

immediate consideration.
The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 92

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 889 modified as follows: on page 16, after line 12, insert a new title V consisting of the text of the bill (H.R. 845) rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI or clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No other amendment shall be in order except the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, which may be offered only by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. Points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas, TX [Mr. FORST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

order to foster fiscal responsibility the Committee on Rules has reported a fair and balanced rule for this emergency defense supplemental.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of an amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 889, which makes emergency supplementary appropriations for military readiness, and rescinds \$1.46 billion in defense spending, amended to add the text of H.R. 845, a bill rescinding \$1.4 billion in budget authority for a range of low-priority foreign aid and domestic spending programs.

In order to permit the House to consider the texts of two bills together, this rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI pertaining to germaneness and clause 6 of rule XXI regarding reappropriations.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate and an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which may be offered by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee. That amendment shall not be subject to amendment. Finally, the minority is provided with one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Due to the unforeseen nature of emergency appropriations, the rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI against the bill and the amendment consisting of the text of H.R. 889 and H.R. 845. The rule prohibits unauthorized appropriations.

In the name of fairness, the amendment in the nature of a substitute provided to the rule by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations will receive the same rule waiver.

Mr. Speaker, changing the culture of deficit spending is not easy. The American people need only look to the other body to observe the daily antics of reactionaries fighting to stop bipartisan proposals such as the balanced budget amendment and an effective line-item veto.

In the past, Congress simply added emergency spending to the deficit. Even with a Federal budget of \$1.5 trillion, there was always an excuse why offsetting spending cuts could not be found.

Mr. Speaker, things have changed. Our new leadership in the House has committed itself to finding offsets for all supplemental spending bills. The deficit buck stops here. Make no mistake, this defense supplemental addresses a true emergency. As the Pre-amble to the Constitution so clearly

na, Iraq, Rwanda, and the Korean Peninsula have created an emergency. The Secretary of Defense and our leader military commanders have indicated that without these supplemental funds being provided by March 31, readiness and training will be cut back to dangerous levels.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat this. The Secretary of Defense and our leading military commanders have indicated that if these supplemental funds are not available by March 31, readiness and training will be back to dangerous levels.

This rule provides a procedure to consider this emergency defense supplemental in a manner that is fiscally responsible. The Committee on Appropriations met the challenge of reporting rescissions to fully offset all the new spending, a challenge that the President has, unfortunately, not met.

In addition, the minority is given both a substitute amendment and a motion to recommit with instruction to offer alternatives.

To those who believe that far more can be done in the area of rescissions, I totally agree. That day is coming. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations testified before our Committee on Rules that a major rescissions bill will be coming to the floor soon, possibly in March. That rescission, because it is not related to a national security emergency, will be considered under a much more open amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair, balanced, and responsible rule. It provides the minority with two opportunities to provide alternative proposals. It provides the same substantive waivers to the amendment as are provided to the bill. All new spending, even though we have an emergency, is offset.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this rule increases the likelihood we can maintain military readiness by enacting the necessary legislation by March 31.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this fair, balanced, and very responsible rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, since the end of the cold war, the United States has called upon the men and women of our armed services to perform duties ranging from humanitarian assistance, to peacekeeping, to engaging in an all out war. And these duties have been performed ably and with honor in an era of decreased funding for the entire Federal budget.

to provide these funds, and we are fulfilling our responsibility by acting on that request. There is no other acceptable course of action.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to House Resolution 92 which provides for the consideration of H.R. 889, the Department of Defense emergency supplemental, as well as for the consideration of H.R. 845 which rescinds \$1.4 billion in domestic discretionary budget authority. I want to be very clear that I support the provision of supplemental appropriations to the Defense Department in order that we, as a nation, do not find our strategic and defensive posture compromised.

