in order to finance that tax package. Now the chairman of the committee claims that because of the adoption of the Senate amendment in conference, that somehow the Brewster amendment is protected.

I want to ask one question: If the Brewster amendment was protected, why did the Republican conferees vote against my motion in conference to keep it? You voted against it, you killed my amendment that would have saved the Brewster amendment, 8 to 6. If the Brewster amendment had been protected in conference, $50 billion more of savings in this bill would be dedicated for deficit reduction. They would not be available to finance that turkey of a rich man's tax cut that you supported on the other side of the aisle.

The CBO, as I said earlier, fully understands that if all of the dollars that were saved in this bill were dedicated to deficit reduction, as the Brewster amendment provided, there would be $50 billion more in deficit reduction provided under this proposal. So I think that is reason enough to vote for this proposition.

And there is a second reason. It is simply because this bill represents warped priorities. It cuts education and training funds by $875 million. Is it really smart to cut our effort to preserve drug-free schools by 50 percent? Is it really smart to cut school-to-work programs? Do you really want to take deep cuts in elderly and housing projects in order to move funds down the line to use for tax cuts for wealthy people?

Someone on the other side have just suggested that the LIHEAP program, low income heating assistance program, was not all that important to old folks anymore. I want to tell you, 80 percent of the people who use that program make less than $10,000 a year. One-third of them are disabled. Two million senior citizens nationally use that program.

I will never forget a woman in my own district, in Stevens Point, I met when I walked into her house to talk to her about the program. She lived in a house that was built for her by her husband as a wedding present. She was 82 years old. She had very little money. She had every room in that house closed up except the living room, the kitchen, and the bathroom, in order to save heat. She slept on an old beat up couch in the living room.

That house meant as much to her as life itself. It was her last link with her husband. She desperately wanted to hang onto it, and it was low income heating assistance program that helped her to do so.

Do you really think you ought to cut a woman like that so you can give one of your wealthy $200,000 a year income friends an additional tax break? Pardon me, I do not agree with those kind of priorities.

I think we also ought to take a look at what you have not cut. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, got up here and defended highway demonstration projects. I like to see highway projects built just like anyone else, but not at the expense of senior citizens, not at the expense of drug-free schools, not at the expense of decent education and training opportunities for our young people.

Of all things, I do not see why this Republican-controlled Congress should have retained the Benedict Arnold tax loophole provision which allows people to renounce their American citizenship in order to avoid paying taxes to the country that made them rich in the first place.

The gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KASICH] said that we hate rich people on this side of the aisle. Absolute nonsense. I would like everybody in this society to be rich. Profits are good for this country. High incomes are good for this country. But what is also good for this country is that when people make it, and they make it very well in this society, they should not be pulling the ladder up after them. They should be willing to pay their fair share to support the public services in this country that the entire society needs. That is all we are suggesting.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], said the vote today was about balance. There is nothing very balanced about proposals that cut back on aid to seniors, that cut back on educational opportunities, that cut back on veterans who have fought and risked their lives for this country, in order to give somebody who makes $200,000 bucks a year a tax cut. That is not balance at all. That is extreme. It is wrong economically, it is wrong morally.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President for drawing the line in the right place. We ought to turn this bill down. We ought to reshape it, we can easily do that in a week, and we can come out here with something that we can be proud of.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my chairman yielding. I did not intend to speak on this measure, but the fact is that over half of the funds we are talking about here, the rescissions, came out of my subcommittee. In view of the President's decision—at least it appears to be a decision—to veto this measure, I thought there were at least a couple of points I should try to make.

My colleagues, the President has proposed a list of 14 items that if restored would cause him to sign this legislation. Five of these items fall under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee. While all of them deserve mention, there are two points that I would like to make.

As you know, the AmeriCorps Program budget of 1995 has been reduced by $210 million to the 1994 funding level of $365 million. This reduction was

made not out of partisanship, but out of a true desire to review how well the AmeriCorps Program has worked, a program the President holds at the highest priority.

Many of my colleagues made it no secret that they wanted to eliminate this program. Until now, I personally had not come to a final consideration on the matter. Today I stand before you convinced that the President has already given up on the National Service Program, AmeriCorps. His veto promise has raised the stakes, and regardless of the outcome, I now believe the President will lose on that one.

Like it or not, the National Service Program has become an even larger target than ever before. Maybe not today or this week or this month, but you can rest assured the AmeriCorps Program will be the victim of this debate and this veto. The writing is now on the wall.

Mr. Speaker, there is another item that I would raise that would hopefully cause the President to reconsider his position, and that is my second point. A few months ago, before my committee, James Lee Witt, the Administrator, the Director of FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, told us that without replenishment, that as of the end of May, FEMA would run out of money. They would be out of money. No more in the pipeline.

Think of the disasters. Not just earthquakes and floods in California, but disasters across the country. Of most important recent notice, the horrible disaster of Oklahoma City. FEMA running out of money, not being able to respond to those disasters. The President is now actually thinking about turning his back on those people who had to deal with those disasters.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to rethink this position. He should not take the advice of his political advisers. He should look to the people of the country who at this moment need our assistance.

Mr. Speaker, upon completion of the conference on HR 1158 this past Tuesday morning, I had anticipated taking just a little time to briefly discuss the role my subcommittee—VA, HUD, and independent agencies—had in achieving over half of the budget savings realized in this emergency supplemental and rescissions bill.

While we certainly had difficult choices, the conferees on this chapter worked diligently to retain or restructure certain high priority items while at the same time making meaningful reductions where we thought appropriate. Our final decisions were, in my mind, legislative compromise in the truest and best sense of the word.

Perhaps more important than the specific choices we made though was the fact that our actions have gotten us headed on a track that recognizes the even more difficult budget decisions awaiting us in fiscal year 1996 and beyond. Simply put, balancing this Nation's budget will require hard choices and sacrifice on the part of each and every lawmaker and each and every citizen.

It is in this vein that I am absolutely dismayed at the announcement by the President that he will veto this legislation. The very first real opportunity this President has had to show he truly wants to get spending under control is instead squandered for what can't be described as anything other than cheap demigodary. As I mentioned the President has proposed a list of 14 items that, if restored, would cause him to sign this legislation. Again five of these items fall under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee, and a quick review of each of the other four items points out just how ridiculous is the President's announced action:

Environmental Programs: Safe Drinking Water—The President has proposed restoring $500 million for State revolving grant funds for this program which does not now and has never existed. This proposal will do nothing more than put funds aside for a program that likely will not be authorized until next year and, once it is authorized, will likely see at least another half-year of rule writing before a single dime is sent to the States. How can the President possibly justify giving money to a program that does not exist while agreeing to take funds away from others that do?

VA Medical Care—The President has suggested giving $50 million back to VA medical care, even though these funds are salary savings that the Department itself says it will not use. This rescission will not impact a single VA employee or patient, yet it clearly appears on the President's list merely for its press value.

HUD: Assisted Housing—The President has asked to restore $150 million to HUD assisted housing for residents displaced by demolition of old housing units, but apparently never checked with HUD to see what their needs are in this regard. In fact, the conferees restored half-a-billion dollars for this purpose and there is enough money now in the account to fund 20,000 families with 5-year vouchers or 50,000 families with 2-year vouchers. According to the Department, this is more than adequate to meet their needs.

HUD: Housing Opportunities for People With Aids (HOPWA)—The President's suggestion to restore $30 million in this account is truly the height of hypocrisy. The 1995 funding level of $156 million for HOPWA is exactly what the President requested for the program for 1995. Moreover, this funding level agreed to by the conferees now leaves over $400 million available for HOPWA, meaning this administration has yet to even distribute all of the funds we appropriated for HOPWA in fiscal year 1993, let alone use the funds we provided for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. Shouldn't the President be more concerned with helping the people we meant to be helped rather than raise phony issues meant to obscure the real facts?

Mr. Speaker, although I can't speak to the details of each of the 14 items, I am quite certain the story for each is similar. The President's scenario in this sorry episode is, indeed, all too clear: he decides for the first time to fully engage himself in this rescission process that for this Member started in January. He realizes he is late to the table so threatens to use his veto to get his way. For cover, he demands that 14 sexy- looking programs be restored, yet utterly fails to realize there is no substance behind restoring most if not all of the 14 items He hopes to claim a public relations victory, caring not that the real losers are the American public who most go on paying for programs that should, indeed must, be phased out.

Mr. Speaker, the President's actions so far in this regard is politics at its absolute worst and nothing short of despicable. I can only hope he somehow get a dose of honest conscience before his pen makes the wrong marks.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that the President will in fact sign this bill, I would like to take an additional moment to clarify our intent with respect to language included in the bill dealing with EPA's Automobile Inspection and Maintenance Program provided for in the Clean Air Act.

Under the regulatory framework first developed by EPA, a premium was placed on State adoption of a centralized testing facility, while an automatic discount was applied to noncentralized facilities proposed by the States. EPA itself has recently indicated they intend to be more flexible in the granting of credits for noncentralized programs, and our bill and report language should be interpreted to support EPA in this movement toward flexibility and reasonableness.

Rather than automatically discount programs, EPA should attempt to assign credits to each State's program based on the worthiness of each program. Higher credits, even up to 100 percent, need not be granted just for programs that have expensive equipment. On the contrary, if a State presents a plan that outlines how and why a certain level of credit can be achieved, EPA should be reasonable and thoughtful in its review process toward making a decision allowing such appropriate credits. If EPA believes additional data is required to make the State's case, they should be flexible in permitting such data collection for up to 2 years or two full cycles.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that what we are doing in their regard is a step in the direction of truly permitting sound science to prevail. Sometimes laws and regulations become too prescriptive in our zeal to achieve an end result. I am absolutely committed to our national goal of clean air, but I am equally persuaded we must be flexible and allow new methods and new

technologies and new ideas to lead the way toward this goal. If the agency will not or cannot provide that flexibility I am quite certain the Congress will once again address this issue in a manner that is perhaps less appealing to those who support our clean air goals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WALKER). Members are reminded that all remarks are to be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking minority member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1158, a bill rescinding appropriations for fiscal year 1995.

From the very beginning of deliberations on this legislation, it has been clear that Draconian and callous cuts to funds already approved for Federal programs were for the purpose of fulfilling the Republican Contract With America to cut taxes. This is abundantly clear when you consider that the conference agreement rejects the House adopted amendment which required all budgetary savings from the rescissions bill be used for deficit reduction. Under the Republican proposal, these savings can be use to finance tax cuts to benefit the wealthiest persons in this Nation.

Take for example, the $6.3 billion cut from critical housing programs serving the elderly, low income, and homeless families with children, and the disabled. The $1.9 billion cut from incremental assistance programs means a loss of 52,000 section 8 rental certificates. An additional $815 million reduction in public housing modernization will prevent public housing agencies from rehabilitating some 40,000 substandard pubic housing units. Further cuts of $620 million to public housing development will prevent the tearing down and replacement of 7,000 of the most distressed public housing units in the Nation.

