



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1995

No. 108

House of Representatives

The House met at 11:30 a.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. KINGSTON].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 29, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable JACK KINGSTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Bless us, O God, and all Your people so the works of justice and mercy will have the center of our focus and an attitude of reconciliation and peace will be our goal. Help us to be aware, gracious God, that You have called us in this day and time to be people of character and integrity and in spite of any difference or dispute, may we seek to express the unity of Your creation that is Your gift to us. With humility and thanksgiving, with gratitude and praise, we receive this new day by Your promise and by Your grace. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] will lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HALL of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1058. An act to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996-2002

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 175

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996,

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The provisions in section 2 of this resolution shall be effective upon the adoption by the Congress of House Concurrent Resolution 67.

SEC. 2. HOUSE CONFORMING CHANGES.

(a) REVENUE INSTRUCTION IN THE HOUSE.—For the purposes of the compliance with reconciliation directions in the House under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, subclause (II) of section 105(a)(2)(B)(xii) of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1996 shall be deemed to read as follows:

“(II) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee for fiscal year 2002 is not less than \$1,295,840,000,000 and for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 is not less than \$7,896,813,000,000.”.

(b) HOUSE CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE.—Section 205 of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1996 shall not apply with respect to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 30 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 175 provides for consideration of House Congressional Resolution 67, the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996 thru 3002. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides 1 hour of debate on the conference report, divided equally between the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H6561

chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Finally, the rule provides that the provisions in section 2 of the rule shall be effective upon the adoption of the budget resolution by the Congress. Section 2 of the rule clarifies the interpretation of two procedures as they apply to the House. First, the rule clarifies the House procedures for certifying a balanced budget are contained in section 210 of the conference report. Second, the rule provides the correct numbers for the level of revenue reconciled to the House Committee on Ways and Means. The numbers in the rule are consistent with the aggregate levels in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is consistent with the precedent set by the rules utilized for conference reports for 7 of the last 8 years. It will allow for a fair and reasonable debate on the substance of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today is truly a historic day.

Today we will consider the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996 through 2002, in layman's terms our Nation's detailed fiscal path back to a sound financial footing.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will approve a balanced budget, something the naysayers and the protectors of the status quo said could not be done. Well, I stand here on the floor of the House today with all of my Republican colleagues to say we have done it, without raising taxes, without cutting Social Security, and without cutting veterans earned benefits.

Mr. Speaker, as all of us well know, formulating this historic package has not been easy. It has actually been very difficult, and quite frankly, in many parts of this country, has not even been totally popular but it has been the right thing to do.

But regardless of whether we agree with the results—and I personally do agree—of this effort, we all must commend those involved, for a sincere, upfront and realistic approach to dealing with this real fundamental problem of governing. In recognition of this I personally want to publicly commend, again, my colleagues on the Budget Committees of both Houses for their dedicated work. Specifically, I must also commend the leadership of JOHN KASICH on this vital issue. With the help of his committee, he has brought the immediacy of this issue into every home, business, and farm. He has fostered a complicated consensus of ideas—a consensus that will garner a majority vote in both Houses of the people's Congress.

As a result, this conference report represents the utilization of our cherished democratic process in resolving a serious national problem. This is how the process was intended to work.

In reference to the details of the conference report I must say that I personally am pleased with the outcome. The agreement of the House and Senate

represents a reorganization of our Nation's limited fiscal priorities in a way most conducive to the principles of federalism.

We all have our personal refinements that we would like to make to the agreement. I personally would have liked this bill to contain more money for defense and more department eliminations. Most of you also know that I would prefer to balance the budget sooner than 2002. However, the beauty of democracy is that it is premised on the need for consensus.

This conference report represents a consensus.

Consequently, I am proud to be part of this Republican Congress which has stuck to its promises, and stood by its convictions by presenting this balanced budget to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, with that I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the final passage of this historic balanced budget resolution.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the other side of the aisle has properly described this rule. It is a simple one which waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. It also provides for 1 hour of debate time equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Finally, the rule provides clarifying procedural language and the correct revenue amounts for reconciliation in section 2 of this rule which shall be effective upon final action on the budget resolution by Congress.

This is not an unusual rule for a conference report and I do plan to support it. However, Mr. Speaker, I have grave misgivings about the content of this budget resolution.

Although this resolution simply sets spending ceilings, and the implementing legislation, in many areas will come later, this resolution assumes cuts that many of us believe are simply to severe. You can look at this budget and see numbers—numbers in the millions, billions, and trillions. Yet there are faces behind those numbers. There are seniors, and working class families, and the poor. These are the people who will be hurt under this budget.

This resolution calls for a balanced budget by the year 2002, a laudable goal. Yet in order to get to this goal, this budget calls for cuts of \$270 billion in Medicare; \$180 billion in Medicaid; \$10 billion in student loans; and a 31-percent cut in nondiscretionary programs by the year 2002, including highway construction, air traffic control, meat inspection, and numerous education and training programs. I do not think the American people are aware of

the impact these kind of cuts will have on their everyday lives in 1, 2, or even 3 years.

The Medicare and Medicaid cuts alone account for more than one-third of the cuts in this bill. Yet last year's debate on health care reform pointed out the complexities of changing seniors' health care coverage. Medicare recipients, by and large, have worked hard their entire lives and they want the right to choose their own doctors. This budget takes a meat ax to the Medicare budget and seniors will suffer under it, as well as poor families and the disabled.

One of the most troubling aspects of this piece of legislation is the \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthy and large corporations. To ask seniors and middle-class families to take the kind of hits they are going to get under this bill, and to then turn around and pass out tax breaks to corporations and those making over \$200,000 is simply ludicrous. If we are going to balance the budget we should at least try to do it in a responsible way. While the special interests have gotten a good deal under this package, the American public has not. The \$500 children's tax credit my colleagues on the other side like to talk about does not even touch really poor families, those making less than \$23,000. Middle-class families, making under \$100,000, will barely benefit from it. And the \$354 billion tax cut package already passed in the House, which I opposed, already offends this budget which calls for a \$245 billion cut for the wealthy.

