

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS, 1991 ISTEA DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS NOT UNDER CONSTRUCTION AS OF FEB. 24, 1995—Continued

[*These balances are subject to change]

State and section No.	Project description	NHS	Est const start	Cong. dist.	Amount available thru FY 1995	Amount obligated (02/24/95)	(*) Unoblig Bal (02/24/95)	New authorization 96-97
Pennsylvania—1106(b)3	Beave/Butler Co: I-79 to Rt. 60	no	1999	4	2,212,000	0	2,212,000	1,288,000
Pennsylvania—1107(b)134	Route 120 - Lock Haven	unk	1996	5	2,528,000	160,000	2,368,000	1,472,000
Pennsylvania—1107(b)19	Borough of Water Street-US 22	yes	1997	9	5,056,000	240,095	4,815,905	2,944,000
Pennsylvania—1107(b)20	Borough of Holidaysburg: US 22	yes	no info	9	32,864,000	1,040,000	31,824,000	19,136,000
Pennsylvania—1107(b)22	US 22 North of Lewistown	yes	1998	9	36,845,600	427,390	36,418,210	21,454,400
Pennsylvania—1107(b)23	Reedsville and Seven Mountains	yes	1997	9	22,183,200	216,231	21,966,969	12,916,800
Pennsylvania—1107(b)25	Roaring Springs: PA 36	no	1995	9	5,561,600	1,090,400	4,471,200	3,238,400
Pennsylvania—1107(b)26	Altoona to Juniata	no	1998	9	4,499,840	120,000	4,379,840	2,620,160
Pennsylvania—1107(b)27	Bedford Co.-Rt. 30	no	1998	9	30,336,000	1,858,447	28,477,553	17,660,000
Pennsylvania—1107(b)31	Widen US 202 to Montgomeryville	unk	no info	8,13	5,624,800	1,668,000	3,956,800	3,275,200
Pennsylvania—1107(b)52	Wilkes-Barre & Mountaintop	yes	1996	11	10,554,400	0	10,554,400	6,145,600
Pennsylvania—1107(b)58	Montgomeryville: US 202	no	no info	8,13	6,825,600	0	6,825,600	3,974,400
Pennsylvania—1108(b)39	Erie Co.: Eastside Connector Proj.	no	no info	21	4,740,000	1,966,927	2,773,073	2,760,000
Pennsylvania—1108(b)5	OH border to Pittsburg Airport	no	1997	4	2,022,400	0	2,022,400	1,177,600
Pennsylvania—1108(b)6	Reconst. Delaware Ave. Serv.	no	1995	1,3	1,516,800	240,000	1,276,800	883,200
Total					420,191,520	35,012,550	385,178,970	244,668,480
Rhode Island—1107(b)140	I-95 Stormdrain Construction	unk	1995	1,2	8,216,000	800,800	7,415,200	4,784,000
Rhode Island—1107(b)149	Woonsocket Bridge Improvements	unk	1995	1	221,200	0	221,200	128,800
Rhode Island—1107(b)150	Reconstruction of Roadways	unk	1996	2	3,602,400	648,396	2,954,004	2,097,600
Total					12,039,600	1,449,196	10,590,404	7,010,400
South Dakota—1105(f)17	Improve Heartland Expressway		1996	001	9,353,600	255,200	9,098,400	5,446,400
South Dakota—1107(b)51	Mo River bridge in Vermillion		1996	001	2,275,200	88,512	2,186,688	1,324,800
Total					11,628,800	343,712	11,285,088	6,771,200
Tennessee—1104(b)17	Bicycle Sys. Contr.-Murfreesboro	no	no info	6	252,800	40,000	212,800	147,200
Tennessee—1104(b)3	Davidson-Williamson County Bike Path	no	no info	5,6	632,000	36,000	596,000	368,000