On top of these reductions, there is the $1.5 billion cut to the Labor and Employment Training Program, the $844 million cut to Health and Human Services programs, and the $875 million cut to education programs. I find these reductions in quality of life programs appalling. Further, how can the Members of this House support a bill that cuts $65 million from student aid, cuts $11.2 million from TRIO, cuts $236 million from safe and drug-free schools, eliminates summer youth jobs in fiscal year 1996, and cuts by 68 percent funding for youth employment training? In an ever-increasing technological society, instead of ensuring that we provide adequate training to new and returning workers, this bill makes drastic cuts in vocational and adult education, displaced worker initiatives, and school-to-work programs.

This bill sends a signal to the rest of the world that the United States of America, a world leader, places a very low priority on the education of its youth.

While the uproar over initial rescissions figures forced restoration of some of the funds taken from VA programs, this bill still cuts $81 million from veterans programs. Therefore, Republicans are sending a message to our veterans that their needs are not as important as tax cuts for the wealthy.

I can understand and support a balanced approach to addressing our Nation's fiscal difficulties. But I cannot, and will not, support balancing the needs of the wealthy on the backs of the poor, the elderly, our children, veterans, and the disabled. I urge my colleagues to defeat this conference report.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's position regarding the housing cuts of roughly $6 billion, but does he realize the President only asked to restore $150 million of the housing cuts? Obviously the balance of over $5 billion is okay with him.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I will accept the gentleman's comment.

□ 1745

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have worked on this rescission package for over 2½ months. We worked through the House and the Senate and for the past 2 weeks we have been meeting often, often late into the evening in order to resolve our differences.

Nowhere, nowhere in this process was the President or his representatives seen. There was no hint to any of us as to his feelings regarding sections of this bill, and I think all of us were dismayed on opening the newspaper a day or two ago to find that he has vowed to veto it.

He has not been a part of the process. He has not said to any of us he would veto it, if certain conditions were not met. And what is most dismaying, Mr. Speaker, is that he is talking about $1.5 billion or about 9 percent of a $16.5 billion bill, which is itself only 1 percent of the entire Federal budget for fiscal 1995.

He is talking about half of that in the area of education and job training or one-twentieth of 1 percent of Federal spending, a minuscule amount. He objects, even though in our area of labor, health and human services and education, the House figure was $5.9 billion in rescissions, the Senate figure was about $3 billion in rescissions, and the House went very far in accommodating the view of the Senate, which the Senate was very insistent on, and we ended up at $3.3 billion. So we were not making the heavy cuts that the House had recommended in our area. We, rather, deferred to the Senate on most of these matters. And the cuts involved are cuts that are very, very minor, although obviously in programs that we consider to be very important as well.

I find the President's lack of attention and unwillingness to be at the table irresponsible in the extreme. I find his threat to veto this legislation incomprehensible. If we are to approach our entire fiscal 1996 budget with a President who will not be at the table, who will simply say, I am going to veto it when all the work is done, I think we are going to have a very, very difficult time indeed.

No one wants to ascribe certain motivations to the President. I will not do so. But I will say that it is irresponsible for the President to threaten such a veto.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, this floor has been full of debate on the budget the last few days. Many Members from both sides of the aisle have spoken on the importance of deficit reduction and debt reduction.

And, yet, this conference report is classic double-speak. This conference report does not contain the Brewster-Minge lockbox, but rather contains a Pandora's Box. The Brewster-Minge lockbox, which passed the House overwhelmingly by a vote of 418 to 5, has been scored by CBO as containing $66.2 billion in savings.

Instead, this afternoon we are considering a conference report with a watered-down version of the lockbox—a true Pandora's Box. This conference report has been scored by CBO to only save $15.4 billion—over $50 billion less than the Brewster lockbox.

That's $50 billion that should be deposited in the lockbox but will instead go for additional spending.

Mr. Speaker, I will be candid about my feelings on this conference report. There are many difficult cuts in this bill that will effect education, housing, economic development and agriculture. There are programs eliminated that are very valuable to my State of Oklahoma.

I have discussed with my constituents over the last few years about the seriousness of the Federal deficit. They do not like many of these cuts either. But, these citizens are willing to once

again sacrifice in order to reduce our deficit.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, they will not support these cuts if the savings goes for anything other than deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to send this Pandora's Box back to the conferees, and let us come back with the lockbox that will make these cuts count.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 20 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the fiscal year 1995 supplemental appropriations or rescissions bill conference report there is $100.5 million provided for so-called enhanced counterterrorism. Included in this figure is over $20 million for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and $77 million for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These have caused me some concern.

As the chairman knows, just two weeks ago the administration presented to the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary incomplete draft counterterrorism legislation that contained proposals for new federal authority, redefinitions of current authority and new jurisdiction, in addition to a request for consideration of a new counterterrorism center within the FBI.

Needless to say, the Committee on the Judiciary is conducting a careful examination of the testimony presented and is studying that which has thus far been proposed. Unfortunately, the administration has yet to finalize its proposals to the Congress and necessarily its arguments in behalf of its position are still unfinished.

Therefore, I was surprised to see that the administration has somehow organized itself to make appropriations requests of the conference. It would be most disturbing were the administration presenting differing sets of proposals to the House, one incomplete and unfinished, and still another to the conferees if an effort to sidestep its responsibility to argue for its views before the authorizing committee of jurisdiction, in this case the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these concerns and understanding our mutual desire to see important emergency funding to help the people of Oklahoma City, I want to ask, is it the gentleman's understanding that none of the funds in this rescissions package provide for new or expanded authority for any federal law enforcement and including but not limited to ATF and the FBI.

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

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman should be pleased to know that except for one provision that permits the Attorney General to offer up to a $2 million reward to capture the people responsible for the Oklahoma City tragedy, there are no new or expanded authorities contained in this conference report. What we do in this bill is to provide the immediate resources necessary to respond to the tragedy in Oklahoma City.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the chairman of the committee, the new chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], as well as the minority spokesman on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for their hard work on this. But let me say at the outset, I sincerely hope that this rescission bill is defeated today on the House floor and, if it is not, I hope the President keeps his word and vetoes it. I want to tell you why.

For the past several months we have heard like Banquo's ghost rattling through the halls. The Republican tax break program rears its ugly head every time Congress tries to tackle a serious issue. We want to sit down and talk about a balanced budget, which our nation wants and both parties profess to want, and yet the Republicans insist on a tax break package which gives tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and absolves the most profitable corporations from paying their fair share of Federal taxes.

We want to talk about a bill like this, a rescission bill to cut spending so we can come up with money to pay for disasters in California and Oklahoma City and other places. The Republicans, again, want to make sure that some of the money that we are going to save will be around to fund the tax break package for the wealthiest privileged few in America.

It just boggles my mind, and I have been around politics so long. What is in this tax break package that is so important to them that they will literally taint every debate on this floor by making certain there is money in there for their tax break? I tell you what it is, my friends. It is because for some big businesses and for some special interests, that tax break means more than every other issue on this floor.

They are sticking with it, even if it means cutting 80,000 people off of the WIC program. Women and children who would get prenatal care will not because of this spending cut bill. They are sticking with it even if it means eliminating the Food and Drug Administration reorganization plan, to make that agency more efficient so it can safeguard our families.

No, they will make these cuts, and they will have to answer, and their answers are not any good because the Republican tax break program is not what we are here to talk about. We are here to get this public's House in order, to get our budget in order, and that tax break package is not the way to do it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.

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

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

In response to the previous speaker and all the rhetoric we have heard around here today about tax breaks and tax cuts, if BS was a dollar a pound, we would have paid off the deficit at about noon. This thing has nothing to do with tax breaks or tax cuts. What part of zero do we not understand here?

What I really came down here to talk about was the president's veto on the rescission package. It is like he is trying to Monday morning quarterback a ball game that he did not even watch. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], not only invited him to watch the game, he invited him to participate, clear back in the month of February.

They declined to do so at the White House. Yesterday we got the message they are going to veto the rescission package.

We asked the GSA to give us a list of the so-called pork that is in our portion of the bill. That was yesterday. Today we finally get a response. OMB has ordered GSA not to give us a list of any kind. Mr. President, where is the pork? If you say it is there, identify it so we can work on it, because we think that we took every bit of pork out of this package that was there. The unauthorized programs are gone.

So I would only say in closing that, as we look at this rescission package, we also should be cognizant that the president's approval ratings went up for the way that he handled Oklahoma City. And he is to be commended for that. But now the rubber meets the road. The money for Oklahoma City is in this bill. The investigative agencies who hopefully will put together a successful investigation that will convict and send to prison the people who perpetrated the crime in Oklahoma City are running out of money. The money for that investigation is in this bill. The President says he wants to veto it. I think when we learn someday that you can go to hell for lying the same as stealing, this will be a lot better town to live in.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to also commend the chairman of the committee on his first conference report and the ranking member

on our side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for working together. But regrettably, I fail to understand why we are here today. I wish we could have gone back to conference, worked out the finetuning that would have been required to bring this bill to the floor and pass it with little, if any, opposition.

The President does have a role to play and he has played it. I believe that the President's priorities are important and we need to talk about them. We look at those programs that have been cut, the safe and drug-free schools program which will have $200 million less to fight these problems on campuses across the country.

We look at the Goals 200 program, which will increase academic standards for students throughout our country, something we have worked closely on with employers and school administrators and teachers and parents and students, something that has been advocated by the Governors of our States.

□ 1800

We have cut $90 million out of their program this year. The school-to-work program, which was designed to help move children from the school system that is not always succeeding in educating them to jobs, something that has been essential to try to make our young people more effective in the job market, and to make our country more competitive in the international market we are part of, that program is reduced in this bill.

The President has good reason, therefore, to ask us to go back and take up the task again. The reason that we, I think, find it difficult to do that, the reason we seem to be so dug in that we need to be here today, is for one very good reason. That is that after we pay for the much needed disaster relief, from California to Oklahoma City and around this country, once we have paid that bill, that $7 billion bill, we wanted to take $9 billion more out of this current fiscal year, not to balance the budget, but to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest in our society. That is terrible and it is regrettable. I am hoping we can fix it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy said that a journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step. Today we took, earlier, a giant step toward a balanced budget for the year 2002. That is the passage of the budget resolution.

Now we have an opportunity to take another step. That is to support this rescission bill. I say that because many of the programs, many of the construction projects that were rescinded, would have great outyear costs. By stopping these programs, slowing them down, rescinding buildings, rescinding other expensive projects, it will save money as we go down the road. Therefore, this bill becomes very important if we are to reach the goal of a legacy of a balanced budget and a strong economy for future generations in the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I would also just add that we do deal with a forest problem that enables us, in the Forest Service, to take diseased, dead trees, trees that have been scarred by fire, and use that lumber for the benefit of the young people of this Nation that want to build homes at a reasonable cost.

I was out in California and spent 2 days looking at the program. I think it will work very well. It will not in any way harm the forests, and it will provide for their health by removing trees that could be a potential fire hazard for the future. Therefore, I think this bill has a lot of good features.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge my colleagues to support this second, very important step towards a balanced budget.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rescission bill. This rescission bill, to some degree, came out of the air. If it did not come out of the tax cut that we keep talking about, I am not sure where it came from.

The gentleman who now chairs the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations did not come to me at the end of last year and say ''We ought to get this out of bill. This is wrong. It should not be in the bill.'' I did not hear any other ranking member say that in committee, as I recall, and certainly not the $16.4 or $17 billion. If that did not come simply because we needed to get money for a tax cut, I do not know where it came from. Nobody has told me where that magic figure came from.