The student aid cuts under this budget bill are too extreme. The average income of a family receiving student loans is \$35,000. Eliminating the interest subsidy, as called for in this budget, increases a student's indebtedness by 20 percent. This means an average student will pay \$5,000 more per student loan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot stand here today without expressing my disappointment over the dismantling of the child nutrition programs which occurred in the so-called welfare reform bill passed earlier in the year. This budget resolution assumes the enactment of the final package. Unless our colleagues in the other body correct the block granting of school lunch and other programs, millions of school children across the country will lose their school lunches.

For these reasons and others, I will be opposing this budget resolution when we have a chance to vote, and I urge my colleagues to take a very close look at its impact on middle-class Americans and the poor. However, as I indicated earlier, I have no objection to the rule which sets the terms of debate and I will be supporting it.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on

Rules, a very valuable Member of this body who has done more to bring about this balanced budget than many people that I know. He is a very valuable Member.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, our distinguished Chairman, for yielding me this time and I rise in strong support of this rule, a very good and very special rule. Mr. Speaker, with this rule we will bring to the floor the central feature of the new majority's promise to the American people: a balanced Federal budget. We cannot forget the importance of this budget blueprint—every year since 1969 the Federal Government has spent more money than it had available in its coffers. Our total debt is now in the neighborhood of \$5 trillion, almost \$20,000 for every man, woman, and child. So it is an incredible feat that for the first time in over a quarter of a century, we have made a hard commitment to a balanced budget. And we have done this in spite of the lack of a balanced budget amendment, and in spite of a budget process that, at best, makes it extremely difficult to bring the budget into balance and at worst actually hinders the process of cutting waste and overspending.

Mr. Speaker, having served on the Blue Ribbon Bipartisan Entitlement Commission, known as the Kerry Commission, I have seen firsthand the problems that are lurking just around the corner if we do not fulfill our promise of balancing the budget. Asking the American people to put up with continued budget deficits is like asking them to paddle over Niagara Falls in a canoe, a predictably unpleasant outcome. Without serious reforms in all areas of the budget—including discretionary programs, including entitlements—we are setting the stage for certain tragedy.

Many people talk about the impact that the national debt and annual deficit will have on future generations, but the threat is actually much more immediate. Take Medicare for example: the trustees responsible for reporting on the state of this vital health program have said, plainly and simply, that Medicare will be broke in 2002—we are not talking about our children or grandchildren—this will have a direct impact on everyone from current retirees on down. This budget resolution addresses this crisis head on, and provides a platform to prevent a disaster—in Medicare and all other truly vital programs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN KASICH of Ohio, for his tireless work in bringing this budget agreement to the floor. As he told us in committee, it is very important that we pass this conference report expeditiously, so that the various authorizing committees can fulfill their reconciliation goals and further us on the path to a balanced budget in 7 years. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the budget.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, there are many of us who oppose this budget resolution that is before us, but support moving toward a balanced budget within 7 years.

Let me remind the House of the coalition budget, which is one example that was on the floor that would have provided for a balanced budget within 7 years with less borrowing than this budget resolution provides and would do it without the draconian cuts in our Medicare system or cuts in student financial assistance.

We can do that if we would only give up the tax breaks that are in the budget resolution that provide \$245 billion of relief to our wealthiest people. We can have a balanced budget without jeopardizing our Medicare system and without jeopardizing our students' ability for financial assistance. We can do better.

We should not put tax breaks for the wealthy ahead of a health care system for our seniors or the need for student assistance.

We can do better. We should do better. Let us defeat this budget resolution; let us bring out one that would not jeopardize senior health care and our students.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Muncie, IN [Mr. MCINTOSH], an outstanding new freshman Member of this body who has already made his mark.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule.

I think that a lot of us in the freshman class and a lot of us in the Republican conference supported the Contract With America and promised the American taxpayers that we would have tax cuts in this new Congress, and in the Contract we passed numerous tax cuts. We provided the family with a \$500 tax credit. We provided the elderly with a tax cut, repealing President Clinton's tax increase on Social Security. We provided small business men and investors a greater return on their capital investments, which will also stimulate the economy and create jobs.

Those promises were central to our effort last fall to go to the American people and explain to them why we needed a new majority in Congress.

I am proud to say that in the negotiations on this conference report, we were able to keep the bulk of those tax cuts. We were not able to keep all of them. Now, my preference would have been to keep every single one of them.

But I am here to say that I think this is a good step forward. I think we should support the conference report, but we should consider it to be a floor. This is the lowest amount the tax cuts that we can expect, and the freshman class and the conservatives in the conference and the Republican Party will be continuing to work for even more tax cuts so that we can be assured that we do repeal the Social Security tax

increase, we do give every family in America a full \$500 credit for every child, and we do give the full amount of capital gains tax cut. That is the standard that we will hold as we move toward reconciliation, and that is where we will be pursuing our efforts to fight on behalf of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good compromise and a good conference report. I rise in favor of the rule and the conference report.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, we all support a balanced budget. So why do I oppose this balanced budget proposal? Because I do not support balancing the Federal budget while you unbalance the budget of millions of American families. In West Virginia, for instance, 300,000 senior citizens will see their Medicare cut, that is right, cut, because when you pay over \$3,000 more out of pocket over a 7-year period, that is a cut.

We know that in West Virginia 35,000 students depend upon student loans, and there are student loan cuts in here as well that restrict growth and opportunity for the middle-income.

Because there is a tax cut for the wealthy in here at a time you are trying to balance the budget, to give two-thirds of West Virginia families \$90 or less, you are going to give 1 to 2 percent \$2,400 back in tax cuts. In other words, so that 1 or 2 percent over \$100,000 a year get \$2,400, you are going to cut 100 percent of senior citizens and their Medicare.

What happens is middle-income families lose the programs that are important to them.

I cannot support a balanced budget proposal that cuts Medicare, cuts economic growth and unbalances the family budget.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Appleton, WI [Mr. ROTH], a truly outstanding Member with whom I came to this body 17 years ago.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for yielding me this time.

The budget resolution before us today will affect our trade and our budget policies, and this is very important to us.