But, Mr. Speaker, just a few short weeks ago I joined with over two-thirds of my colleagues in this body in supporting a constitutional amendment to balance the budget of the United States. That amendment did not exempt defense spending from its requirements, yet I cannot help but think that this supplemental—whether designated as an emergency or not—is not paid for and only adds to the deficit which we are so committed to erasing.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended, in addition to the DOD supplemental, a bill which rescinds \$1.4 billion in discretionary domestic spending which purports to cover the expenditures provided in the supplemental. However, there are many on this side of the aisle who wonder if these cuts are nothing more than a fig leaf. There seems to be some question whether our colleagues in the Senate will use domestic cuts to pay for defense increases. But, whether the Senate enacts these domestic rescissions or not, this bill still creates an outlay shortfall—nearly \$300 million in this fiscal year and \$645 million over the next 5 fiscal years. Mr. Speaker, where I come from those numbers can only mean one thing: We are adding to, not subtracting from, the deficit.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule in order that the Committee on Rules might reconsider how we might deal with the critical necessity of meeting these urgent requirements of the branches of our Armed Forces while not adding to the national debt.

As this rule is constructed, there is really only one opportunity for Members to vote to not increase the deficit while at the same time assuring that DOD readiness is not impaired—by fully compensating the Defense Department for its contingency expenses. The Rules Committee has allowed for the consideration of only one amendment, a substitute by the gentleman from

Mr. Speaker, I must ask why is only the Obey substitute made in order? Why is it necessary to consider this supplemental under such a restrictive rule? When the House considered the most recent supplemental—the 1994 California earthquake emergency supplemental—the Committee on Rules provided for the consideration of six amendments, not just one amendment, the Obey amendment in this case. Chairman SOLOMON then protested that the rule was too restrictive. He said, and I quote: “Even when you move a bill with all deliberate speed, you must still deliberate—that is, carefully weigh and debate the merits of the legislation and consider amendments to improve on it.” I would recommend to my colleagues that the chairman’s words are every bit as relevant today as they were 1 year ago.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, when the House considered a supplemental appropriation in May 1993, under an open rule, my colleagues on the other side protested that the rule was not open enough. I would quote Mr. GOSS who said, “True this is an open rule, but because of the rules of the House, there are several important amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee that will not be allowed to be considered, even under this open rule.” Mr. Speaker, the Democrats on the Rules Committee have not even asked for an open rule in the case of House Resolution 92. What we have asked for is an opportunity for the House to consider amendments which might allow the House to fulfill its commitment to deficit reduction, not for a closed rule as has been reported out by the committee.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would renew my appeal that this rule be defeated in order that the Committee on Rules might have an opportunity to quickly reconsider a rule for this supplemental. Time is of the essence, but so is our commitment to the defense of this Nation and to deficit reduction.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, to simply respond to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, by making it very clear that there is an important distinction between this year and last. That is, we have offsets, so that must be underscored time and time again.

We are not going into deficit spending here, we are having offsets, which this Committee on Appropriations, under the leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], has adequately recognized.

rection.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I come at this from the same position I have always taken. When I went down to see President Clinton right after he was elected, I said “Mr. President, we have been cutting the defense budget substantially over the last 6 or 7 years, and we have been trying to do it in a way where we did not end up with a hollow force. We did not want the disaster we had after World War II, after Korea, and after Vietnam.

I said to him that the only way that I can support this reduced budget, which he was proposing, was if he sent a supplemental appropriation for extraneous operations. As many of the Members know, I opposed the Somalia incursion, and yet last year, in a bipartisan effort, we funded that program substantially without offsets.

The Haiti invasion I personally supported. Most of the members of the subcommittee did not support it. However, we felt very strongly that the Congress passed legislation which supported Haiti, and this helps to refund money that the military has already spent. There is no way that we can continue the type of readiness we need to deploy troops quickly if we offset this money.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are two plans. One is to offset if from the rescissions, and one is to offset if from the Defense Department. I do not like either, but my proposal is that we move this supplemental forward. I am in favor of a restrictive rule. I feel very strongly about it, that we have to move this forward so that in the end we will be able to work this thing out.