The fact of the matter is we passed a bill which balances the budget by 2002. That is fine. I voted for one of the amendments that did exactly that; not for the one that had the tax cut in it, but for the other one, because I thought the priorities were better, and the priorities in this rescission bill stink. That is what the President said, and he was telling the truth. He was not lying.

The fact of the matter is the priorities in this bill are not for the children pictured in the last debate. Summer jobs go down the drain in this bill, for young people that need that experience and need that future. That is not a policy that is looking to have people fly, I suggest.

This rescission bill is ill-considered, in that it does not address what are really the priorities of this country. There is no priority to cut the taxes for the wealthiest 10 percent in America. I would like to cut their taxes. Very frankly, most of us fall within that category, and we will personally benefit from that tax reduction. However, the fact of the matter is there are a lot of people in this country who need the opportunity to succeed, and this bill takes it away from them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear over and over again how we are taking the food out of the mouths of babes. Well, as chairman of the subcommittee that funds the WIC program, let me clear the air once and for all.

Since fiscal year 1990, annual increases to the program have ranged between $200 million and $350 million. During this same time period, the unspent recovery balance has increased from $28 million to $125 million. The program couldn't absorb the large increases we were giving it every year.

The bill we have before us rescinds $20 million from the $125 million unspent fiscal year 1994 carryover balance. We have heard the Democrats say that this $20 million rescission would result in 480,000 fewer food packages. I'm not sure what this means. In the history of program, no one has ever measured the program by the number of food packages. The measurement has always been the number of women, infants, and children served.

The truth of the matter is, even with this $20 million rescission, the Department does not expect to change its estimates on how many additional women, infants, and children will be served this year. Why? Because the President is projecting an unspent recovery balance of $100 million at the end of this fiscal year, fiscal year 1995. What does this mean? It means that the average monthly participation will still increase by 500,000 this fiscal year. This rescission will have absolutely no effect on the 1995 level of participation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill, and want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, and the staff, for the work they have done. I want to change what I was going to say. I keep hearing about a tax cut. If this is for the tax cut, I say good. The American family is under more pressure today than any other time in the history of the country. Every indicator that you look at for the well-being of the family is going the wrong way. Child abuse is at an all time high, spouse abuse is at an all time high, teen suicide is at an all time high, teen pregnancy an all time high, teen violence an all time high.

I say if this is to give a mom and a dad the opportunity to keep a little

more money so they can take care of the family, I want to vote twice for it, not once, but twice, if I could. That would not be bad.

However, what we have done, I think, has been good. Additionally, I will put my statement in the RECORD on the demo projects. We are not going to have any demo projects in the transportation bill that comes out. They are all gone. I do not support them. I will never support a bill on this floor that has demos coming out of my committee, so we do not have to worry about them.

Number two, the administration has never even called us. Our staff and Jim Tarnall asked the administration on the administrative costs. We cut $20 million out, the Senate cut $10, and we asked them over and over, ''Should it be 15? Should it be 12? What should it be?'' They would not even give it to us.

I know why this bill is going to be vetoed, if it is. It is because of the reason I heard on public radio, yesterday, when they said ''It is a political reason. It is an opportunity to make a statement.'' Demos are gone. They did not talk to us, but if this money is used to help the American family, I say God bless, and we ought to be proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, which provides supplemental appropriations for emergency disaster assistance for the Northridge earthquake, west- and Gulf-coasts floods, and recovery assistance for Oklahoma City, by rescinding $16.4 billion in budget and obligational authority in fiscal year 1995.

Within the $16.4 billion, the conference report rescinds $2.728 billion from transportation programs. Rescissions in transportation programs are appropriate and necessary, particularly when the Congress is considering reductions in programs such as Headstart, hunger programs, immunizations, and breast cancer screening. Transportation programs should not be exempt. Furthermore, the transportation rescissions contained in this conference report are justified, reasonable and fair.

The conference report contains rescissions in unavailable contract authority including:

$2.1 billion for the airport improvement program; and

$250 million for the magnetic levitation [MAGLEV] prototype train development.

These balances of contract authority are moneys that cannot be spent in fiscal year 1995 due to other provisions of law, and therefore, these rescissions, when enacted, will have a negligible, if any, impact on transportation in this country.

In addition, the conference report rescinds:

$132 million in highway research and development programs, including $40 million in intelligent transportation systems;

$42 million in the coast guard; and

$40 million in transit research and discretionary grants, by reducing 50 percent of their obligated transit balances made available prior to fiscal year 1993.

The conference report does not include a reduction in highway demonstration projects, as proposed by the Senate—a proposal which I believe has a great deal of merit and for which I am sympathetic.

I am opposed to earmarking Federal moneys for highways demonstration projects, scarce transportation dollars must be carefully directed to programs addressing essential public safety needs rather than special projects. I have announced this to my colleagues, State transportation officials, industry representatives, and other interested parties.

I have written letters and outlined my position in statements and meetings, and am underscoring my position here today. Simply put, it has become a choice between paying for the truly essential public safety needs or continuing to spend for these highway demonstration projects. To me, the choice is clear. Without regard to partisan politics, and without reference to the merits of any particular projects, the fiscal year 1996 transportation appropriations bill will contain no highway demonstration projects.

With respect again to the conference report. It should be noted that since the Congress began to consider rescissions in January, and subsequent to the Senate's action in March, unobligated balance in the highway demonstration program accounts dating back to 1982 and 1987 have been reduced by nearly half. Unobligated balances have fallen from $252 million to $149 million today. And it is still dropping.

The mere threat of this Congress rescinding these balances over the past 90 days has accomplished what the Federal Highway Administration and 52 State Departments of Transportation could not do over the past 13 years—that is to get these funds out on the streets for which they were appropriated. To that end, we have been successful.

None of the transportation rescissions have been raised by the administration as egregious or needing to be restored.

I urge my colleages to support this conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would, at the outset, only say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the majority that if they are worried about the disaster assistance for Oklahoma City, efforts that we have made, that we put into the supplemental bill, and it is not just the rescission bill, it is a supplemental, they were able to do some things within 100 days. I am proud of them. I think they could do the same things with those matters. Just pass the legislation, we will put it on the President's desk. We can deal with this issue. We can find some places to cut.

My chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been very forthright and very candid and very honest about his position with respect to highway demonstration projects. I only question whether or not the same thing will be true for aviation projects, as well as transit projects. I think we need some clarification on that, so there is no confusion.

Let me say that, really and truly, the way this thing works, I know my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] was concerned about the fact that we were having a veto. I was looking at the Constitution the other day. Article 1, section 7, is still in here. Read it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have had contacts from people all over the Southwest, the Southeast, and the eastern United States asking that the rescission bill be passed, primarily for the timber consideration. We have labor unions in that area that are without jobs. We have tens of thousands of people that are waiting for the President to fulfill his commitment on option 9, which would put timber in the pipeline that would allow those people to go back to work. We have forest health being damaged because of insects, because of fire, because of the damage to the forest that could be obliterated if we could get the salvage wood out of the forest, and this bill provides a mechanism for that. It also gives the taxpayer $135 million for doing it, which would go toward the deficit. It gives us an opportunity to keep our commitment.

Reading some of the opposition, one of the folks who urged the President to veto this bill stated that it would stop clearcutting in the West. The depth of dumb cannot be fathomed in this area. These are dead and dying trees, not live trees to be clearcut.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio, [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. For the last 2 days we engaged in debate over balancing the budget. That fight to cut spending, reduce the deficit, and balance our budget must be won. A budget balanced fairly, with no tax giveaways to the privileged few, is not beyond our abilities, though that is not the budget that passed here earlier today.

Now before us is another bill that cuts spending, but again, does not dedicate its savings to deficit reduction. In the original bill, we all supported the Brewster amendment, which overwhelmingly passed this Chamber by over 400 votes. However, what we have here is a bill that imposes draconian cuts: no summer jobs after this year, a cut this year in thousands of jobs across this country, no heating assistance for our seniors, and then it directs those precious dollars to give tax benefits to the most privileged among us. This bill deserves to be vetoed. We will have another bill here that is just and fair.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

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

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

What a difference 2 years makes, Mr. Speaker. We are paying our bills even during an emergency. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I am insulted by the way the President of the United States is handling it. He came to Oklahoma, we wanted him to come, we were glad to have him to mourn with us. However, the money in here in response to Oklahoma is not for Oklahoma, it is for the whole country, for heightened security around the country, to defend against the possibility of something happening to the rest of you as happened to us.

The President pretending that he is wanting to veto it because of pork, it is a lie. What he is complaining about is what was put in bills last year by the Democrat leadership that he signed and put into law, and he is trying to say ''It is your fault because you are not taking out what I did.''

What a lie, Mr. President. We are sick of the rhetoric that you are using on this. Do not do it. Look at it on the merits. If you have some things you want to take out, you should have sent a list up when there is time to do it, but I am insulted by the way the President is behaving.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Members are reminded that the President of the United States is to be treated in debate in the same manner as Members of the House.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, do the rules of the House allow a Member to impugn the motives or activities of the President of the United States without being subjected to having the words taken down, as they would if he made that charge about another Member of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules require that no Member may be personally abusive to the President of the United States, and the words may be taken down, as with Members, if such conduct takes place.

The words to be taken down, though, would be requested from the floor.

Mr. OBEY. I think the Chair is absolutely right on his ruling. I want to say that out of courtesy, I did not make that motion, even though he was obviously out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair noted for all Members the situation with regard to the President of the United States.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. The Speaker indicated that the words could have been taken down if a Member had risen.

Does the Speaker have the authority to raise that point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair or any Members can raise the point.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Chair for his response.

□ 1815

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for America's veterans. Before there was a Contract With America, America had a solemn contract with its veterans. Today House Republicans have broken that contract with our veterans.

One week before Memorial Day, on the eve of our celebration of the end of World War II, Republicans have cut $24 billion in veterans' health care. According to the VA, that means by 2002 the closure perhaps of 41 VA hospitals. It means a cut of 60,000 VA employees. It means 4 million veterans may not get health care, veterans who fulfilled their contract with America in World War II, in Korea, and Vietnam.

Now Republicans are saying $24 billion in veterans' cuts is not enough in one day. They are asking for another $50 million in cuts in critical veterans' health care and hospital equipment, equipment that our veterans desperately need and deserve. That is not fair, Mr. Speaker. It is not right. It is a breach of contract with America's veterans.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, who indicated that if these cuts were used to fund the tax cut, then God bless.

Unfortunately, that is not what that Member or 417 other Members of this body voted to do 2 months ago when the Brewster amendment was passed. That amendment would ensure that spending cuts in this bill reduced the deficit over the next 5 years.

However, that was stripped out of the conference report as Chairman KASICH and Majority Leader ARMEY indicated it would be immediately after the bill. The only conceivable reason for stripping this provision is to maintain flexibility to use these spending cuts to fund the tax cut.

If leadership planned on keeping their promise to cut spending, balance the budget and fund the tax cuts, the lock box provision would be irrelevant. So why strip it out?

I support spending cuts to balance the budget. However, this bill amounts to spending cuts for the sole purpose of paying for tax cuts. That is not the way to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement in opposition to the conference report for the RECORD as follows:

I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1158, the omnibus rescissions and supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1995.