Did you see this morning's paper? I know we have been in session all night long. I want you to read this morning's paper. It is the same old story: "The U.S. blows a lot of smoke, huffing and puffing and bluffing, and Japan walks away with all the dollars." I was somewhat surprised. I thought that President Clinton would stand strong. I really did. I was wrong.

The President came in weak, and he got weaker. The problem is last year we had a \$150 billion trade deficit. My friends, I want you to remember this number: This year our trade deficit is projected to be \$200 billion.

Do you know what that is going to do to our economy and to our workers? We just cannot keep going this way. We cannot keep doing that to our economy and to our workers.

It seems to me all too often people are only concerned about themselves and their group and no one is any longer thinking about our country. We cannot continue this way.

The President pulled a gun on Japan, and it turned out to be a water pistol, and the Japanese are laughing all the way back to Tokyo. We cannot keep going in this way. No one respects America anymore, and our other trading partners are laughing also.

This is a shell of an agreement. Read this. This is a shell of an agreement. It is not an agreement. It is an agreement for an agreement's sake. Our trade negotiator climbed way out on a limb, and the Japanese came along and sawed it off.

This agreement makes America weak, and, just as bad, it makes America look weak.

As the paper said this morning, the Clinton administration assault right here is a classic, notable for bellicose U.S. threats, not for significant results. Translated: American leadership is just hot air. Translated: What they are telling us is that American leadership is just a lot of hot air. That is not what American leadership should be and what we can expect from our administration.

On this resolution, instead of arguing back and forth like we have all night long, let us address this, not as Democrats and as Republicans, but as Americans. This is a big problem. Let us address it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], a very trusted and distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the rule and in opposition to the conference report that it makes in order.

Although the spending cuts and the tax cuts provided for by the conference report are not quite so extreme as in the House-passed version of the budget resolution, this plan still represents a massive transfer of resources from poor and middle-income Americans and from children and the elderly to the wealthiest Americans. This is a plan that hurts those who need the most help from Government and helps those who need it the least.

It is a blueprint for shifting budget priorities in a way we do not believe the majority of the people of our country support. We do not believe the people support cutting Medicare and Medicaid by \$452 billion. We do not believe that people support cutting domestic spending on a host of programs that represent investment in our Nation and that improve the quality of our lives, spending in such areas as education,

job training, transportation, environmental protection, science and health research. Those programs would be cut by nearly \$200 billion, or by nearly one-third in real terms from current levels.

We do not believe people support cutting all of these programs by such massive amounts. Just so the wealthiest Americans can benefit from a tax cut, particularly before we know whether we have actually achieved a balanced budget.

Many of us who will be voting against this conference report share the desire of the majority to balance the budget over the next 7 years, but we feel strongly there are far more fair and equitable ways to balance the budget than the one before us now.

□ 1200

For example, as Members recall, when the House considered the budget resolution last month, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] offered a plan that would also have balanced the budget by 2002. However, that plan would have avoided about \$140 billion of the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that this conference report contains. It also would have protected many other important domestic programs, including education programs, from the extreme cuts contained in this budget plan.

There are two key reasons why the Stenholm-Orton plan was able to produce a balanced budget by the year 2002 without making such severe cuts. Unlike the majority's budget plan, it would not have cut taxes, and it would not have increased defense spending.

The contingent \$245 billion tax cut contained in this bill is one of the most troubling features of this plan. Although the details of the cuts are yet to be determined, most of the benefits of the tax cuts would likely go to the wealthiest families and corporations.

In addition, the tax cut is supposed to occur only if we cut spending enough to balance the budget. The fact is, however, the tax cut is not contingent upon reaching a balanced budget, as the Senate wanted, but upon a projection that a balanced budget will be achieved by 2002.

That projection would be based on highly questionable assumptions. One is that Congress will stay on the spending-cut path laid out by this resolution. Yet the cuts in this plan are so draconian that it is doubtful that they can be sustained over the next 7 years.

The contingency plan also assumes that there will be a \$170 billion so-called economic dividend—positive trends in interest rates, unemployment rates, and other economic indicators that will produce higher revenues and less spending. Yet, as we all know, even minor changes in such trends can produce huge budgetary differences.

If the objective of the majority was to provide a tax cut as a reward for balancing the budget, then a more honest and realistic approach would be to wait

until we actually achieve a balanced budget, rather than relying on a projection of a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to emphasize that many of us who will be voting against the conference report strongly support efforts to balance the budget over the next several years. In fact, many of us—particularly those of us who have spent many years fighting to bring our Nation's deficit problem under control—are pleased that this year, the debate has moved from whether we should balance the budget, to when and how it should be done. The Republican leadership, and in particular, the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] deserves a great deal of credit for that change.

However, as I said earlier, we do object to the unfair and inequitable manner in which this budget resolution seeks to achieve that goal. For that reason, when the time comes to vote on the conference report itself, I urge Members to vote "no" on the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, obviously my friend and distinguished colleague, member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], for whom I have genuine affection and great respect, has pointed out there are many ways to balance the budget. I guess the debate is that we have found a way to do it and, under the leadership of the other party from the 40 years, we seldom have done it so we think we are making progress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE]. I would have to say that Ohio's loss of a jurist has been the Committee on Rules' very tremendous gain.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, let me first express my strong support for this very straightforward rule and acknowledge the hard work and dedication of Chairman SOLOMON in pursuing relentlessly this concept.

Second, I would like to commend my good friend and colleague from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, for his hard work and dedication in this effort. Like so many other pursuits, Chairman KASICH approaches the budget debate with passion and dogged determination.

He is guided by a clear sense of doing what is right for the American people, even if it means challenging the status quo with ideas or policies which some around here might consider politically unthinkable.

But doing the unthinkable, the politically difficult, is precisely what this budget debate is all about, Mr. Speaker.

After years of unbalanced budgets and reckless spending, we have the opportunity today, by adopting this conference agreement, to set a bold new course toward balancing the budget, limiting the size and scope of Government, and creating a meaningful future for all Americans.