In working with the new chairman, the gentleman from Florida, BILL YOUNG, and the gentleman from Louisiana, BOB LIVINGSTON, the chairman, there has been no proposal that I have made that they have not listened to and tried to find a way to work out.

I understand the pressure. I did not vote for the balanced budget amendment. Two-thirds of the House did, so I understand why there is a feeling that it is necessary, but I support the administration’s position that this money should not be offset.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, if we were to offset all the money for these kinds of operations, it destroys the very thing we have done over the last few years, and that is to try to very delicately reduce the size of the force and make money available when there is an extraneous operation.

Many of the Members on the subcommittee feel exactly the same way, many of the Members of the floor feel

about, because I do not think the offsets can be found from the Defense Department without hurting the very viability and readiness of the Defense Department.

I feel strongly that there should be a restricted rule, that we should move forward with this legislation. All the Commanders in Chief of the various regions have said to us they have to have this legislation by the end of March. It is absolutely essential we get it through the House, that we get it over to the Senate, let the Senate act on it, and then we will work our will in conference.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that I understand what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is trying to do. I feel very strongly, I am against that just as much as I am against the rescissions, so my feeling is very clear. My position is very clear. I am against any offsets. I think this bill should not be offset. I do not think we ought to take it out of the hide of the military.

On the other hand, I think we ought to move this legislation forward. I think this is the only way to get the legislation through in any method so we can start addressing it in the Senate.

□ 1215

I support what the Committee on Rules has done. I think this is the only kind of a rule that will expedite the matter and we should pass the legislation as quickly as we can and get to conference where we can work out the details.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today we are being force-fed another closed rule that will prevent Members from trying to repair two badly flawed bills.

That is right, I said bills. This rule makes one bill out of two Republicans say that is because the two bills are closely linked, one is designed to pay for the other.

But according to the Washington Post that will not happen. The Post reported that Senate Appropriations chairman HATFIELD said the Senate will not consider domestic cuts to pay for military spending.

Since it takes both Houses to rescind appropriations it looks like Republicans do not have a way to pay for this increased military spending. Because if

this bill still adds \$202 million to the deficit this year and \$645 million over 5 years.

And today's emergency supplemental directly contradicts the position Republicans took on the National Defense Revitalization Act.

Republicans who voted for H.R. 7 said in effect that they wanted to put the House on a path to restore the firewalls between defense and domestic spending.

But soon after voting to restore the firewalls with H.R. 7, Republican Members are voting to ignore them with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in knowing whether my Republican colleagues want the firewalls or not.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and give Members a chance to fix this bill. And this bill needs all the help it can get.

That is why I am surprised the Republicans on the Rules Committee put out this closed rule. Plenty of Members, both Democratic and Republican, have lots of good ideas on how to cut spending.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the Republican leadership is afraid of.

I urge my Republican and Democratic colleagues who want a chance to cut Government spending to join me in opposing the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we have seen the bipartisan nature of support for this rule with the statement from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indian Rocks Beach, FL [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], a former chairman of this subcommittee, for the strong support that he gave us as we put this bill together. I think that he would disagree with the previous speaker, as do I, that this bill is flawed. Is it perfect? Absolutely not. I do not think I have ever seen a perfect bill before the House since I have been here. But this is a good bill.

The problem that we face today is time, Mr. Speaker. When I was designated chairman of this subcommittee in the middle of November, I began meeting with folks at the Pentagon, the Defense Department, the civilian leaders, the military leaders, with commanders in the field, with war fighters. My question was, "What do we need to look forward to for the next

fourth-quarter training, flying hours, steaming hours, all kind of training was going to be degraded to the point that it would have a serious effect on readiness.

We committed to moving this bill expeditiously so that we could get it to the Defense Department by March 31. We are a week behind. We set a schedule that would move us along expeditiously. We are a week behind that schedule. We had difficulty getting a request for this supplemental from the administration. We finally got it. The truth is, we marked up ahead of the administration's request just to keep on our timetable.