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. House leadership has claimed that it intends to balance the budget at the same time or before cutting taxes.

Yet, twice today, we have voted on leadership proposals which amount to a clear statement that they plan on passing massive tax cuts before making the tough spending decisions. Earlier today, the House budget resolution irresponsibly set up a two-step reconciliation process. Under this process, massive tax cuts will be enacted 2 months prior to enacting over 40 percent of the spending cuts needed to balance the budget.

By stripping the lockbox provision, the rescissions conference bill that leadership is bringing up for a vote now is a second clear and unambiguous sign that leadership makes spending cuts a secondary priority.

Two months ago the House voted 418-to-5 for the Brewster lockbox amendment. The lockbox amendment would ensure that the spending cuts in this bill over the next 5 years are completely dedicated to deficit reduction.

However, in conference, this provision was stripped, as Chairman KASICH and Majority Leader ARMEY said it would be immediately after the overwhelming vote in the House. They never intended to allow these spending cuts to reduce the deficit. I cannot support this irresponsible fiscal behavior. The only conceivable reason for stripping this provision is to maintain flexibility to use these spending reductions to finance tax cuts, without making the spending cuts necessary to balance the budget. The simple fact is that if leadership follows through on their promise to pass spending cuts sufficient to balance the budget and pay for the tax cuts, the lockbox provision would not matter. So why strip it out?

I support sensible spending cuts to balance the budget. However, this bill amounts to spending cuts for the sole purpose of paying for tax cuts. This is not the way to balance the budget.

I urge a ''no'' vote. Let's send this back to the conferees to reinstate the Brewster lockbox provision.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], a member of the committee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1158, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. This conference report provides important emergency funds for Federal disasters, and for the second time this session, Republicans have fully paid for emergency appropriations through corresponding offsets.

As has already been mentioned today, included in H.R. 1158 is a provision that will prevent future national disasters. The emergency timber salvage amendment directs the Forest

Service to remove dead, dying and diseased timber from our national forests to the maximum extent feasible.

We, in the West, know that the health of our forests has declined drastically because of prohibitions against salvage logging, thinning and controlled burns. In the summer of 1994, more than 67,000 wildfires burned almost 4 million acres of forest and rangeland. 26 firefighters lost their lives fighting these fires. In the month of August alone, a partial list of Federal expenses came to $7.8 million per day. The emergency salvage amendment is a provision that will go a long way toward preventing future forest fires by improving the health of our forests today, and being sensitive to environmental concerns. Most importantly, it will help small timber companies and rural communities.

I urge all Members to support this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to respond to comments made by 3 gentleman on the other side of the aisle.

First of all, with respect to the comments made by my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], he threatened retaliation against the President and his favorite program in this bill, AmericCorps, if the President vetoes this bill. I think that is an example of what is wrong with the mindset on that side of the aisle these days.

I recognize the Republican Party is new to power in this House, but it seems to me that if the country is to be well-served in the Republican Party's exercise of that power, that in divided government persons with responsibility on that side of the aisle need to learn how to share power, not to threaten its abuse.

Second, with respect to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] who complained that the President was not involved and that he did not know that the President was going to veto the bill, I would simply say he should not be surprised.

I pointed out in the conference that when meetings were held between the Senate and the House conferees on the labor-health-education programs in this conference, that the Republican subcommittee staff made it quite clear to Democrats on that subcommittee that we were not welcome to even attend the meetings. So if the gentleman from Illinois is surprised that the President vetoed the bill, he should not be surprised because he put himself in the isolation room.

I have a stack of letters from the President to the committee at various times during the process laying out exactly what they wanted done. We have a letter on April 28 spelling out that if the President were presented with a bill containing objectionable provisions contained in the House version of the bill as outlined below, he would veto the bill, and he proceeded to list 29 specific problems. I do not know why the sudden surprise.

With respect to the suggestion by the gentleman from Iowa that implied that the investigation of the Oklahoma bombing would somehow be delayed by the President's veto, I will simply say that is outrageously false. The Department of Justice has indicated to the committee that the Oklahoma investigation is the top priority of the department and that the extraordinary expenses related to the bombing for the FBI, U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshal's Service and the DEA are already being incurred and funded using available 1995 funds.

With respect to the outrageous words just directed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] against the President of the United States, I would simply say that those words have damaged the gentleman from Oklahoma far more than they have damaged the President of the United States. I think I will simply let them go at that.

I urge a vote against this bill in the interest of fairness and deficit reduction.

The letters referred to follow:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, April 28, 1995.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Additional Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Bill, FY 1995, as passed by the House and by the Senate.

The Administration is strongly opposed to the House version of the bill and believes that it would unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that educate our children, aid the disadvantaged, and protect our health and safety. If the President were presented a bill containing the objectionable provisions contained in the House version of the bill, as outlined below, he would veto the bill.

While the Senate version of the bill is acceptable, there are a number of provisions that could be improved. We urge the conferees to consider the concerns discussed below.

As the President stated at the April 26th Bipartisan Leadership meeting, he will shortly be sending to Congress a supplemental request for the costs of the Federal response to the Oklahoma City bombing. We urge the conferees to include such funding in H.R. 1158 and to present the President with a bill that he can sign so as not to delay providing these urgently needed funds.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

This Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, we worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. The Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992—to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, especially those aimed at helping the disadvantaged, should be cut, particularly if such cuts were made to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

CUTTING PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION, AND THE DISADVANTAGED

The House-passed bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These reductions would have a particularly harmful effect our Nation's children and disadvantaged by cutting funding for National Service; the Summer Jobs program; Goals 2000; the Education for the Disadvantaged program; the Safe and Drug Free School Program; the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund; and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

While the Senate version of the bill represents a significant improvement over the House-passed bill with respect to funding for these programs, the Administration has concerns over any reductions to programs that assist our Nation's children and the disadvantaged. The conferees are urged to restore full funding for these programs, or, at a minimum, accept the Senate levels.

JORDANIAN DEBT RELIEF

The President has made clear that the provision of debt relief to Jordan can contribute to further progress toward a Middle East peace settlement. We strongly support the Senate language of H.R. 1158, which would appropriate the full $275 million requested for forgiveness of Jordan's debt to the United States. Every Administration since the creation of the State of Israel has determined that the promotion of peace in the Middle East is a vital U.S. National interest. Jordan has taken important steps for peace at great risk. Jordan and other countries in the region need concrete evidence that the United States supports those steps and that we stand by our commitments. For this reason, full debt relief is of paramount importance. We support providing as much of the $275 million of obligational authority in FY 1995 as possible.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed by the House and the Senate for many science and technology programs would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness. These include programs in the Department of Commerce, such as the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the National Information Infrastructure Grants Program, and the laboratories of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and in the Department of Education, such as grants for the development and adoption of education technology. The Senate is to be commended for restoring funding for several of these programs. The conferees are urged to restore full funding for these programs or to accept the lower of the House or Senate rescission level so as not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

STRIKER REPLACEMENT

The Administration strongly opposes a provision in the House version of the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive

Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs. The use of, or the threat to use, permanent replacement workers destroys opportunities for cooperative and stable labor-management relations.

Additional Administration concerns with the House and Senate versions of the bill are contained in the enclosure.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS—H.R. 1158—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS BILL, FY 1995 (AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE)

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The $416 million rescission proposed by the House for the Corporation for National and Community Service would virtually terminate the program. Remaining funds would provide only 4,000 of the proposed 33,000 opportunities for young adults to serve their communities as AmeriCorps members and earn an education award. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Learn and Serve America program, which provides support for thousands of school children to learn responsibility to their community.

The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health. AmeriCorps members also have helped raise the spelling scores and reading levels of rural disadvantaged children, built homes for ''working-poor'' families, and provided disaster relief assistance to victims throughout the western part of the country.

The conferees are urged to restore full funding for this important program, or, at a minimum, to provide for a rescission of not more than $105 million, the amount recommended by the Senate.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth. These young people might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The Administration is pleased that the Senate version of the bill would not reduce funding for this program for the summer of 1995, as proposed by the House. However, the Senate, like the House, would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in the summer of 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element of a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all American and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business. At a minimum, the conferees are urged to accept the Senate's position on this program. If funding for the summer of 1996 is not restored in this bill, then the Administration will press for restoration in the FY 1996 budget process.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The House version of the bill would reduce funding for Goals 2000 by over one-third ($174 million), thereby greatly diminishing support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The House also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $148 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The House version of the bill contains a sharp reduction—$65 million—in funding for education technology programs, which would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

The Senate version of the bill would reduce Goals 2000 by $8 million, cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $8 million, and cut the Federal direct student loan program by $95 million. The conferees are urged to restore full finding for Goals 2000, Education for the Disadvantaged, and education technology programs, or, at a minimum, approve the Senate levels.

SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS

The Administration opposes the House action that would rescind nearly $472 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every pool shows that crime and school safety are major concerns of Americans. This program is an important element of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulates by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth. The Administration is pleased that the Senate has restored funding for this important program and urges the conferees to adopt the Senate position.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million contained in the House version of the bill would terminate the CDFI program. The Senate restored $36 million of this amount. The conferees are urged to restore full funding for the CDFI program. The conferees are urged to ensure that the program remains balanced between existing and new community development financial institutions, as provided in the current authorization law.

Without full funding, in FYs 1995 and 1996 the CDFI Fund would be unable to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $70.5 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $39 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The House version of the bill would reduce funds available for the WIC program by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The House's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the heath and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified. The Administration commends the Senate for restoring funding for this important program and strongly urges the conferees to accept the Senate proposal.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK

This innovative partnership, financed equally in the Departments of Education and Labor, provides seed money to States to create state-wide School-to-Work Opportunities systems. These systems will help youth acquire the knowledge, skills, abilities, and labor market information they need to make a smooth and effective transition from school to career-oriented work or further education or training. The House proposes a $12.5 million rescission for each department—a 10-percent reduction to the FY 1995 appropriation in each agency. The Senate rescission is $2.5 million for each department. The Administration prefers the Senate level and urges the conferees to support this important program, which will help youth obtain jobs and employers gain a responsible and skilled workforce.

CUTTING PROGRAMS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

While an improvement over the House version of the bill, the proposed Senate rescission of $0.8 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would still seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need significant resources to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress were to fail to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds could be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

Reductions are also proposed by the House and the Senate for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. The additional reductions to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

The Administration continues to estimate a supplemental requirement of $6.7 billion for FEMA disaster relief. Absent approval of this supplemental, FEMA estimates that under current operations, it will need to redirect funds already allocated to other disasters to meet more immediate requirements beginning in early summer.

JOBS CORPS

The House version of the bill would rescind $10 million from the Job Corps program; the Senate version, $46 million. The Senate's action would halt expansion of a youth training program with a track record of improving the employment and earnings of poor youth. It would also eliminate funds to continue work on eight new Job Corps centers that were launched with previous years' appropriations. Work is underway on these eight centers, which would create 3,200 new training slots for about 4,700 severely disadvantaged youth each year. In addition, the Senate would eliminate funds to initiate four new Job Corps centers in FY 1995, which would boost capacity by another 1,600 slots. The Administration prefers the House level.