Now, we have all heard the criticisms aimed at this very responsible budget plan. We have seen actual spending increases being called cuts, and the Budget Committee's good-faith efforts being portrayed as attacks on senior citizens and children.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this budget agreement offers solutions no more complicated or profound than those offered by responsible American families who, everyday, play by the rules, pay the bills, and make ends meet.

So, this debate really comes down to a simple choice. Do we continue following the old ways of doing business and piling up more debt? Or do we recognize that things have to change, and that the status quo is simply unacceptable if America expects to have any future.

I believe the will of the American people is clear: They want us to be bold, and to have the courage to make the difficult choices so that future generations of Americans will enjoy the good fortune and prosperity they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to reassure the American people that this Congress is serious about reducing the deficit and cutting spending. I urge my colleagues to adopt this responsible rule, and to pass this bold plan for securing America's future.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip of the Democratic Caucus.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are going to see a lot of charts and numbers on this floor.

But this debate is not just about numbers. It's about people.

It is about the real effects these massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid will have on real people.

People like Margaret Leslie.

Some of you will remember—last month I stood on this floor to talk about Margaret.

Today, Margaret is a proud senior citizen who lives in my district.

But 51 years ago—she was known to her friends as Margie the Riveter.

When she was young she answered the call of this country and helped build the B-29's that helped this country win the war.

Like most people of her generation, today Margaret lives on Social Security.

And after paying for her rent, her medicine, and her MediGap and Medicare premiums, she's left with about \$130 each month—to pay for food, bills, heat, and everything else.

And she struggles to make ends meet.

But instead of trying to make her life easier, this budget before us today will make her life harder.

The budget before us today takes us one step closer, a \$240 bite out of her Social Security check.

It takes us one step closer to the day when she has to pay an additional \$3,500 out of her pocket for Medicare.

It takes us one step closer to the day when her family will be forced to pay the bills that she can't.

Mr. Speaker, is this what we are all about as a nation?

Are these the values we hold dear?

Is this the message we're trying to pass along to our children and grandchildren?

Don't we have a responsibility to those who sacrificed so much for us?

Those of us who stand up for senior citizens and their families have been called fearmongers, with no vision of the future.

That is an insult to the senior citizens of this country.

Their concerns are real and need to be addressed.

The Gingrich Republicans keep saying they are making these cuts to save Medicare, to save the system, and I wish I could believe that.

But then I recall that 30 years ago, BOB DOLE voted against the very creation of Medicare.

I recall that 20 years ago, the majority leader campaigned on the theme of abolishing Social Security.

I recall that last January, the Speaker himself proposed abolishing Medicare and replacing it with a private system. That in February, the lead editorial in the Speaker's think newsletter read: "For Freedom's Sake . . . Eliminate Social Security."

And then I read just the other day that the majority leader's new book proposes to abolish Medicare and replace it with a private system.

So I say to my colleagues following the Gingrich revolution: don't come to this floor today and tell us that you're cutting Medicare to save Medicare, because all you've talked about the past 20 years is how we should abolish Medicare.

We wouldn't be in the Medicare situation we're in today if you hadn't come to this floor just 3 months ago and passed a bill that took \$87 billion out of the Medicare trust fund.

Where was your concern then? Where was your concern for saving the system then?

Let us be honest: You took money out of the trust fund then for the same exact reason you are cutting Medicare today: to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest people and the wealthiest corporations in our society.

We say the American people deserve better. People like Margaret Leslie stood by this country in times of war and peace. And we have a responsibility to stand by them today.

That is the sacred promise we made on Medicare, and it's time we live up to that promise.

I urge my colleagues: say no to this rule. And say no to this terrible budget.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] a hard-working and

energetic member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the previous speaker, the minority whip of the House, who in the second-to-the-last second in his peroration mentioned the rule. We are here to talk about the rule. It is a fair rule and a good rule. It is a rule that we should have had last night, when we had a wide open rule, and we watched petulant people, being like my children did when they were adolescents. I am embarrassed for our House, and I am embarrassed for what our country saw on television.

I would like to talk about the bill, just like the previous speaker did. We are here to balance the budget. For the first time since 1969, we think it is important to balance the budget. We are not balancing this budget to create tax cuts for the rich. People on Social Security with a \$40,000 income are not the wealthy but they are going to be benefited.

The 25-year-old couple with four children hoping to buy a home and save money for college, they are going to be benefited. The senior citizen who wants to sell an asset, wants to sell a home, wants to sell a business they built all of their lives, they are going to be benefited.

Then we are told that cuts are too deep. How deep? How long? When? When will you propose that we take this burden off the backs of our children and grandchildren?

The whole direction of what the previous speaker called the Gingrich revolution was to simply say that our children and our grandchildren are real people, too. I am delighted to meet Margie the Riveter. I think it is a wonderful story. But if you go to Margie the Riveter and say, we want your grandchildren to pay for your health care and the bills you have run up, she would not like that either.

The typical person on Medicare pays 24 percent of its costs over a lifetime. They do not want our grandchildren to pay for their care. For 30 years, for 30 years this Nation has voted itself wishes and dreams over needs and passed the bill onto our grandchildren. And that is, Mr. Speaker, immoral; \$5 trillion later, that is immoral.

I have got one grandson and I have another grandchild on the way. When that grandchild comes in November, if we do not do this, if we continue on the path of the last 30 years, that new grandchild will enter the world and during the course of his or her lifetime will pay \$187,000 just in interest on the debt. That is immoral. That is what we are about. When you see all the pictures up here and all the sob stories, remember this, America: Your children and grandchildren are real people, too.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Today we will

vote on a budget that would reduce Medicare spending by \$270 billion over 7 years. That is three times larger than any cut ever enacted in the history of Medicare. Let's not hide the facts. The magnitude of these cuts could decimate the only universal, portable health coverage we have in this country. When combining these cuts with steep reductions in Medicaid's coverage for nursing homes, the budget offers seniors a bitter pill to swallow.

Some have said that these cuts are needed to save Medicare. America knows better. The same budget that cuts Medicare by \$270 billion would also enact a \$245 billion tax break for the wealthy. This is not a fair trade for our Nation's seniors.