Tennessee—1105(f)2	Route 72 East-West Corridor	yes	no info	7	1,765,808	416,000	1,349,808	1,028,192
Tennessee—1106(a)13	Ft Loudon Dam Brdg-Lenoir City	no	no info	2	316,000	38,766	277,234	184,000
Tennessee—1106(a)69	W. Fork Stone River Bridge in Rutherford	yes	1995	6	505,600	62,025	443,575	294,400
Tennessee—1106(b)45	Urban Diamond Interchange & Connector-Chattanooga	no	1996	3	1,959,200	240,348	1,718,852	1,140,800
Tennessee—1107(b)76	1-81/Kendrick Creek Rd.-Sullivan	yes	no info	1	3,665,600	80,000	3,585,600	2,134,400
Tennessee—1107(b)77	Foothills Parkway	no	1995	1	7,078,400	371,623	6,706,777	4,121,600
Total					16,175,408	1,284,762	14,890,646	9,418,592
Texas—1105(f)15	Constr. US-71	yes	1997	1	3,953,286	0	3,953,286	2,301,914
Texas—1106(a)110	Contr-Impr 4-lane divided hwy	yes	1997	14	27,744,800	0	27,744,800	16,155,200
Texas—1106(a)63	Highway 288: Angleton	yes	1997	14,22	568,800	0	568,800	331,200
Texas—1107(b)101	Ft. Worth: I-35 Basswood interch	yes	1996	6	11,249,600	0	11,249,600	6,550,400
Texas—1107(b)115	Ft Worth Hillwood/I-35 Interch	yes	1995	6	8,026,400	1,645,360	6,381,040	4,673,600
Total					51,542,886	1,645,360	49,897,526	30,012,314
Utah—1108(b)38	Provo Municipal Airport	no	no info	3	632,000	0	632,000	368,000
Vermont—1107(b)146	Constr. US-7 N Bennington to SW NY-7 Hoosick NY	unk	1999	1	12,640,000	1,389,600	11,250,400	7,360,000
Virgin Islands—1104(b)34	Raphune Hill Bypass: St. Thomas	yes	no info	1	11,628,800	3,761,212	7,867,588	6,771,200
Virgin Islands—1107(b)94	Constr. second Road: St Thomas	no	no info	1	1,074,400	310,000	764,400	625,600
Total					12,703,200	4,071,212	8,631,988	7,396,800
Virginia—1107(b)14	Maine/Worsham St. Brdg/Danville	no	1996	5	6,320,000	0	6,320,000	3,680,000
West Virginia—1104(b)42	Impr. SR-9 Martinsburg to VA Berkeley & Jefferson	unk	1995	2	69,520,000	3,330,442	66,189,558	40,480,000
West Virginia—1104(b)43	Constr. Coal Field Expressway	unk	1997	3	31,600,000	2,148,338	29,451,662	18,400,000
West Virginia—1105(f)10	Shawnee Project, part of I-73/74 Corridor Proj	yes	1998	3	2,844,000	1,188,000	1,656,000	1,656,000
West Virginia—1105(f)11	Widening US-52 Hunting-Willism.	yes	1995	3	63,200,000	8,951,200	54,248,800	36,800,000
West Virginia—1105(f)12	Replac. US-52 From Williamson WV to I-77	yes	1997	3	8,848,000	2,087,865	6,760,135	5,152,000
West Virginia—1106(a)105	Hwy Impr. Mason County	yes	1996	2	12,324,000	194,960	12,129,040	7,176,000
West Virginia—1106(a)118	Chelyan Bridge Replacement	no	1995	2	5,372,000	0	5,372,000	3,128,000
West Virginia—1106(a)77	Riverside Expressway Imprv.	no	1996	1	3,349,600	1,248,758	2,100,842	1,950,400
Total					197,057,600	19,149,563	177,908,037	114,742,400
Wisconsin—1104(b)36	I-794 Bicycle Transportation	yes	no info	4,5	948,000	0	948,000	552,000
Subtotal not under construction					1,893,875,342	272,828,236	1,623,533,506	1,103,977,258