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA) YOUTH TRAINING GRANTS

The JTPA Title II–C program provides grants to States for training, education, and employment services designed to provide low-income youth with marketable skills leading to productive, unsubsidized employment. The Congress already has rescinded $200 million from this program in P.L. 104–6—approximately one-third of the resources available for the 1995 program year, which

begins in July. This would mean about 105,000 youth would not perceive services. Both the House and Senate have proposed rescinding more than is contained in P.L. 104–6. Adequate funding for this program is essential to provide the Department of Labor the flexibility to work with States to re-examine the program's design and test new strategies to help youth succeed in the labor market. The Administration prefers the House level, which would reduce this program by an additional $110 million, as opposed to the $272 million reduction proposed by the Senate.

ONE-STOP CAREER SHOPPING

This initiative provides competitive grants to States to improve employment and training services by providing a common point of access to career and labor market information, occupational skill requirements, and other information about jobs and training. The House proposes rescinding $12 million, or 10 percent of the 1995 appropriation; the Senate, $20 million. These career centers are key to successful implementation of a new consolidated and integrated workforce development system serving the needs of job seekers and employers. The Administration prefers the house level.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Both the House and the Senate versions of the bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would threaten the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. In particular, the draconian cuts targeted by the House towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The House version of the bill could also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. In addition, the House's rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH AIDS (HOPWA)

The HOPWA program provides housing and other services for people with AIDS. Without such assistance, some of the most vulnerable people in our society would become homeless. The Administration is opposed to the House action that would rescind $186 million from the HOPWA program, thus eliminating the entire amount appropriated for this program in FY 1995. We commend the Senate for restoring funding for this important program and urge the conferees to adopt the Senate position.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration opposes both the House and the Senate's recommendation to rescind $65 and $29 million, respectively, for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives. Within this overall reduction, the House would reduce by $28 million and the Senate by $17 million funding for Drug courts, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. The Administration also opposes the House action that would cut $32 million from the Drug Elimination grants at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Administration prefers the overall Senate level of funding for these programs.

The Administration objects to a provision in the Senate version of the bill that would delete all grant funding for the Ounce of Prevention program. This program is vital to the Administration's efforts to coordinate crime prevention programs nation-wide. The Administration prefers the House level of funding for this program.

VETERANS MEDICAL CARE AND CONSTRUCTION

The Senate version of the bill would rescind $100 million from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans medical care and construction. These cuts would eliminate $20 million in new medical equipment for veterans health care, $30 million for veterans health services, and $50 million for expanding or improving veterans medical facilities. The Administration believes these cuts are unwise and unnecessary, and would harm the veterans who need their nation's help the most. The Administration prefers the House position.

TIMBER SALES

The Administration is opposed to a provision contained in both the House and Senate versions of the bill that would too broadly define ''salvage timber sales'' to include sales of primarily healthy trees, supersede the otherwise applicable environmental and land management statutes, and restrict citizens' access to the courts. The Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce last month announced a comprehensive plan to accelerate timber salvage sales. In addition to the measures already underway at these agencies to accelerate timber salvage sales, the Administration stands ready to work with the Congress to find appropriate, productive solutions to this pressing national problem that would not result in a return to gridlock, as may well result from the bill's provisions.

In addition, the Administration is opposed to a provision contained in the Senate version of the bill that would overturn the existing environment and land management framework of the President's Forest Plan for the Pacific Northwest (''Option 9''). The carefully crafted balance in the Forest Plan allows for a sustainable timber harvest as well as environmental protection. This Plan was key to the release of a court injunction on logging in the territory of the Northern Spotted Owl and represents a finely crafted compromise that took two years to achieve. The Administration believes that it can expedite Option 9 sales without setting aside the existing land management framework.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the House's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location. While the Administration does not support the Senate rescission, which freezes the program at the FY 1995 level, the Administration prefers it to the House action.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (OSHA)

The House version of the bill would rescind $19.6 million from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. This is a 6.3 percent reduction in OSHA funding although, effectively, a 12.6 percent reduction since it comes so late in the fiscal year. The rescission would have a dramatic impact on OSHA's ability to fulfill its mission to protect workers and on the Administration's efforts to make the agency more effective. This rescission would hinder OSHA's compliance assistance programs and education and training initiatives, as well as enforcement, resulting in an estimated 6,300 additional preventable injuries. The Administration is pleased that the Senate version of the bill does not include this cut and prefers the Senate funding level.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Our Nation's future economic health depends on strong public and private support for science and technology. The proposed rescission to many of the Administration's investments would jeopardize our ability to achieve sustained economic growth and competitiveness.

The Administration prefers the Senate version of the bill with respect to the funding level for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) over the House version, which would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The Administration objects to the House's proposed rescission of $30 million for the Commerce Department's National Information Infrastructure Grants program. The Administration believes that this program provides substantial benefits by facilitating access to information products and services by all Americans. P.L. 104–6 rescinded $15 million from this program. If the rescissions contained in the House version of the bill were adopted, the program would be cut by a total of 70 percent.

The Administration also opposes the $16.5 million and $19.5 million rescission of funds proposed by the House and Senate, respectively, for laboratory research at NIST. These rescissions would have a real impact on industry's ability to compete in both emerging and mature markets and would result in the diminished competitive posture of U.S. industry. NIST laboratories develop and deliver measurement techniques and services that provide a common language needed by industry in all stages of commerce.

The House's proposed rescission of $16.7 million and the Senate's proposed rescission of $12.5 million for the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest. This rescission would force the Service to consider closing one or more of four major laboratory centers, and joint State projects underway in more than 30 States would be reduced.

The Senate has proposed rescinding $42 million in funding for upgrades to the national transonic wind tunnel. These upgrades have been planned for many years and are critical to maintaining the performance of these tunnels. The wind tunnel complex has contributed to the development of almost every U.S.-developed military and civil aircraft. Failure to modernize this facility will increase the delay in critical test data. These upgrades are needed now and are unrelated to the development of a new wind tunnel facility.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (SSA) AUTOMATION INVESTMENT

The Senate version of the bill would reduce funding for SSA computer systems by $88 million, thus elimination all second-year funding for SSA's multi-year automation investment. This reduction would lead to deterioration in service by not allowing for the

purchase of new computer equipment as existing equipment wears out and customer demands increase. The funds proposed for rescission are already programmed to support contract awards for quantities of computers supported by the Senate and the General Accounting Office.

The Administration notes the Senate's concern about the total number of computers SSA plans to acquire over a five-year period. Under the current SSA plan, the level of funding provided in FYs 1994 and 1995 would fund the installation of less than one-third of the total number of workstations planned. The Administration believes that the Senate's concern with out-year plans would be more appropriately addressed in relation to out-year funding.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

The Administration does not support the rescission of the full $1.9 billion proposed by the Senate. Most of the projects proposed for rescission by the Senate were proposed in previous budgets. The Administration continues to support the requested funding levels for these construction and repairs and alterations projects. Rescission of funding for new construction projects may result in higher costs, if long-term needs must be met in leased space. In other cases, where leasing is not an option (i.e., courthouses and border stations), it may not be possible to meet Federal agency needs in the near term. Rescission of funds for modernization projects and other repairs and alterations could lead to the gradual deterioration of government-owned assets.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The Administration believes that the House proposal to eliminate all emergency relief funds is irresponsible, given the recent flooding in California and other requirements likely to arise this year. The Senate proposes to rescind only $50 million of emergency funds. The Administration also objects to the Senate proposal to eliminate $50 million in contract authority for the congestion pricing pilot program. This may restrict the Department's ability to pursue important projects in FY 1996 and FY 1997 currently being developed. While opposing the rescission of Coast Guard Operating Expenses because it undermines the recent supplemental, the Administration notes that the Senate bill cuts a smaller amount. Finally, both the House and Senate versions of the bill include across-the-board reductions in operating costs for transportation programs. These reductions are in addition to the government-wide reductions in the Senate bill. It is unfair for the Department to be hit twice by such reductions. The transportation-specific provisions should be dropped.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

The Senate version of the bill would rescind $104 million from the Base Realignment and Closure accounts. This action would slow local communities' productive reuse of base closure property by limiting funding for environmental restoration. It would also slow funding for construction of facilities at receiving bases, which could delay the move of some military units from closing bases to their new locations. Making property available for economic redevelopment is a key part of the Administration's Five Point Plan for assisting base closure communities. The Administration prefers the House level of funding.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

The Senate version of the bill would rescind $69 million from the NATO Infrastructure account. This action could undermine existing NATO Infrastructure agreements and treaty commitments and frustrate U.S. efforts to increase the burdensharing contributions of our allies. All of the FY 1995 appropriations for NATO Infrastructure have been obligated or committed for specific NATO construction projects, which would have to be terminated—with potential termination penalties—if the rescissions were enacted. Furthermore, such a rescission would set a precedent for other NATO nations to withdraw their support from the NATO Infrastructure budget. The Administration prefers the House level of funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

With regard to P.L. 480 food programs, the Administration strongly supports the Senate action rescinding the $142.5 million that the Administration proposed for rescission. This rescission is preferable to other rescissions in international affairs programs in the bill.

The Administration prefers the Senate position regarding the funding level for foreign operations programs. The Senate's unallocated reduction of $125 million would give the Administration greater flexibility, and would do less damage to foreign policy priorities than the House's targeted rescission totaling $192 million. For international programs under the jurisdiction of the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee, the Administration prefers the overall House position.

The Administration opposes the Senate proposal to rescind $27.7 million for international broadcasting activities. In accordance with the Administration's international broadcasting consolidation plan and the International Broadcasting Act of 1994, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) and USIA's Voice of America are in the process of significant downsizing. To accomplish the reductions and relocation of RFE/RL to Prague from Munich, over $100 million was provided in FY 1995 specifically for the one-time costs of downsizing and the move. The proposed rescission, along with the Senate's failure to provide $7.3 million that is needed to offset exchange rate losses, would seriously hamper implementation of the consolidation plan passed by Congress, which is estimated to save over $400 million by the end of FY 1997. The Administration prefers the House's position.

Both the House and the Senate propose to rescind $14.6 million from the State Department's Contributions to International Peacekeeping Activities, which support peacekeeping activities around the world. This action runs counter to U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. The U.S. strives to lead the international community in promoting peaceful resolution of regional conflicts. This rescission would undermine these efforts, weaken U.S. leadership, and exacerbate the arrearage problem. In FY 1995, the U.S. is in arrears (expected to total over $650 million) on its UN treaty obligations to pay its share of peacekeeping activities. The conferees are urged to restore these funds.

S 617—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1995

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on S. 617, the Second Supplemental and Rescissions Bill, FY 1995, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

While the Senate Committee bill would delete or reduce several of the most objectionable rescissions contained in the House-passed bill, the Administration must strongly oppose many provisions of the Committee bill, and, therefore, finds the bill unacceptable. We believe that it unnecessarily cuts valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged, including the National Service program. The Administration also opposes reductions in programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992—to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's preeminent standing in science and technology, should be cut. The Administration would be particularly troubled if such cuts were made to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers. It is noted that the Senate Committee bill does not include language that would direct that savings generated by the bill be set aside for deficit reduction.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, the Senate-reported bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, WIC, Goals 2000, Head Start, Job Corps, Education for the Disadvantaged, direct student loans, and housing for families. Many of the cuts are short-sighted—reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting funding for safe drinking water and violent crime prevention and anti-drug programs. In its consideration of the bill, we urge the Senate to restore these cuts.