Let's not destroy Medicare in the name of saving it. I urge Members to think twice before they vote for a plan that breaks America's contract with Medicare beneficiaries.

This is not a fair trade for our seniors. We should not say we are going to take Medicare and change it as we know it today, a program that works, and we are going to save it in the process. The magnitude of these cuts goes much further.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I found it curious that the gentlewoman from Connecticut spoke so much about the tax on the seniors situation. The Republican platform, of course, does have a tax break for seniors. That has been much discussed and that means a lot to me, because I represent a lot of seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Salt Lake City, UT. [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, this rule that we are discussing will enable us to pass a budget document that irrevocably sets us on the road to a balanced budget. As a new Member of the House, I am proud to be part of this historic occasion, to be the first Congress in almost 30 years to pass a balanced budget.

For too long Congress has failed to balance the budget and, in so doing, we have failed the American people. This budget agreement is an important step toward restoring the budget's confidence and trust in our ability to lead this country toward a better future for our children, free of debt, full of opportunity, and we do it without raising taxes. In fact, we are going to reduce taxes on working families and we do not touch Social Security.

This budget will end business as usual in Washington. We eliminate loaded bureaucracies. We cut the waste out of Federal programs. We abolish programs that no longer work, and in doing so, we empower families and States and communities instead of Washington.

Importantly, this budget works to preserve and protect Medicare for current and future seniors, to stave off a looming bankruptcy in 2002 that would leave our seniors with no way to pay for their hospitalization.

The rule accompanying this resolution provides for fair consideration of

these critical issues by granting the traditional time given for debate on the budget conference agreement. None of us like every provision in the budget resolution, but it is time to move forward and allow this process to move forward.

Throughout the summer and throughout the budget process, we will continue to debate these issues and we will work out a solution that will keep us on course to a balanced budget and at the same time help us create a better future for every American family.

We owe the people who sent us here an honest debate, one where we do not call spending increases cuts, where we face the Medicare bankruptcy crisis head on and solve it instead of sitting on the side lines and criticizing and hoping no one notices that we do not offer solutions and where we stop trying to frighten the most vulnerable people in our population for political gain and truly work to help them improve their lives instead of frightening them for the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to balance the budget and stop running up the debt that our children will pay for what we are enjoying now. It is time for us to agree on the framework to balance the budget and reduce the deficit.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the budget resolution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 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 rule, much less than a straightforward rule. I have been around here over 16 years now, and I have had a chance to see and to hear a lot of things, but this rule is truly an amazing document.

I am having a hard time understanding how a conference report signed by the conferees of both bodies can be two different bills in the bodies when it is being considered. It first came to my attention when I realized that the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans seemed to be talking about two different bills, at least when it came to the treatment of the tax cuts.

I understand how political spin works, how one person can talk about the trunk, the other about the tail, and both are talking about the elephant. But the differences here go beyond spin, and it all comes down to the rule we are considering.

Initially I was encouraged when I heard that the conference committee had agreed to postpone consideration of tax cuts until CBO reviewed the spending cuts and certified that the reconciliation bill will result in a credible path toward a balanced budget in 2002. That was what I heard my friend, Senator PETE DOMENICI, talking about. Despite my reservation about his health, agriculture, and education cuts, I suspect that if I were in the other body today, PETE might persuade me to vote for this rule and this bill.

But here in the House I read a different story, as I read this rule. This rule includes a self-executing provision that means it includes policy substance, not just procedure, which states, "section 205 of the concurrent resolution on the budget shall not apply with respect to the House."

Let me make sure everyone understands that. This rule starts our debate by saying, sure, we know we have a conference agreement, but even though the House agreed to it, we do not really have to abide by it. And just what is this section 205 that does not apply to the House? Well, it is the section that includes the requirement that CBO certify we put together a credible plan to balance the budget before we consider tax cuts. Instead, the House will be covered by a much weaker provision which allows tax cuts to be placed in the reconciliation bill before CBO has reviewed the package.

Even more disturbing, CBO is ordered how to do its business. CBO must give the House credit for the full economic bonus that results from a legitimate, steady, balanced budget plan. CBO itself has warned that the estimates of this economic bonus assume that the budget would be balanced smoothly over the next 7 years and would occur only if reductions are deemed credible. Does this plan meet those requirements necessary to earn the bonus? Well, it does not even begin a downward path until the third year.

All of these great and wonderful statements about this plan balancing the budget, oh, how I wish we were doing it credibly. But since CBO will be ordered to give the credit, the numbers will offer promises highly unlikely to be met.

Unfortunately, I have to encourage a no vote on this rule. Bring back a straightforward rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply refer the gentleman from Texas who is leaving the well to section 210 which is entitled "Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget in the House of Representatives," which I think will satisfy his needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER] vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Sanibel for yielding time to me.

I rise in strong support of this rule. Clearly, this day is a very important one, not just the fact that we have stayed up all night here but the fact that we are bringing about a conference report that has been agreed to by both the House and the Senate, that is going to put us on that glide path toward a balanced budget.

Earlier several of my colleagues have been trying to tragically, once again, engage in this class warfare argument which we have been listening to for

such a long period of time. The "us versus them" case that they make really does not hold water, because I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that an overwhelming number of the American people realize that we are in this together. We need both Democrats and Republicans alike, if we are going to move toward a balanced budget.

The President of the United States has, in response to our passage of a balanced budget, said that within 10 years he could balance the budget, angering many Members of his own party by pointing out some of the tough decisions that will have to be made. Unfortunately, our friends here in the House have continued to try and pit one group of Americans against another. I believe that this is very sad.

They have called us mean spirited, coldhearted. We have been accused of taking food from the mouths of babes. As we look at some of the programs that we have addressed in the first 6 months of the 104th Congress, it is very apparent, very apparent that only in Washington, DC, can a 4.5 percent increase, as we have put in the school nutrition program, be labeled a draconian cut. That is exactly what they have done with that issue. They have tried to do that with Medicare and a wide range of other things.

We desperately want to ensure that no American is hurt by this, but we also recognize that if we are going to have a balanced budget by the year 2002, tough decisions have to be made. That is exactly what happened in this conference report.