One of the reasons that the administration hesitated in sending a request down here was that they were afraid this would become a target, or a vehicle for all kind of mischievous or extraneous nondefense-related activities. They did not want that to happen. Neither did we. So we have brought this out under a rule where the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has every opportunity to rewrite every section of this bill. He will do so in a substitute that he will offer here shortly.

But we have got to keep on track. We cannot sit here and decide what we think is right based on what we assume might happen in the other body. We should not be assuming what the other body might do. We have got to keep this bill moving. We will get into the debate as to why after we pass the rule, but this rule is a good rule to expedite this emergency defense supplemental.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will very reluctantly vote for this rule because it provides for the offering of an amendment which I want to offer and I think it would come with ill grace if I did not support it. But I would simply say that I hope that Members are not fooled by this process that is going on today.

What has happened is very simple. The President sent down a \$2.5 billion supplemental. He offset it with \$700 million in rescission, leaving a gap of about \$1.8 billion added to the deficit.

The committee decided they were going to add \$670 million to the bill. They also added about \$700 million to the rescission, so they also wound up with a \$1.8 billion gap in spending. Then both sides got the benefit of almost \$400 million in CBO scoring adjustments which means that at this point, the original bill that came out of the committee added \$1.4 billion to the deficit.

ate, and that would have left us with that still \$1.4 billion deficit hole in the bill.

So now reacting to that problem, what this rule is going to do is to merge the two bills so that the "let's pretend" second part of the act gets merged with the real first act and somehow they then want to suggest that the bill is entirely paid for.

The problem is it is still not paid for. It is paid for on the budget authority side but it is not paid for on the outlay side. As everyone knows in this place, the deficit is measured by outlays.

The fact is that even if you adopt this rule today, you will wind up if you vote for this package as is adding \$282 million to the deficit this fiscal year and \$644 million to the deficit over 5 years. That from a crowd that says that we are supposed to balance the budget through a constitutional amendment. I find that ironic indeed.

That is why I am offering my amendment. My amendment simply says this: It says instead of adding all of the bells and whistles and all of the let's pretend gimmicks in the second bill, let's drop everything except the administration's original request so that you have got a bill that costs \$2.5 billion, and then give the Secretary of Defense the authority to make reductions in low-priority items and pork items in order to balance off the book. That is the only way we can keep a commitment to balance the budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], my colleague on the Committee on Rules and chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Process.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from greater metropolitan San Dimas, CA, for yielding me this time.

I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and as well the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for their hard work in crafting what I think is a very fair and well-tailored rule. The purpose is to implement a policy that many of us have long advocated around here, and that is, paying for what we do. This rule will allow us to marry together an important defense appropriations supplemental bill needed to provide for military missions already undertaken as described by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] with a rescissions package designed to actually pay for

I have seen it so far.

As best I can tell, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has suggested temporarily granting a power I thought he opposed, that is, the line-item veto authority to the Secretary of Defense, a distinguished but nevertheless unelected official, and this is all without ensuring congressional review.

For those who thought H.R. 2, the line-item veto act passed by this House last month, was a little too much delegation of power away from Congress, I would have to think that the Obey approach, giving line-item veto to the Secretary of Defense, would be completely out of bounds. But that remains to be seen.

Finally, I wish to comment on the substance of this defense supplemental appropriations bill. The bulk of the money is earmarked to cover the costs of unbudgeted contingency operations in places like Somalia and Haiti. This is money that has already been spent and some of us think unwisely in part. Now the bill is coming due.

Although I strongly support our military, as we all do, and recognize that at this point we have no choice but to settle up our accounts on missions already underway or done, I am really troubled by the administration's tendency to embark on costly, ill-defined peacekeeping adventures around the globe without consulting with the Congress, and then coming forward after the fact and saying, "Oh, we've got to have some money."

This trend was especially disturbing in the case of Haiti where the administration did find a lot of time to seek U.N. approval for its plans but somehow or other did not seem interested in coming up to get some congressional support in advance for sending our troops there.