FEMA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee was chosen to include in this controversial bill the urgently needed FEMA supplemental, which is appropriately designed as an emergency for which offsets are not required under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters in 40 states, including victims of the Northridge earthquake. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the Committee-reported bill are contained in the attachment.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National And Community, Service would reduce significantly the President's National Service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as an AmeriCorps member and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the opportunity for thousands of school children to learn about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health. AmeriCorps members also have helped raise the spelling scores and reading levels of rural disadvantaged children, built homes for ''working-poor'' families, and provided disaster relief assistance to victims throughout the western part of the country. The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The Senate is urged to restore full funding for this important program.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million contained in the Committee-reported bill would terminate this program. Without this funding, in FYs 1995 and 1996 the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $70.5 million in grants, technical, assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $39 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The Senate is urged to restore this funding.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The Committee-reported bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $35 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Committee's action would result in 840,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

HEAD START

The Administration objects to the Senate action that would reduce funding for Head Start by $42 million. At the FY 1995 estimated per-child cost of $4,530, $42 million would be sufficient to provide Head Start services to approximately 9,300 children. HHS would make every effort to minimize the number of children and families who could potentially be affected by a mid-year funding reduction. However, at a minimum, the statutorily-mandated effort to serve children under age three would be sharply reduced, with more than 3,000 children not receiving Head Start services. The rescission could also eliminate all new funding for the statutorily-mandated initiative to enhance the transition of Head Start children into the public schools.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Committee-reported bill would reduce the funding for Goals 2000 by $68 million, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The Committee-reported bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $80 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The Administration is also opposed to the $95 million reduction proposed for the direct student loan program.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The Administration is pleased that the Committee has not reduced funding for this program for the summer of 1995. However, the Administration remains concerned that the rescission contained in the Committee-reported bill would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in the summer of 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business.

JOB CORPS

The Administration objects to the Senate Committee action that would rescind $46 million for Job Corps. This action would halt expansion of a youth training program with a track record of improving the employment and earnings of poor youth. The Committee action would eliminate funds to continue work on the eight new Job Corps centers that were launched with previous years' appropriations. Work is underway on these eight centers, which would create 3,200 new training slots for about 4,700 severely disadvantaged youth each year. In addition, the Senate Committee action would eliminate funds to initiate four new Job Corps centers in 1995, which would boost capacity by another 1,600 slots.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the Committee has chosen to rescind nearly $100 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarming increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the Committee's recommendation to rescind $53 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives—$39 million of which is funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF). Of the total amount rescinded, nearly $27 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real first-time drug offenders. Another $11 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth. All grant funding for the Ounce of Prevention Council would be rescinded. Another $13 million (non-VCRTF funding) would come from Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) block grants, which would reduce States' abilities to offer drug abuse treatment.

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The Committee-reported bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to thousands of needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation.

TIMBER SALES

The Administration is opposed to a provision of the Committee-reported bill that would too broadly define ''salvage timber sales'' to include sales of primarily healthy trees, supersede the otherwise applicable environmental and land management statutes, and restrict citizens' access to the courts. The Administration remains steadfastly committed to the Northwest Forest Plan, which establishes a careful balance between sustainable timber harvest and sound ecosystem management.

The Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce last month announced a comprehensive plan to accelerate timber salvage sales. Nevertheless, the Administration is concerned that the current timber salvage program does not meet expectations. In addition to the measures already underway at these agencies to accelerate timber salvage sales, we stand ready to work with the Congress to find appropriate, productive solutions to this pressing national problem that would not result in a return to gridlock.

DAVIS-BACON PROVISION

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would exempt any contract associated with the construction of facilities for the National Museum of the American Indian from the Davis-Bacon Act. The Act requires that all Federally-funded or Federally-assisted construction be covered by the Davis-Bacon Act. An exception in this case would be counter the goals of the Act.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investment will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed by the Committee for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) contained in the Committee-reported bill would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access top state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The proposed $19.5 million rescission of funds for laboratory research at NIST would have a real impact on industry's ability to compete in both emerging and mature markets. NIST laboratories develop and deliver measurement techniques and services that provide a common language needed by industry in all stages of commerce. The rescissions would result in the elimination of new starts in the areas of Advanced Manufacturing, Biotechnology, Semiconductor Metrology, and Information Infrastructure standards development resulting in the diminished competitive posture of U.S. industry.

Reductions are also proposed by the Committee for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. The additional reductions to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The Committee's proposed rescission of $12.5 million for the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest. This rescission would force the Service to consider closing the Great Lakes Science Center in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Also, certain laboratory facilities would be considered for closure, and joint State projects underway in more than 30 States would be reduced.

The Committee has proposed rescinding $42 million of upgrades to the national transonic wind tunnel. These upgrades have been planned for many years and are critical to maintaining the performance of these tunnels. The wind tunnel complex has contributed to the development of almost every U.S-developed military and civil aircraft. Failure to modernize this facility will increase the delay in critical test data. These upgrades are needed now and are unrelated to the development of a new wind tunnel facility.

The Senate is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Committee-reported bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the Committee has proposed to rescind peacekeeping funds.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

While an improvement over the House-passed bill, the rescission of $0.8 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements contained in the Committee-reported bill would still seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (SSA) AUTOMATION INVESTMENT

The Committee bill reduces funding for SSA computer systems by $88 million, thus eliminating all second-year funding for SSA's multi-year automation investment. This reduction would lead to deterioration in service by not allowing for the purchase of new computer equipment as existing equipment wears out and customer demands increase. The funds proposed for rescission are already programmed to support contract awards for quantities of computers supported by the Committee and the General Accounting Office.

The Administration notes the Committee's concern about the total number of computers SSA plans to acquire over a five-year period. Under the current SSA plan, the level of funding provided in FYs 1994 and 1995 funds the installation of less than one-third of the total number of workstations planned. The Administration believes that the Committee's concern with out-year plans would be more appropriately addressed in relation to out-year funding.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes the Committee's action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

The Committee bill would rescind $140 million from the Base Realignment and Closure accounts. This action would slow local communities' productive reuse of base closure property by delaying the departure of military units and by limiting funding for environmental restoration. Making property available for economic redevelopment is a key part of the Administration's Five Point Plan for assisting base closure communities.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee bill would rescind $69 million from the NATO Infrastructure account. This action could undermine existing NATO Infrastructure agreements and treaty commitments and frustrate our efforts to increase the burdensharing contributions of our allies. All of the FY 1995 appropriations for NATO Infrastructure have been obligated or committed for specific NATO construction projects, which would have to be terminated—with potential termination penalties—if the rescission were enacted. Furthermore, such a rescission would set a precedent for other NATO nations to withdraw their support form the NATO Infrastructure budget.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on H.R. 1158, the supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill, as passed by the House. As the Senate develops its version of the bill, your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The Administration strongly opposes the House-passed bill. We believe that it unnecessarily cuts valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged, including the National Service program. The Administration also opposes reductions in programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology. Further, we strongly oppose a provision in the bill that would prohibit implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacements. Based on all of these considerations, if the President were presented a bill containing these provisions, he would veto the bill.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT EMERGENCY DESIGNATION

As the President stated in his February 14, 1995, letter to the Speaker, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from the statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting unanticipated emergency requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992—to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $191 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's preeminent standing in science and technology, should be cut. The Administration would be particularly troubled if such cuts were made to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers. In light of the House Budget Committee action last week, it is clear that savings generated by the House version of H.R. 1158 are intended to be used for a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY

1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, the House-passed bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, WIC, and housing for families. Many of the cuts are shortsighted—reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting funding for safe drinking water and violent crime prevention and anti-drug programs. In its consideration of the bill, we urge the Senate to restore these cuts.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The proposed $416 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would virtually terminate the President's National Service program. Remaining funds would provide only 4,000 of the proposed 33,000 opportunities for young adults to serve their communities as AmeriCorps members and earn an education award. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for thousands of school children to learn responsibility to their community for the first time. In addition, over 1,000 young persons currently serving in communities hard hit by defense downsizing would be sent home immediately, and their camps—established on downsized military bases—would be closed.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health. AmeriCorps members also have helped raise the spelling scores and reading levels of rural disadvantaged children, built homes for ''working-poor'' families, and provide disaster relief assistance to victims throughout the western part of the country. The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The Senate is urged to restore full funding for this important program.

STRIKER REPLACEMENT

The Administration opposes a provision in the House-passed bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs. The use or the threat to use permanent replacement workers destroys opportunities for cooperative and stable labor-management relations.

TIMBER SALVAGE SALES

The Administration objects to a provision that would mandate a minimum level of timber salvage sales from Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands. The Department of Justice has advised that enactment of this amendment would likely result in renewed judicial review of the President's Forest Plan and could reduce timber, grazing, and mining activities in the West. The Administration is already taking steps to restore and sustain significant levels of timber harvest in the immediate future. In addition, the Administration will shortly announce changes in the consultation process designed to expedite review of timber salvage sales as well as other actions to increase timber harvest, in full compliance with environmental laws.

FEMA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

The Administration is disappointed that the House has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in this controversial bill. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the House-passed bill are contained in the enclosure. We look forward to working with the Senate to address our mutual concerns.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS—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 (AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE)

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the House has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The rescission contained in the House-passed bill would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The House-passed bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The House's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The House-passed bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The House-passed bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $140 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The House-passed bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology programs ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the House has chosen to rescind nearly $472 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the House's recommendation to rescind $65 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. Another $37 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed by the House for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) contained in the House-passed bill would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission included in the House-passed bill for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and State and local governments. An additional rescission of $34 million is contained in the Senate version of H.R. 889. These two rescissions would eliminate all funding for this program. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants. The Senate is urged to rescind funds from lower-priority projects as set forth in the President's budget.

Reductions are also proposed by the House for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

Coming this late in the fiscal year, the House's proposed rescission of $16.8 million for the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior (10 percent of the operating budget) will force the Service to consider closing one or more of the four major Centers located in Lafayette, Louisiana; Seattle, Washington; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Anchorage, Alaska; as well as several other laboratories. This would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest, and would eliminate joint State projects underway in more than 30 States.

The Senate is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The House-passed bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The bill could also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly.

In addition, the House's rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million contained in the House-passed bill would terminate this program. Without this funding, in FYs 1995 and 1996 the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $70.5 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $39 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The Senate is urged to restore this funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The House-passed bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the House has proposed to rescind peacekeeping funds.

The House-passed bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, an act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the Congress to provide for Jordan debt forgiveness in H.R. 889 as it passed the Senate in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

HIGHWAYS—EMERGENCY RELIEF

The House-passed bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department of Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters. Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the Senate to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements contained in the House-passed bill would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes the House action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the House's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (OSHA)

The House-passed bill would rescind $19.6 million from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. This is a 6.3 percent reduction in OSHA funding and effectively a 12.6 percent reduction since it comes so late in the fiscal year. The rescission would have a dramatic impact on OSHA's ability to fulfill its mission to protect workers and on the Administration's efforts to make the agency more effective. This rescission would hinder OSHA's compliance assistance programs and education and training initiatives, as well as enforcement, resulting in an estimated 6,300 additional preventable injuries.

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

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill as reported by the House Appropriations Committee.