I am particularly gratified with the fact that this conference report is geared toward economic growth. I represent the state of California, which has an economy that is still going through a very very great difficulty, as it has for the past several years.

I believe that issues like the capital gains tax rate reduction will do more to create jobs, spur economic growth and not be a tax cut for the rich but help middle-income wage earners than virtually any Government program that we could put into place.

It seems to me that as this debate has proceeded, many Members have so often forgotten the fact that we want to do what we can to allow working Americans to keep some of their own hard-earned dollars. This is a very good conference report, and it is very fair rule. I support it strongly and thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

□ 1230

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

As the gentleman from California has noted, this House has been in session around the clock until just about an hour and a half ago. I just want to say that when it comes to protecting Medicare, when it comes to standing up for

America's middle class, if we have to be here around the clock another few days, the fight has only begun from the Democratic side, because we are not going to be bullied.

We are not going to permit committees to be stacked to implement this budget resolution by placing all the burden on Medicare recipients, by not doing anything about corporate welfare. We are going to stand up and tell the American people what is happening, and propose reasonable alternatives to that.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening with reference to Medicare? We have one new piece of the agenda since this rule was proposed by one of the Members of the Republican leadership. We have been concerned in the past debate of this budget that they were simply going to reduce benefits and increase out-of-pocket costs. That is the most likely thing to happen.

Now we are told there is a proposal that one of the ways this budget resolution, which is silent on the subject, will be implemented, one of the possibilities is to simply eliminate Medicare entirely for those Americans who are 65 or 66, and raise the eligibility age for Medicare, not lower it to cover more Americans, but to cut out of whole age bracket of people that are turning 65 and 66, as a solution to this proposal.

This particular budget is a day late and a dollar short. It is 2½ months late. It should have been approved April 15. They should not balance the budget on the backs of America's seniors.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to yield 3 minutes to the well-known gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in this rules debate and the budget debate that is about to follow. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very, very important day for the House of Representatives, because we are now going to finalize a budget document that has been agreed on by the House and Senate that balances the budget in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of interesting that we got here despite the words of the critics over the last several weeks and months. We might call them the "couldn't, wouldn't shouldn't" critics along the way. First of all, what they said was that we couldn't produce the fortitude to come up with a balanced budget. It simply would not happen. It did. A few weeks ago we brought to the House floor a balanced budget document.

Then the critics all said, "Well, maybe they could do it, but they wouldn't do it for real, because after all, when it got to the Senate, it was simply not going to happen." But, lo and behold, the Senate and the House have met now and there is a budget document that balances the budget in 7

years, and does so by beginning the process of downsizing the Federal Government.

The American people said clearly last year, "Government is too big. It spends too much." We now have a budget that reflects the priority of Government being too big and spending too much, and we begin the process of reform, restructuring, and relooking at the whole mechanism.

Now what do we hear from the critics? Listen to them out here today. Now they say we should not do it. First they said we couldn't, then they said we wouldn't, now they say we shouldn't. Why shouldn't we do it? Because they have all of these horror stories by people they say will be hurt by the budget. Of course, they have contributed nothing, nothing toward the reform. They have contributed nothing to the process.

In fact, what they have done throughout the process is peddled kind of fear and smear about the whole idea. They have tried to peddle fear as a way of telling people they should not be able to watch this budget process. Then they have tried to smear the whole process by suggesting there was something wrong with it from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that just as they were wrong when they said we couldn't do it, just as they were wrong when they said we wouldn't do it, they are also wrong when they say we shouldn't do it, because the fact is here is an opportunity, unlike any opportunity we have had for many, many years in this country, an opportunity to truly move toward a balanced budget and do so in a reasonable, responsible way, in a way that reforms the Government structures.

It is a shame. It is a shame that the forces of the status quo, it is a shame that the interest groups, are so intent upon keeping in place those things that they have built in the Federal Government structure that they now say we couldn't do it, we wouldn't do it, and now they are saying we shouldn't do it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would say you can't, you won't, and you didn't do it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this budget resolution. As we approach the vote on the budget resolution, I feel there is a lemming-like atmosphere in this Chamber. Many are ready and willing to take the plunge without questioning the consequences.

I think we can all agree reducing the deficit is our No. 1 priority. However, we differ on the approach to reach this goal. The budget resolution before us today is a new version of survival of the fittest and many of my constituents will not survive without being bruised and battered.

To achieve deficit reduction, this resolution is slashing several valuable

programs such as the earned income tax credit. By the time we finish with budget reconciliation, the earned income tax could be dramatically changed. The amount of the earned income tax may be kept at the same level and fully phased in and this could result in over 18,000 of my constituents paying a tax increase. This resolution will limit the earned income tax credit, but includes a large tax cut which will most likely include a capital gains tax cut indexed for inflation which will help the wealthy.

This resolution calls for large cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. These cuts are too deep. We cannot refuse to help the elderly and poor when they are sick.

This resolution contains a sizable decrease in spending on education. Education is integrally linked to our future. Many of my constituents worry about the rising costs of a college education.

It is time to reduce the deficit, but we have to proceed in an efficient and cautious manner. There are many points both sides of the aisle can agree upon. We should use these as our starting point and go back to the drawing board.

The resolution before us today paints a bleak future for many. We can and should do better.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what has happened to the idea of a caring and compassionate Nation. The people of this country have stood up through so many challenges throughout our history, and yet now, when we face a major financial crisis, instead of standing up to Star Wars and the B-2 bomber, instead of standing up to corporate welfare, we put our gunsights on the poor.

We say to senior citizens that we are going to cut the health care programs that they depend on. We say we are going to eliminate the fuel assistance program, we are going to cut the stu-

dent aid programs, we are going to eliminate our capability of having a country that invests in our own people.

We tell little children that are going to be abused that we no longer have enough money to provide foster care, we do not have enough money to find them a hot lunch, but my goodness, when it comes to providing a big tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country, we can come up with \$245 billion. Maybe it is time that we look at ourselves and where we are headed in this country, and whether or not we want to just glad-hand votes around here, going out to the American people and telling them we can have a tax cut, and eliminate the deficit at the same time; or maybe we ought to be talking about real leadership, how this country is going to enter the 21st century, providing good jobs for the American people that are going to require an education, that are going to require serious job training, to be able to get us to the high-skilled jobs that are going to go either to the Germans or Japanese or to the American people. Those are the challenges we need to accept as a people.