We have drained funds from our troops readiness to pay for what is arguably the misuse of our military in Haiti, and many Americans, including this one, strongly resent it.

Mr. Speaker, I fully expect a broad discussion of foreign policy and the appropriate use of our troops to continue as we move into the regular budget cycle. That is what we do. But in the meantime, I urge support for this creative rule, even though I know very full well there are those on the other side of the aisle who voted for misadventures such as the one we have experienced in Haiti who now do not want to pay for the bill.

We must pass this bill. It is a matter of life and death for our troops that we count on.

attention the inappropriate, business-as-usual way in which rescissions were generated for the DOD supplemental appropriations bill.

In the last days of the 103d Congress, the House voted on whether to eliminate \$289.5 million of pork in the HUD portion of the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies' appropriations bill. One-hundred-seventy-nine Members voted with me to eliminate these earmarks; 189 did not. Today I planned to offer an amendment that would give this body a second chance to do the right thing—to vote to eliminate those earmarks in this rescission package. Unfortunately, last night, the Rules Committee denied us this opportunity.

Does this bill rescind any "items of congressional interest," "directed appropriations," or "special purpose grants?" The answer, of course, is no. Instead of going after pork-barrel appropriations, the bill's drafters chose to cut \$1.3 billion from merit-based, competitively awarded research and development programs—vital investment in our Nation's future.

My colleagues in the House know of my active opposition to the practice of earmarking. In the past, a large majority of those who joined me in that effort came from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am extremely disappointed that the first rescission package brought to the floor contains not a single cut to earmarked projects.

Although, my esteemed colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will be marking up another rescission package later this week, it will be too late to recapture the pork projects funded at HUD. Of the \$289.5 million in HUD earmarks, \$94.5 million has already been obligated. The obligation of another \$149.2 million is in process. All of these funds have been obligated since the first of this year, which must be a record rate to get earmarks out the door. By the time the next rescission package comes to the floor of the House, there will be not a penny left to rescind.

In all my years in Congress, I have heard hundreds of speeches decrying pork-barrel politics, the majority of them coming from my Republican colleagues. Indeed the Republican views on the fiscal year 1994 Budget Act included a strong plea for the elimination of earmarking. However, perhaps my Republican colleagues are finding it harder to cut pork now that they are in the majority. Of the HUD earmarks nearly 32 percent goes to five States who elected Republican Governors or Senators in the last election.

...ing and amendments. From my vantage point, whether you call these projects a silk purse or a sow's ear, it looks like it will be business as usual in the 104th Congress.

□ 1230

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my friend from Dallas how many speakers there are on his side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman indicates he has one additional speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 13 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am for the supplemental, for a strong defense, and a supporter of the balanced budget amendment, but I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 889, because it does not permit adequate debate on the technology reinvestment project, a key dual-use technology program. I hoped to offer an amendment consistent with the approach of the bill providing additional rescissions—as recommended by the Department of Defense—that would have permitted the restoration of approximately half the funding for fiscal year 1995 for TRP. Unfortunately, I was denied the ability to offer my amendment.

Even though my amendment has been shut out, I rise now to express my strong support for the TRP program.

I believe that TRP is misunderstood, and its problems exaggerated. Without the TRP approach, DOD will not be able to access, shape, and afford much of the technology it needs.

TRP gives DOD greater access to affordable, leading-edge technology by leveraging commercial capabilities and markets for military benefit. Let me repeat that; for military benefit. A great many defense needs can be served better and less expensively using commercial means.

TRP projects are competitively awarded—as a result, these projects have been awarded to qualified companies and consortiums throughout the country and throughout our districts. These awards—which require a 50 percent match for the applicant—are based on the requirement that the

Few programs have received the level of scrutiny as the TRP. Receiving both considerable praise and criticism, the program was modified to expand participation by small business and increase the military services' involvement to ensure rapid integration into defense weapon systems.