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local, and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal

Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and for other purposes."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman is recognized for 3½ minutes.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore my colleagues to defeat this rule, to defeat this shortsighted, mean-spirited package of cuts that are aimed right at the young people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, let us understand why the Republicans are proposing these deep and dangerous cuts. It is not to balance the budget. It is to pay for a tax cut that gives nearly 80 percent of the benefits to people who earn \$100,000 a year or more.

Each and every Member of this House has to look deep inside themselves and ask a profoundly human question, a profoundly moral question: What are

we serving for? And who are we fighting for?

We should be fighting for young people, like Rasha Singleton of Baltimore. She was here yesterday in the building in a press conference. She talked about dropping out of school at age 16 when her first child was born. She was determined to do everything she could to stay off welfare. She did not have an education, she did not have skills to earn a decent wage. She was forced onto welfare. She became pregnant again. But through the Summer Youth Employment Program she was able to pay the bills while she studied for her high school diploma. She learned clerical skills, she took her high school equivalency test this Saturday. And soon she is going to get a positive result and she will be able to support her children and hold her head up high as a productive citizen of this society. Without that program, she would still be in Baltimore stuck in welfare, stuck in a cycle of lack of hope.

Then there is Damon Davis of Baltimore. He comes from a single-parent household. He had to drop out of high school and take a low wage job to support his family. Again, without the Summer Youth Program he would have never had the opportunity to develop real skills and find a higher paying job. Now he is about to get his diploma and be on the road to a future as a productive citizen in this society.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about a very clear principle and idea. Do you want to invest your money in the people of this country? Do you want people to be productive citizens, and by saying that is our moral conscience, do we want to put that money in that investment in those people? Or do we want to take it from them and give it to the wealthiest, most privileged people in this society? Is that what we want to do?

I do not think that is what we should do. The people who are at the top who have done well, and God love them, we need them. Everybody lives the American dream and wants to become wealthy, and everybody I hope can become wealthy. But once you have reached that status, do we need to help them again at the expense of the people who are trying to crawl out of poverty?

This bill is wrong. It is morally wrong, and I urge Members to vote against this rule and to vote against this bill. Stand up for the Americans that are out there trying to pull themselves out of poverty and be productive citizens. They are the people we should be fighting for, not the people who have done well, who frankly do not even want this tax cut, but want to make an investment in the poor and the middle class citizens of our country.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill only trims last year's appropriation by a net of \$11 billion. Last year's appropriation in the total Federal budget ultimately amounted to \$1.5 trillion. This a little item in the Federal budget. It was also appropriated when the Democrats controlled the Congress.

The Democrats, the other party, has said that we have not named specifics. They said you cannot balance the budget unless you give specifics. We have given specifics in this bill.

They said that we have not cut the pork. They are the ones that passed the pork. They were in the majority last year and every year before that for the last 40 years. It is their pork.

They said that the money that we are cutting goes to tax cuts. We have a proposal that is allowed by this rule, which will be a Democratic Party amendment, to apply these savings only to the deficit.

So all of these arguments are nothing more than the same old Chicken Littleism: The sky is falling, liberals are out of power, and what are we going to do, beat our breasts and talk about the poor and the elderly, when in fact all we are trying to do is bring common sense and sanity to the U.S. Federal Budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple debate which has come down to a combination of rhetoric and reality. We have Members on the other side of the aisle who offer great rhetoric about trying to balance the budget, and yet the reality is they want to maintain the status quo because they are not willing to step up to the plate and make these tough decisions.

Most of them, according to Mr. SOLOMON's findings here, are big spenders. But when it comes to actually making the tough decision, they are voting to keep government as it is. We want to change government for the better so the American people can be proud of what it is that we are doing.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying rescissions bill is a bad bill. The \$17 billion in cuts fall most harshly and heavily on the neediest in our society:

Women and infants who depend on WIC funding for simple sustenance;

Senior citizens who rely on LIHEAP funding to stay warm in the winter;

Young men and women who need the Summer Jobs Program to give them the skills to work and the incentive to stay off the streets.

But let me briefly point out why the rule itself must be defeated.

We will have no opportunity to make this bill better by restoring the devastating cuts in critical domestic programs and paying for them from the defense budget.

The American people should understand, for example, that for the cost of one B-2 Stealth bomber, we could fully fund the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program for 30 years.

But while the rule before us will take food off the tables of working class Americans, it keeps Pentagon pork off the table for those of us who wish to offer further budget cutting amendments.

This rule doesn't even allow me to try to cut one of the most ridiculous programs in the Federal budget—the Civilian Marksmanship Program.

This is a \$2.5 million boondoggle which hands out free ammunition to gun clubs to subsidize recreational shooting, mainly for children.