If those challenges were reflected in this budget, I would vote for it. They are not, and therefore, I urge a no vote on this resolution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair advise me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes, the remaining time, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, like many others, rise strongly in objection to this rule and to the conference report, which I know will follow, because the majority has the votes. They will pass the previous question and they will pass the rule and they will pass the conference report.

However, Mr. Speaker, we all know that this conference report, as the gen-

tleman from Texas pointed out, is really not a complete agreement between the House and Senate; that there are differences between the House and Senate still remaining as far as taxes and revenues are concerned. There are differences between the two bodies. As far as other provisions, there are still differences.

It is common knowledge, the House is to do one thing and the Senate is to do another, and I guess somewhere down the road, later on this year or next year or the following year, they might meet and come together. It is not a complete conference agreement, as we have always known in this House, in the past history of this House, ever since we have had the statutory budgetary law. This is the first time that I know of, at least in the 19 years, 19 budgets that I have been here to vote on, it is the first time that I have ever seen one that is not really an agreement, but they have agreed basically to disagree.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote against the previous question, to vote against the rule, and then to vote against the conference report. It is not only those things that are bad about this conference report, but it is what the implementing legislation needs to do in order to meet the targets that are in the conference report in the budget.

In the first place, it has been pointed out, again by the gentleman from Texas, that there are really not that many cuts in many of the programs in the initial couple of years, so when we look at it, it is just a questionable thing whether after 7 years they are really going to get a balanced budget. There are assumptions in this conference report that no one knows are going to happen. Mr. Speaker, this is not a conference report for a balanced budget.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following document regarding floor procedure.

The document referred to is as follows:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

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

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	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. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	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.	N/A
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open: pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery of the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order: Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D;1R
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open: waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. XXX	Closed: provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive: Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 63% restrictive; 37% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open 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. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that this is the closing minute, I would just like to make a couple of quick remarks. There was some comment from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] that maybe the House and Senate have not got it exactly fitted together. They certainly have it exactly fitted together a whole lot better than the Clinton administration does.

The budget that has been set up here by the President was a nonstarter, and I remember the President, in a place in an approximate position next to the gentleman in the Chair, as he was addressing the joint session said, "It is the CBO who will make the judgment," and the CBO made the judgment and his budget was found wanting, seriously wanting and out of balance.

We have been just told that we can expect some dilatory tactics, more ef-

fort to obfuscate and interfere with the proper business of the people of this country being done in an efficient way by the majority party.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite our colleagues in the minority on the other side to put as much effort as they are putting into the rhetoric on this issue, I would ask them to give that much energy into working in cooperation with the majority, so that every American has a better quality of life. The way to start that is to vote for this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]
YEAS—233

Allard	Armey	Baker (CA)
Archer	Bachus	Baker (LA)

Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billray
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
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
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman

Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingليس
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney

NAYS—181

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
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

Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petry
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souders
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markley

Bliley
Canady
Condit
Cox
Cubin
Fattah
Houghton

Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers

NOT VOTING—20

Kaptur
McKinney
McNulty
Moakley
Reynolds
Seastrand
Skaggs

Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

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

[Roll No. 452]

AYES—236

Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingليس
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
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
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick

NOES—183

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski

Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)

Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petry
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souders
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1304

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. BAESLER, MATSUI, and MORAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 183, not voting 15, as follows:

Doyle Lantos Pomeroy
 Durbin Levin Poshard
 Edwards Lewis (GA) Rahall
 Engel Lincoln Rangel
 Eshoo Bilipski Reed
 Evans Lofgren Richardson
 Farr Lowey Rivers
 Fazio Luther Roemer
 Fields (LA) Maloney Rose
 Filner Manton Roybal-Allard
 Flake Markey Rush
 Foglietta Martinez Sabo
 Ford Mascara Sanders
 Frank (MA) Matsui Sawyer
 Frost McCarthy Schroeder
 Furse McDermott Schumer
 Gejdenson McHale Scott
 Gephardt McNulty Serrano
 Geren Meehan Sisisky
 Gibbons Meek Skaggs
 Gonzalez Menendez Skelton
 Gordon Mfume Slaughter
 Green Miller (CA) Spratt
 Gutierrez Mineta Stark
 Hall (OH) Minge Stenholm
 Harman Mink Studts
 Hastings (FL) Mollohan Stupak
 Hefner Montgomery Tanner
 Hilliard Moran Moran
 Hinchey Murtha Thompson
 Holden Nadler Thornton
 Hoyer Neal Thurman
 Jackson-Lee Oberstar Velazquez
 Jacobs Obey Vento
 Jefferson Olver Visclosky
 Johnson (SD) Ortiz Volkmer
 Johnson, E. B. Orton Ward
 Johnston Owens Watt (NC)
 Kanjorski Pallone Waxman
 Kennedy (MA) Pastor Williams
 Kennedy (RI) Payne (NJ) Wilson
 Kennelly Payne (VA) Wise
 Kildee Pelosi Woolsey
 Kleczka Peterson (FL) Wyden
 Klink Peterson (MN) Wynn
 LaFalce Pickett Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Bliley Kaptur Torres
 Canady McKinney Torricelli
 Condit Moakley Towns
 Fattah Reynolds Tucker
 Houghton Stokes Waters

□ 1323

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 180, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—234