Obviously, these changes have not satisfied the new majority. If we need to modify TRP further, by all means, let's do so. But I urge my colleagues to vote against rescinding all of the TRP funding and against killing a key dual-use technology program—it's too important for our industrial base as well as our national security.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, if this is the concluding speaker of the gentleman from California, I would then sum up by simply stating we continue to be opposed to the rule. I would ask the House to reject this rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is a very bipartisan rule, the support that has emerged from the ranking minority member of the committee and the former chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has demonstrated that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Metairie, LA [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding time to me, and I rise in strong support of the rule. As he said, it does have bipartisan support. I think it is a good rule, a fair rule, and in the name of restoring funds to the Defense Department that are needed for emergency purposes to avoid a wholesale curtailment of operations and to avoid a risk of failure to support our young people in uniform, I think that it is very important that we not only support the rule, but that we support the bill.

The rule before us basically does three things. First it merges two bills developed by the Committee on Appropriations; namely, the defense supplemental and a companion rescission bill into one legislative proposal. The net effect of those two actions is to rescind approximately \$14 million in budget authority more than we appropriate. That is, we are actually taking back \$14 million in budget authority that we appropriated last year in excess of what we are spending on defense.

aircraft carriers in which young service people are killed, when an F-15 shoots down two U.N. helicopters filled with U.S. and U.N. personnel, that such programs as an advanced automatic train control system for the Bay Area Rapid Transit System that cost \$39 million of taxpayers' funds is necessary. Likewise, when tanks are forced to stop, and their crews are forced to get out because the engines in those tanks are risking the possibility of catching fire and exploding, and then they do their tank maneuvers by walking around in the desert, I have a hard time explaining why the Diversity in Cultural Change Program involving manufacturing at the University of Wisconsin, which expends \$3.3 million in taxpayers funds, or the Holistic Approach to Preparing Students to Learn and Lead in New Manufacturing paradigm at a cost of \$3.7 million, or the Realization Coalition, whatever that is, at \$6.6 million are necessary.

So I think those cuts are well placed. I think if we are going to prepare for the maintenance, the operations, the training of service people, we have to make cuts where cuts can be made, and those programs are not, in my opinion, necessary to the defense of the Nation.

As a second part of this rule, it grants to my ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I supported this request at the Committee on Rules because I support his right to offer such an amendment, even though I do not agree with the substance of his amendment and do not understand why delegating to the Secretary of Defense the authority for line-item vetoes over appropriations bills for the Defense Department is necessary.

□ 1240

Third, this rule specifically grants to the minority a motion to recommit with or without instructions. I support that right even though proponents of this motion to recommit do not want to pay, apparently do not want to pay for the defense of the Nation, even though they are the same people who wanted to send our troops to Haiti last year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I may differ with my ranking member in his budget priorities, but I support this rule because it allows him to discuss his priorities and bring them to a vote.

I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and the distinguished member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and all of the

the package, even with the two bills fused, will add \$644 million to the deficit on the outlay side over the next 5 years and \$300 million in deficit in outlays for this year alone?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman intends to deal only with outlays, it would be one of the first times, I think, that he has done so. As the distinguished member, former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, knows, our committee deals with budget authority, we do not deal with outlays.

As far as the payment of this package, we deal with budget authority.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield further, is it not true the deficit is measured only in outlays and not in budget authority, is that not true?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would say to the gentleman that in the out years the budget authority pays for the bill, then ultimately the bill will be paid for.