The Administration strongly opposes this bill in its present form. We believe that it unnecessarily cuts valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged. The Administration also opposes cuts for programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology. We also strongly oppose a provision in the bill that would upset the balance contained in current law concerning Federal funding of abortions for the victims of rape and incest and a provision that would prohibit implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacements. Based on all of these considerations, if the President were presented a bill containing these provisions, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget would recommend that he veto the bill.

As the President said in his February 14, 1995, letter, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting emergency, unanticipated requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investment in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992, to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's standing in areas of science and technology, should be cut. It would be particularly unwise to make such cuts to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, this bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, and WIC. Many of the cuts are shortsighted, reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting safe drinking water funding and violent crime prevention programs.

The Administration is opposed to an amendment that was added by the Committee that would allow states to decide to stop using public funds to pay for abortions in cases of rape and incest. The President believes that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. The Administration is committed to ensuring that women who are victims of rape and incest have the right to choose abortion as an option. A woman should not be precluded from choosing this option if she is poor.

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs.

The Administration objects to an amendment that was added by the Committee that would mandate a minimum level of timber salvage sales from Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands. The Department of Justice has advised that enactment of this amendment would likely result in renewed judicial review of the President's Forest Plan and could reduce timber, grazing, and mining activities in the West. The Administration is already taking steps to restore and sustain significant levels of timber harvest in the immediate future. In addition, the Administration will shortly announce changes in the consultation process designed to expedite review of timber salvage sales as well as other actions to increase timber harvest, in full compliance with environmental laws.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in this controversial bill. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the Committee-reported bill are contained in the attachment.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE FULL COMMITTEE

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business. The House is urged to restore funding for this important initiative.

NATIONAL SERVICE

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would reduce significantly the President's National Service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as an AmeriCorps member and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the opportunity for thousands of school children to learn about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health.

The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The House is urged to restore funding for this important program.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Committee's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $105 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology program ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed in this bill for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission proposed for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and state and local governments. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants.

Reductions are also proposed for the Department of Energy's (DOE) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The proposed rescission of $16.8 million, or 10 percent of the operating budget of the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior, this late in the fiscal year, will force the Service to consider closing one or more of the four major Centers located in Lafayette, Louisiana; Seattle, Washington; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Anchorage, Alaska; as well as several other laboratories. This would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest, and would eliminate joint State projects underway in more than 30 States.

The House is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the Committee has chosen to rescind nearly $482 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the Committee's recommendation to rescind $65 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from

the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. Another $37 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

As currently drafted, this bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The bill would also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. The House is urged to restore funding to these vital areas.

In addition, the rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million would terminate this program. Without this funding, the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $50 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $20 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The House is urged to restore this funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the Committee has rescinded peacekeeping funds.

This bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, an act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the House to provide the requested funds for Jordan debt forgiveness in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

HIGHWAYS—EMERGENCY RELIEF

This bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department of Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters.

Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the House to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the Committee's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location.

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

H.R. 1159—MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995 AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the two supplemental appropriations and rescissions bills, H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee.

The Administration strongly opposes both of these bills in their present form. We believe that they unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged. The Administration also opposes cuts for programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology. We also strongly oppose a provision in the bill which would upset the balance contained in current law concerning Federal funding of abortions for the victims of rape and incest and a provision that would prohibit implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacements. Based on all of these considerations, if the President were presented a bill containing the provisions of these two bills, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget would recommend that he veto the bill.

As the President said in his February 14, 1995, letter, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from the statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting emergency, unanticipated requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992, to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's standing in areas of science and technology, should be cut. It would be particularly unwise to make such cuts to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low priority programs. In contrast, the two House bills, H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159, would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, and WIC. Many of the cuts are shortsighted, reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting safe drinking water funding and violent crime prevention programs.

The Administration is opposed to an amendment that was added by the Committee to H.R. 1159 that would allow states to decide to stop using public funds to pay for abortions in cases of rape and incest. The President believes that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. The Administration is committed to ensuring that women who are victims of rape and incest have the right to choose abortion as an option. A woman should not be precluded from choosing this option if she is poor.

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue,

implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs.

The Administration objects to an amendment that was added by the Committee that would mandate a minimum level of timber salvage sales from Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands. The Department of Justice has advised that enactment of this amendment would likely result in renewed judicial review of the President's Forest Plan and could reduce timber, grazing, and mining activities in the West. The Administration is already taking steps to restore and sustain significant levels of timber harvest in the immediate future. In addition, the Administration will shortly announce changes in the consultation process in order to expedite review of timber salvage sales as well as other actions to increase timber harvest, in full compliance with environmental laws.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in a controversial bill such as H.R. 1158. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the Committee-reported bill are contained in the attachment.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS H.R. 1158—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL/RESCISSION BILL

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers.

The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business. The House is urged to restore funding for this important initiative.

NATIONAL SERVICE

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would reduce significantly the President's National Service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as an AmeriCorps member and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the opportunity for thousands of school children to learn about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health.

The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The House is urged to restore funding for this important program.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Committee's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $105 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology programs ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed in this bill for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission proposed for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and state and local governments. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants.

Reductions are also proposed for the Department of Energy's (DOE) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The proposed rescission of $16.8 million, or 10 percent of the operating budget of the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior, this late in the fiscal year, will force the Service to consider closing one or more of the four major Centers located in Lafayette, Louisiana; Seattle, Washington; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Anchorage, Alaska; as well as several other laboratories. This would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest, and would eliminate joint State projects underway in more than 30 States.

The House is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the Committee has chosen to rescind nearly $482 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the Committee's recommendation to rescind $65 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. Another $37 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

As currently drafted, this bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The bill would also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. The House is urged to restore funding to these vital areas.

In addition, the rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of

Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million would terminate this program. Without this funding, the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $50 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $20 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The House is urged to restore this funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the Committee has in H.R. 1159 rescinded peacekeeping funds.

HIGHWAYS—EMERGENCY RELIEF

This bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department of Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters. Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the House to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the Committee's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location.

H.R. 1159—NON-EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL/RESCISSION BILL

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

This bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, an act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the House to provide the requested funds for Jordan debt forgiveness in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, Mar. 1, 1995.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on the two supplemental appropriations and rescission bills that are being considered by the House Appropriations Committee. The Administration strongly opposes these bills in their present form. We believe that they unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that aid the disadvantaged in our society and programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology.

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. While placing a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992, to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's standing in areas of science and technology should be cut. It would be particularly unwise to make such cuts to finance a tax cut for higher income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, the draft House bills would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, and WIC. Many of the cuts are shortsighted, reducing funding for education and for advanced technology programs which are critical to our Nation's future. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting Ryan White and safe drinking water funding. Examples of the Administration's concerns on specific items are discussed in more detail in the enclosure.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in this controversial bill. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut. We strongly urge the Committee to consider funding for this emergency program in a separate bill.

The Administration believes that the emergency spending provided by the pending legislation is not required to be offset. The Budget Enforcement Act emergency authority was established specifically to provide for the funding of such unanticipated requirements.

As the President said in his February 14, 1995, letter, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from the statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting emergency, unanticipated requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

We would encourage the Committee to review its recommendations and adopt a rescission package that is more consistent with the one submitted by the President in his FY 1996 Budget. We look forward to working with the Committee to address our mutual concerns.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

Enclosure.

EXAMPLES OF CONCERNS

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MAKING RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL/RESCISSION BILL

FEMA Disaster Relief

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the historical average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

Housing Assistance

As currently drafted, this bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would eliminate subsidized housing assistance to 63,000 needy, low-income households, and would prevent 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. The Committee is urged to restore funding to these vital areas.

In addition, the rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardizes the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and without the FY 1995 funding are in danger of being closed.

Summer Jobs

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant productive workforce for U.S. business. The Committee is urged to restore funding for this important initiative.

National Service

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would reduce significantly the President's national service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities through AmeriCorps and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for thousands of school children learning about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps has already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health.

The Administration strongly believes that national and community service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The Committee is urged to restore funding for this important program.

Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

The bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Subcommittee's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

Education Programs

The bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly reduce support to States and communities to raise academic standards and improve their local schools. The bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $105 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology programs ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

Science and Technology

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed in this bill for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission proposed for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and state and local governments. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants.

Reductions are also proposed for the Department of Energy's (DOE) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to fully implement the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The Committee is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

Violent Crime and Drug Abuse Control

The Administration opposes the decision to rescind $67 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. All funding for the Ounce of Prevention Council would be rescinded. Over $36 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

The Administration is concerned that the Subcommittees have chosen to rescind nearly $482 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulate by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

Highways

This bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters. Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the Committee to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration to projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

Drinking Water State Revolving Funds

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need most $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the crytosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee that killed 100 people and caused illness and another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize this program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

Coast Guard

The Administration opposes action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

Non-Emergency Supplemental/Rescission Bill

Striker Replacements

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacement for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply for quality goods and services for the government's programs. We urge the Committee to strike this provision.

International Programs

Neither of the bills under consideration appropriates the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests.

The non-emergency supplemental/rescission bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, and act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the

Committee to provide the requested funds for Jordan debt forgiveness in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS)

The Administration objects to the $10 million in unrequested supplemental appropriations for salaries and expenses for the former Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), now part of the Department of Agricultural's Consolidated Farm Service Agency (AFSA). The additional funds are not needed, particularly since FY 1995 appropriations for the ASCS were already $13 million greater than requested by the Administration. At a time when Federal employees are being reduced government-wide, it is inappropriate to provide additional funds to more county office personnel managed by a Federal agency. The presence of surplus funds in CFSA would not facilitate a timely transition to the streamlined CFSA organization of the future.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day, finally a balanced budget. I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER],

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Americans who are concerned about the proposed veto threat by their President.

Mr. Speaker, last summer fire storms roared through Northern California, threatening to destroy entire communities. Last spring this same area was ravaged by devastating floods which left thousands homeless. During these calamities families and communities cried out to the President for help.

Today we will give the President the means to help these people, but he is turning his back on them. We offer relief to thousands of flood victims, but the President is turning his back. We offer a timber salvage plan to protect forest communities from incinerating fires, but the President is again turning his back.

Mr. Speaker, the President is turning his back, but we are not. Today we will show these Americans who has the real compassion. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to bring Members' attention to language in this bill that I believe represents the opening salvo in the fight to win freedom for our States and our constituents from entrenched EPA bureaucrats and the regulatory tyranny imposed by the Clean Air Act.

There are Members of both bodies that better wake up and recognize that there's rebellion in the streets over the heavy handed, misguided, EPA directed inspection and maintenance program.

I fought hard to get strong language in this bill that would force EPA to correct their flawed program and bring immediate relief to States. The best we could get was language sending an explicit warning to EPA that if they fail to demonstrate clear flexibility in allowing States to design programs that fit their particular air situations, that we would come back and put that strong language on the next available vehicle.

Those of us who understand the arrogance and intransigence EPA has exhibited in dealing with the concerns of States will be watching EPA's actions very closely looking for the first misstep. I submit to my colleagues that EPA cannot be trusted to make the reasonable changes necessary.