It's a sad day in the House when we pass a rule that will force Congress to vote to take food and education away from our children while making sure that we can still give them free bullets!

Let's defeat the rule and put together a bill that cuts programs that need to be cut, rather than programs which will cut down the needy.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this extremely restrictive rule.

Last year, I led a fight in this body to have fiscal year 1995 appropriations spending bills be considered under an open rule, with unlimited opportunities to offer spending cut amendments. Under Democratic leadership, we brought the last 11 appropriations bills to the floor under an open rule. These bills accounted for almost 95 percent of discretionary spending.

During consideration of those bills, the House debated and voted on 74 amendments offered to cut fiscal year 1995 spending. Some of them failed, many of them passed. Most importantly, we could accurately tell the American public that all spending was on the table; that no rules or procedural gimmicks were used to protect particular items of spending.

Nine months later, we are revisiting fiscal year 1995 spending. The new majority ran on a platform last year of open rules which would give Members unfettered ability to cut spending. Many of these same Members pilloried me last year for my activities on the so-called A-to-Z bill—claiming—falsely—that I was standing in the way of spending cuts.

So what do these Members do now that they are in charge. They vote for a rule that makes 80 percent of discretionary spending off-limits from spending cuts—for the same fiscal year 1995 spending that the Democratic leadership allowed virtually unlimited amendments. This is the ultimate in hypocrisy, and I urge all Members of this body to reject this rule.

Now, let me make it clear that I support bringing a rescission bill to the floor today. With or without passage of a balanced budget amendment, we have to continue to debate spending priorities and cut spending where we can.

I also believe it is reasonable—even advisable—to bring this bill to the floor under a rule which requires that any restoration of proposed rescissions be offset by equal or greater spending cuts. This is essential to preserve a base level of spending cuts.

However, the rule also unfairly provides that any offsetting cut be made in the same chapter of the bill that the rescission restoration is made. There is absolutely no justification for this rule. Leadership has offered the excuse that this is necessary to avoid letting the process get out of hand. With preprinting requirements in the RECORD, such an argument escapes me completely. More importantly, it is

hypocritical. Just a few weeks ago, the leadership brought a supplemental bill to the floor which violated today's rule—by paying for defense increases by cuts in nondefense discretionary spending.

Finally—and most egregiously—the rule effectively prohibits amendments which make cuts in the line items that are not included in the bill. This is the ultimate in arrogance. Leadership is saying that they and they alone will decide which items are on the chopping block and which are completely immune from cuts.

I understand the motivation behind this rule. Leadership wants to avoid embarrassing amendments to cut spending for projects which only benefit Republicans. Leadership also wants to control our spending priorities.

But, the effect of this is terrible, in two important ways. First, according to my calculations, it bars spending cuts in almost 80 percent of the discretionary spending that we ap-

proved for fiscal year 1995. This is the wrong way to go about cutting spending and balancing the budget. Because of this, I assume that every Member who cosponsored the A-to-Z petition last year or campaigned for it will vote against this rule. I don't know how they can possibly justify their vote in favor of this highly restrictive rule.

Second, this convoluted rule makes it almost impossible to propose spending shifts. There are many rescissions in this bill that I support. However, there are many items that I believe it would be a mistake to cut. However, any Member wishing to offer an amendment to restore a proposed cut is seriously restricted in any effort to pay for such a restoration. Because unless the item that Member wants to cut is in the bill, it cannot be cut at all.

Let me illustrate this point. I will be cosponsoring an amendment to be offered by Representative KLUG to zero out funding for the

Appalachian Regional Commission. The only reason we can offer this amendment under the rule is that the bill proposed a meager cut of \$10 million in this program. However, if the bill did not include this \$10 million cut, we would be precluded from offering any amendment at all to cut funds for this program. This is arbitrary and ridiculous.