Mr. OBEY. Is it not true that the deficit is measured only in outlays?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The deficit is measured—ultimately is measured in outlays, and ultimately the outlays will follow the budget authority and does so by a surplus of \$14 million.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support of this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 144, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—282

Allard	Barrett (WI)	Boehlert
Andrews	Bartlett	Boehner
Archer	Barton	Bonilla
Army	Bass	Bono
Bachus	Bateman	Brewster
Baesler	Bereuter	Browder
Baker (CA)	Berman	Brownback
Baker (LA)	Bilbray	Bryant (TN)
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Bunn
Barcia	Bishop	Bunning
Barr	Bliley	Burr
Barrett (NE)	Blute	Burton

Coble	Hutchinson
Coburn	Hyde
Collins (GA)	Inglis
Combest	Istook
Condit	Johnson (CT)
Cooley	Johnson, Sam
Costello	Jones
Cox	Kasich
Cramer	Kelly
Crane	Kim
Crapo	King
Creameans	Kingston
Cubin	Klecicka
Cunningham	Klink
Davis	Klug
de la Garza	Knollenberg
Deal	Kolbe
DeLay	LaHood
Dellums	Largent
Diaz-Balart	Latham
Dickey	LaTourette
Dicks	Laughlin
Doggett	Lazio
Doolittle	Leach
Dornan	Lewis (CA)
Doyle	Lewis (KY)
Dreier	Lightfoot
Duncan	Lincoln
Dunn	Linder
Ehrlich	Lipinski
Emerson	Livingston
English	LoBiondo
Ensign	Longley
Everett	Lucas
Ewing	Manzullo
Farr	Martini
Fawell	Mascara
Fazio	McCollum
Fields (TX)	McCrery
Flanagan	McDade
Foley	McHale
Forbes	McHugh
Fowler	McInnis
Fox	McIntosh
Franks (CT)	McKeon
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf
Frelinghuysen	Meyers
Frisa	Mica
Funderburk	Miller (FL)
Galleghy	Minge
Ganske	Molinari
Gekas	Montgomery
Geran	Moorhead
Gilchrest	Morella
Gillmor	Murtha
Gilman	Myers
Goodlatte	Myrick
Goodling	Nethercutt
Goss	Neumann
Graham	Ney
Greenwood	Norwood
Gunderson	Nussle
Gutknecht	Obey
Hall (TX)	Oxley
Hamilton	Packard
Hancock	Parker
Hansen	Paxon
Hastert	Payne (VA)
Hastings (WA)	Petri

NAYS—144

Abercrombie	Chapman	Dooley
Ackerman	Clay	Durbin
Baldacci	Clayton	Edwards
Becerra	Clyburn	Engel
Beilenson	Coleman	Eshoo
Bentsen	Collins (IL)	Evans
Bevill	Collins (MI)	Fields (LA)
Bonior	Conyers	Filner
Borski	Coyne	Flake
Boucher	Danner	Foglietta
Brown (CA)	DeFazio	Ford
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Frank (MA)
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Frost
Bryant (TX)	Dingell	Furse
Cardin	Dixon	Gejdenson

Jacobs	Molloy	Studds
Jefferson	Mollohan	Tanner
Johnson (SD)	Moran	Tejeda
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Thompson
Johnston	Neal	Thurman
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Torricelli
Kaptur	Olver	Towns
Kennedy (MA)	Ortiz	Tucker
Kennedy (RI)	Orton	Velazquez
Kennelly	Owens	Vento
Kildee	Pallone	Visclosky
LaFalce	Pastor	Volkmer
Lantos	Payne (NJ)	Ward
Levin	Pelosi	Waters
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (FL)	Watt (NC)
Lofgren	Pickett	Wise
Lowey	Poshard	Woolsey
Luther	Rangel	Wyden
Maloney	Reynolds	Wynn
Manton	Richardson	Yates

NOT VOTING—8

Ehlers	Hoyer	Rush
Fattah	Meek	Williams
Gonzalez	Peterson (MN)	

□ 1300

Mr. LUTHER changed his voted from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 450, REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-45) on the resolution (H. Res. 93) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 450) to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is with regard to section 749 of the House rules, and in particular clause 1 of rule XIV, in which Members are prohibited from addressing anyone but the Speaker, and in particular the practice that has apparently taken place today of Members wearing badges to relay a message rather than addressing their message through the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this has happened in the past in the House, but I