Because the EPA has refused to be flexible to date, 15 States will be subject to sanctions in the next 3 months. Their I&M programs have either been delayed or suspended or the State has refused to comply with the requirement altogether. Some States have grass roots efforts pushing for total repeal.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, this is just round one. If EPA has any sense at all, they will take a good look at the language in this bill and think long and hard before they reject a State plan, like the one Texas has proposed, that addresses the unique air problems of that State.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rescission bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGTON] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to first answer the charge that has been made that this President is not concerned about victims of natural disasters.

In my view this President and this Federal Emergency Administration has done more faster to help people who are in need in natural disasters than any administration I can remember. We will get a piece of legislation to his desk that will handle those problems.

But I rise today to make one fundamental point. Shame on those who vote for tax cuts for the wealthy and budget cuts for children from struggling families. Make no mistake about it, that is what this bill does. It cuts food and nutrition for pregnant women and babies, a program that saves nearly 4 times what it costs.

It eliminates the summer jobs program, which has enabled so many young people to lift themselves out of poverty and off of welfare.

It even cuts medical equipment that is desperately needed to care for our veterans. And heat for the low-income elderly, a program that literally saves people from freezing to death.

These cuts would be reckless and unfair no matter what purpose they served. But to make these deep and dangerous cuts to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest people in the country, to give a $20,000-a-year windfall to the people who do not need it, those earning more than $350,000 a year, is simply unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was originally passed in the House, we at least had a guarantee because we had voted for the guarantee that not a dime of these cuts would be used for tax breaks for the privileged few. Now that guarantee has been stripped out of this bill. The money saved by these cuts goes right from the hardworking middle class to the wealthiest people in the country, the most outrageous redistribution of income since the days of the robber barons. That is why we have to vote against this bill in the name of the deficit but also in the name of common decency.

I urge Members of defeat this wrongheaded rescission bill. We do not need more tax perks for the privileged at a devastating cost to the people of this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, a few housekeeping matters. There is no rescission in this conference agreement for any VA construction projects or equipment purchases. There are no tax cuts in this bill. And for the benefit of anyone in the White House, this committee has no jurisdiction over tax cuts.

This bill does not pay for tax cuts. What it does do is provide billions of dollars for many deserving Americans who need help to rebuild their lives after the Oklahoma City tragedy, after the California earthquake and floods, after the Texas and Louisiana floods and all those other disasters across the land.

□ 1830

This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides $250 million for Oklahoma City, just as the President asked. It provides $275 million for the Jordan debt relief that he asked for. It provides $6.7 billion for FEMA emergency assistance that he asked for.

Unfortunately, it struck the striker-replacement language that I favored, but he asked us to strike it; and in

order to get a compromise with the other body it was struck.

It includes emergency salvage timber sales language that will allow tens of thousands of people in the Northwest to go back to work, and the bill also cuts the deficit by $16.4 billion, the largest single rescission of existing appropriations in the history of the Nation. It gives us a net savings to the American taxpayer in fiscal year 1995 of $9.1 billion, the largest savings to the American taxpayer in the history of the country.

What this bill says to the American people is that we can meet our emergencies, that we can pay for them, and that we can move toward a balanced budget for the first time since 1969. We can protect the future of our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good deal. A good deal for present and current Americans and their children and their grandchildren, and a no vote against this bill would be irresponsible and a veto by the President of the United States would be irresponsible.

I urge the Members of this body to adopt this conference report.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, earlier the majority in this body passed their budget resolution to effectively restructure future Federal tax and spending policies to benefit the most well-to-do individuals and largest corporations in the United States at the expense of hardworking Americans and their families. We now have before us a piece of legislation which reaches back into last year's appropriations and cruelly snatches away already allocated Federal funding for numerous initiatives vital to our local communities and constituents. Like the Energizer Bunny, the ''Contract on America'' just keeps going and going and going.

The GOP leadership likes to give lip service to the issue of empowerment, to helping people help themselves. However, this rescissions package flies in the face of such a philosophy. What the Republicans are really saying with this conference report, with the budget resolution which just passed, is ''We just don't care.''

However, residents of the Seventh Congressional District in Illinois, my constituents, care deeply about the reckless nature of the GOP budget axe and its disastrous impact on them, their families, and their communities.

Of great concern is the status of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which helps 2 million struggling senior citizens meet the high costs of their winter heating bills without having to make a choice between those bills and their daily meals and medicine. Yet the GOP indiscriminately guts LIHEAP by 25 percent. As a result, tens of thousands of Chicago households that were served in fiscal year 1995 will be threatened, not to mention those who have been on waiting lists.

Mr. Chairman, in a city such as mine, where on an average winter day the temperature hovers around 10 degrees, with the wind chill in the negative double digits, you tell me this is a sound policy decision. Tell the family of 60-year-old Earline Hooker, who froze to death in January in Chicago because she wasn't able to get LIHEAP assistance, that this program is wasteful or unnecessary. I challenge you.

In keeping with the GOP assault on our children and our future as a nation, this bill steals all hope and opportunity away from 600,000 of our disadvantaged youngsters through the eradication of the summer jobs program in 1996—a proven program that provides basic skills, income, and work experience. Across the Chicago metropolitan area next summer, kids who had looked forward to being entrusted with responsibility and leadership will now be faced with hanging on the streetcorner with nothing to do but get into trouble. So much for promoting positive alternatives for our youth. But again, the Republican leadership just doesn't care.

The GOP also doesn't care that this legislation punishes low-income babies and their moms with a $20 million cut from the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program, an $85 million cut in the lead-based paint abatement program. They're poor, who cares?

Yet one of the most disturbing portions of this bill is its complete lack of regard for the plight of public housing residents in this Nation and the neighborhoods in which they live and work. Although the Department of Housing and Urban Development has already begun a serious effort to restructure and make Federal housing and development programs more efficient and responsive to local needs, the Republicans don't want to hear it. They just want to slash, cut, and burn without regard to the necessity or productivity of the program or who gets hurt.

HUD has estimated that the $6.3 billion in housing cuts in this bill will result in the elimination of thousands of low-income housing units in my city of Chicago. Assistance will be lost for public housing modernization and operating subsidies, seriously disrupting already weakened maintenance and security for residents. In addition, needed funds to help the homeless and individuals with AIDS find suitable shelter is out the window. Explain to me how in the world this helps meet the goal of ''a kinder, gentler nation,'' for which former President Bush and his Republican friends reportedly advocated. I don't think so.

With respect to the issue of disaster relief for the California earthquakes and the tragedy in Oklahoma, no one in Congress wishes to hold up that aid and charges that opposition to this conference report will do that are unfounded. The Republican majority knows full well that they could craft a bill today for these important purposes, pass it, and send it to the President's desk for signature without delay.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Republican rescissions conference report and put a quick halt to the GOP's careless, reckless beginning to this second 100 days. Take a stand—the President has.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 1158.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the House, I voted for a balanced budget amendment knowing full well that such a measure would require tough choices. While some contend that we don't need such an amendment, personally I felt that our Nation's future depended on it.

Our national debt is staggering, our annual deficit continues to grow, and our actions today on this conference report mark the first real step to protect future generations. We are here for our children and grandchildren, pure and simple. If we act today we give them a greater measure of security. Most important, this first tough vote may give them a chance to have the opportunities we enjoy: a great education, the prospect of a real job and an opportunity for a better future. Our vote today is a downpayment on a balanced budget.

Let's be clear this package is a $16.4 billion reduction out of a total of a $1.5 trillion budget. It is less than a 1 percent reduction.

The bottom line is that we need to start the process. What better steps than to consolidate a horde of programs, some highly duplicative, some unauthorized by Congress itself, some with unjustified increases, and others paralyzed in the money pipeline with little likelihood of being spent.

I am astonished that President Clinton is considering using his first veto on this bill that would reduce Federal spending by $16.4 billion and provide emergency funding for the California floods and the Oklahoma City bombing recovery effort.

The President and the Democrats have made their position clear—which is that they intend to sit on the sidelines while the Republicans balance the Federal budget. As I said early, this reduction represents less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, and yet the President thinks that is too much. It is ironic and saddening that the very day the House will vote on the first real balanced budget plan in 25 years, the President would rather keep spending money we don't have and stick our children and grandchildren with the tab. This is living proof that Washington will not stop spending without a balanced budget amendment.

With this bill we are making it clear that we will set priorities, we will limit the size of government, and we will do what we said we would—reduce the deficit, balance the budget, and restore the future to our children.

I urge the passage of this important conference report.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 189, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No 346]

YEAS—235

Allard	Bonilla	Coble
Archer	Bono	Coburn
Armey	Brownback	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Bryant (TN)	Combest
Baker (CA)	Bunn	Condit
Baker (LA)	Bunning	Cooley
Ballenger	Burr	Cox
Barr	Burton	Crane
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Crapo
Bartlett	Callahan	Cremeans
Barton	Calvert	Cubin
Bass	Camp	Cunningham
Bateman	Canady	Davis
Bereuter	Castle	Deal
Bilbray	Chabot	DeLay
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Diaz-Balart
Bliley	Chenoweth	Dickey
Blute	Christensen	Dooley
Boehlert	Chrysler	Doolittle
Boehner	Clinger	Dornan

Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
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
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
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
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Berman
Jacobs
King
Kleczka
McNulty
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Quillen
Stenholm
Tucker
Weldon (FL)

□ 1852

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Weldon of Florida for, with Mr. McNulty against.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL WEAPONS AND THEIR MEANS OF DELIVERY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 104–76)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. WALKER] laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 14, 1994, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and their means of delivery (''weapons of mass destruction''), I issued Executive Order No. 12938 and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*).

As I described in the report transmitting Executive Order No. 12938, the new Executive order consolidated the functions of and revoked Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990, which declared a national emergency with respect to the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, and Executive Order No. 12930 of September 29, 1994, which declared a national emergency with respect to nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and their means of delivery. The new Executive order also expanded certain existing authorities in order to strengthen the U.S. ability to respond to proliferation problems.

The following report is made pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to the emergency declaration. Additional information on nuclear, missile, and/or chemical and biological weapons (CBW) nonproliferation efforts is contained in the annual report on the proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, provided to the Congress pursuant to section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190), also known as the ''Nonproliferation Report,'' and the annual report provided to the Congress pursuant to section 308 of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–182).

The three export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative (EPCI) are fully in force and continue to be used to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

In the 6 months since I issued Executive Order No. 12938, the number of countries that have ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) has reached 27 (out of 159 signatory countries). I am urging the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification as soon as possible. The CWC is a critical element of U.S. nonproliferation policy that will significantly enhance our security and that of our friends and allies. I believe that U.S. ratification will help to encourage the ratification process in other countries and, ultimately, the CWC's entry into force.

The United States actively participates in the CWC Preparatory Commission in The Hague, the deliberative body drafting administrative and implementing procedures for the CWC. Last month, this body accepted the U.S. offer of an information management system for the future Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons that will implement the CWC. The United States also is playing a leading role in developing a training program for international inspectors.

The United States strongly supports international efforts to strengthen the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC). In January 1995, the Ad Hoc Group mandated by the September 1994 BWC Special Conference to draft a legally binding instrument to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the implementation of the BWC held its first meeting. The Group agreed on a program of work and schedule of substantive meetings, the first of which will occur in July 1995. The United States is pressing for completion of the Ad Hoc Group's work and consideration of the legally binding instrument by