The voters sent us here to debate the wisdom of every item of Federal spending, to weigh competing priorities, and to cut spending in all programs which can no longer be justified. The rule for H.R. 1158 prohibits this and therefore it should be defeated.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I want to put in the RECORD a chart showing the restrictive nature of the floor procedures Republicans have used to hastily adopt their agenda. Less than one-quarter of the procedures used have been open despite Republican promises that all contract items will be considered under open rules.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None
H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A
H.J. Res. 2	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes	2R: 4D
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A
H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 665	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 668	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A
H.R. 728	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 729	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed: Put on suspension calendar over Democratic objection	None
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D
H.R. 830	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D
H.R. 450	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 926	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A
H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D
H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 103	Restrictive: 8 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: 7 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 956	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D: 7R
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	3D

** 76% restrictive; 24% open. **** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this rule is a gag rule. Here are some facts to clarify to the American people exactly why they lose with this rule.

This restrictive rule prevents members from offering amendments that are important for their constituents.

This restrictive rule blocks amendments through arbitrary criteria not found in any rule of the House. It allows the Republicans to pick and choose which amendment they want the House to vote on.

This restrictive rule limits debate to 10 hours. Even if the Republicans allowed a Member's amendment, time could run out.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that we will soon be voting on a Republican bill to cut programs which give heat to the elderly, summer jobs for out youth, and educational television and radio to every American. This rule protects the contract with wealthy America at the expense of every middle-class, hard-working American.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this restrictive rule and force the Rules Committee to bring up an open and fair rule.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it used to be that the saying, "God willing and the creek don't rise" was a farmer's oath dealing with the uncertainties of bringing a crop to market. But after the actions being taken today by the Republican leadership, this oath will be repeated by every citizen of this country before they take the Federal Government at its word. Every time the spring rains come hard, prompting a Federal disaster declaration, Americans across the country will be asked to pay the bill.

We have never required rescission offsets to pay for emergencies such as the Northridge earthquake or the spring floods in California. We didn't do it for the midwestern floods and we didn't do it for the hurricanes that have hit the south and east. We didn't even do it for the Northridge earthquake payments that have already been made.

Now, the Republican leadership has decided that they will require offsets, a move that directly contradicts the provisions of the 1990 Budget Act that allow true national emergency payments to go ahead without offsets being required. By fiat the Republican leadership has decided to require offsets for the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] outlays and did so, not by amending the Budget Act, but in a February 7, 1995, letter to President Clinton. Democratic Members of Congress were not consulted, the Governor of California was not consulted, even the Republican Conference was not consulted. A decision was unilaterally made by the Republican leadership and we are here today to pay the price for that decision, without being able to debate the decision, I might add.

What is most galling about this action is that it was made in the middle of the effort to repair the damage from the Northridge earthquake. We are not applying this new policy prospectively, we are applying it retroactively.

The Republican leadership of the House has, in effect, broken a contract with the people of California. They have not proposed an alternative means of dealing with natural disasters, they have not amended the Budget Act, they have taken no rational steps to address this problem.

Even more distressing is the fact that the offsets being proposed total \$17.1 billion, the largest rescission bill ever considered by the House, and all of the money beyond the \$5.4 billion for FEMA were going to fund the tax cut that is being drafted and will be debated early next month. Then, when they realized they didn't have the votes for this, the Republican leadership changed their minds and will put the excess cuts toward deficit reduction. So, nearly \$12 billion of the \$17 billion in cuts in this bill have nothing to do with the FEMA emergency request.

Finally, we all recognize that the Senate will not go along with this approach and even if they should, there is a strong probability that the President will veto this bill. It is pointless for us to bring this bill up for a vote. Because the Republican leadership has engaged in a game of "chicken" with the White House, we are all being dragged along for the ride. We are pitting veterans against the homeless, putting towns seeking water treatment upgrades against cities seeking job training programs, and putting the citizens of California against the rest of the Nation. It is unfair and I hope that the citizens of California remember who put them in this situation.

I plan to oppose the rule and oppose the bill. I don't want to put Americans in the situation of having to check the weather reports or listen to the evening news to see if Mother Nature has canceled their Government checks. I don't want to be part of a program to fix a disaster by creating a disaster.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to the rule governing debate on the Republican rescissions package before the House today. In my view, the rule, like the bill itself, is unfair.

This rule protects defense spending and spending for special projects while exposing most Federal programs that assist low-income children and the elderly poor to excessive cuts.

In particular, I object to the provision that any restoration of spending proposed for cuts must be offset by another cut in the same section of the bill. Thus, if we want to restore funding for summer youth employment for 600,000 disadvantaged youth, we would be asked to take the money from education programs for other disadvantaged youth. We could not move money from the star wars program in defense to restore funding for education programs.

Those of us who would like to restore proposed cuts to public broadcasting would be forced to take the funds from education for disadvantaged children. Yet, those Members with extreme amendments, such as cutting funding for public broadcasting even further, can offer any amendment they want. But any saving from these amendments can not be used to restore any important program being cut in the bill. I urge a no vote on the proposed rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that I urge an "aye" vote on this rule, and I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 226, nays 204, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—226

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

Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—204

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

NOT VOTING—4

Collins (MI)
Cubin

Souder
Zeliff

□ 1401

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Cubin for, with Miss Collins of Michigan against.

Messrs. MILLER of California, BREWSTER, and PETERSON of Minnesota changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am just trying to clarify exactly what is happening at this phase, Mr. Speaker.

There is one more vote on this matter, am I correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the adoption of the resolution as amended, one more vote.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Continuing my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, the first vote, the vote we just finished was on the Dreier amendment to fix up the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct; to amend the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Fix up the rule, whatever.

In effect, Republicans voted to deny Mr. MONTGOMERY—

Mr. THOMAS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MOAKLEY. This is my parliamentary inquiry; Mr. Speaker; Mr. Speaker, in effect the Republicans voted to deny Mr. MONTGOMERY and other the chance to divide the question and get a separate vote on—

Mr. THOMAS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not posing a parliamentary inquiry.

Does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may we vote on the rule?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am still on my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I moved the previous question on the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to complete my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will maintain a proper parliamentary inquiry, not a statement but an inquiry.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that the next vote, the vote we are about to take, is on whether or not to adopt this gag rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 190, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—242

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

NOES—190

Abercrombie	Boucher	Collins (MI)
Ackerman	Brown (CA)	Conyers
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Costello
Baldacci	Brown (OH)	Coyne
Barcia	Bryant (TX)	Cramer
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	de la Garza
Becerra	Chapman	DeFazio
Beilenson	Clay	DeLauro
Bentsen	Clayton	Dellums
Berman	Clement	Deutsch
Bevill	Clyburn	Dicks
Bishop	Coleman	Dingell
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Dixon

Doggett	Klink	Reed
Dooley	LaFalce	Reynolds
Doyle	Lantos	Richardson
Durbin	Levin	Rivers
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Roemer
Engel	Lipinski	Rose
Eshoo	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Evans	Lowey	Rush
Farr	Luther	Sabo
Fattah	Maloney	Sanders
Fazio	Manton	Sawyer
Fields (LA)	Markey	Schroeder
Filner	Martinez	Schumer
Flake	Mascara	Scott
Foglietta	Matsui	Serrano
Ford	McCarthy	Skaggs
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Skelton
Franks (CT)	McHale	Slaughter
Frost	McKinney	Souder
Furse	McNulty	Spratt
Gejdenson	Meehan	Stark
Gephardt	Meek	Stokes
Gibbons	Menendez	Studds
Gonzalez	Mfume	Stupak
Gordon	Miller (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Green	Mineta	Tejeda
Gutierrez	Mink	Thompson
Gutknecht	Moakley	Thornton
Hall (OH)	Mollohan	Thurman
Hamilton	Montgomery	Torres
Harman	Moran	Torricelli
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Towns
Hefley	Nadler	Traficant
Hefner	Neal	Tucker
Hilliard	Oberstar	Velazquez
Hinchee	Obey	Vento
Holden	Olver	Visclosky
Hoyer	Ortiz	Volkmer
Jackson-Lee	Orton	Ward
Jacobs	Owens	Waters
Jefferson	Pallone	Watt (NC)
Johnson (SD)	Pastor	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)	Williams
Johnston	Pelosi	Wilson
Kanjorski	Peterson (FL)	Wise
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Woolsey
Kennedy (MA)	Pickett	Wyden
Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy	Wynn
Kennelly	Poshard	Yates
Kildee	Rahall	
Klecicka	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—2

Borski Cubin

□ 1423

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Ms. Cubin for, with Mr. Borski against.

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 115, the rule just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bills, H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.