Allard Bachus Barr
 Archer Baker (CA) Barrett (NE)
 Army Baker (LA) Bartlett

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

NAYS—180

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

Gordon McCarthy Roemer
 Green McDermott Rose
 Gutierrez McHale Roybal-Allard
 Hamilton McNulty Rush
 Harman Meehan Sabo
 Hastings (FL) Meek Sanders
 Hayes Menendez Sawyer
 Hefner Mfume Schroeder
 Hilliard Miller (CA) Schumer
 Hinchey Mineta Serrano
 Holden Minge Sisisky
 Hoyer Mink Skaggs
 Jackson-Lee Mollohan Skelton
 Jacobs Montgomery Slaughter
 Jefferson Moran Spratt
 Johnson (SD) Nadler Stark
 Johnson, E. B. Neal Stenholm
 Kennedy (MA) Oberstar Studts
 Kennedy (RI) Obey Stupak
 Kennelly Olver Tanner
 Kildee Ortiz Tejada
 Kleczka Ros-Lehtinen Thompson
 Klink Owens Thornton
 LaFalce Pallone Thurman
 Lantos Pastor Velazquez
 Levin Payne (NJ) Vento
 Lewis (GA) Payne (VA) Visclosky
 Lincoln Pelosi Volkmer
 Lipinski Peterson (FL) Ward
 Lofgren Peterson (MN) Watt (NC)
 Lowey Pickett Waxman
 Luther Pomeroy Williams
 Maloney Poshard Wilson
 Mantion Rahall Wise
 Markey Rangel Woolsey
 Martinez Reed Wyden
 Mascara Richardson Wynn
 Matsui Rivers Yates

NOT VOTING—20

Ballenger Johnston Torres
 Barcia Kaptur Torricelli
 Bliley McKinney Towns
 Canady Moakley Tucker
 Condit Reynolds Vucanovich
 Fattah Scott Waters
 Houghton Stokes

□ 1333

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which this resolution, House Resolution 175, was adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Ohio did vote in favor of the resolution and is qualified to make the motion.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 182, not voting 16, as follows:

Dooley
 Doyle
 Durbin
 Edwards
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Evans
 Farr
 Fazio
 Fields (LA)
 Filner
 Flake
 Foglietta
 Ford
 Frank (MA)
 Frost
 Furse
 Gejdenson
 Gephardt
 Geren
 Gibbons
 Gonzalez

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—236

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

NOES—182

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

Dooley	Lantos	Pomeroy
Doyle	Levin	Poshard
Durbin	Lewis (GA)	Rahall
Edwards	Lincoln	Rangel
Engel	Lipinski	Reed
Eshoo	Lofgren	Richardson
Evans	Lowe	Rivers
Farr	Luther	Roemer
Fazio	Maloney	Roybal-Allard
Fields (LA)	Manton	Rush
Filner	Markey	Sabo
Flake	Martinez	Sanders
Foglietta	Mascara	Sawyer
Ford	Matsui	Schroeder
Frank (MA)	McCarthy	Schumer
Frost	McDermott	Serrano
Furse	McHale	Sisisky
Gejdenson	McNulty	Skaggs
Gephardt	Meehan	Skelton
Geren	Meek	Slaughter
Gibbons	Menendez	Spratt
Gonzalez	Mfume	Stark
Gordon	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
Green	Mineta	Studds
Gutierrez	Minge	Stupak
Hall (OH)	Mink	Tanner
Harman	Mollohan	Tejeda
Hastings (FL)	Montgomery	Thompson
Hayes	Moran	Thornton
Hefner	Murtha	Thurman
Hilliard	Nadler	Towns
Hinchee	Neal	Velazquez
Holden	Oberstar	Vento
Hoyer	Oliver	Visclosky
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Volkmer
Jefferson	Ortiz	Ward
Johnson (SD)	Orton	Watt (NC)
Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Waxman
Johnston	Pallone	Williams
Kennedy (MA)	Pastor	Wilson
Kennedy (RI)	Payne (NJ)	Wise
Kennelly	Payne (VA)	Woolsey
Kildee	Pelosi	Wyden
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Wynn
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Yates
LaFalce	Pickett	

NOT VOTING—16

Ballenger	McKinney	Torres
Condit	Moakley	Torrice
Emerson	Radanovich	Tucker
Fattah	Reynolds	Waters
Houghton	Scott	
Kaptur	Stokes	

□ 1352

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

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

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 175, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67), setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 175, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 26, 1995, at page H6273.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, today truly is an historic day as we come to this floor after a long and difficult, contentious night. This is an opportunity, however, to deliver on our promises, to keep our word, and we will be doing it today on a bipartisan basis. We will be out here with Members on the other side of the aisle, recognizing the fact that balancing the budget and giving people some of their money back as we downsize Government is what the American people have asked for.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people were skeptical about the ability of Republicans and our Democrat friends to be able to put a plan together that in fact could balance the budget over 7 years and to provide that tax relief, but we come here today not with rhetoric. We come here today with specifics, and we come here today with a commitment to see this job done through the year 2002 and to keep our word.

Obviously this has been something that politicians have talked about for an awful long time, but it is wonderful that today politicians come here not just with rhetoric, but the deeds that back up the language they have been using. I think it is a great day for our country.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. Like the many seniors who have contacted me, I was shocked to learn that the Republican budget slashes Medicare by \$270 billion. And as if that were not enough, the Republicans slash another \$180 billion from Medicaid. In my State of Michigan, close to two-thirds of Medicaid is spent on the elderly poor.

This is an attack, plain and simple, on America's senior citizens and on the working parents who are being squeezed between love for their own parents and grandparents, on the one hand, and their children on the other. That is the cruel choice being imposed on the average American by the Republican budget.

Sadly, the Republicans are playing "hide the ball" with their plans for reforming Medicare and Medicaid. The current legislative schedule allows for only 9 days in September to introduce, review, and vote on the proposed changes. If the Republicans have such wonderful ideas for ensuring the solvency of Medicare, turning Medicaid over to the States, and still protecting the health of our seniors, why are they keeping them a secret? What are they afraid of?

It appears that they trying to sneak their radical and extreme cuts past the American public. I can understand why they would be inclined to do so, given the fact that they are also pushing a \$245 billion tax cut that primarily benefits the rich.

Seniors have a right to know what is in store for Medicare and Medicaid, especially if they are being asked to bear skyrocketing premiums and limited access to quality care to help finance tax breaks for the wealthy. Working families have a right to know whether the Republicans expect them to bear even more of the costs of caring for their aging parents and grandparents so that the richest few in America can pay lower taxes.

At present, the Republican leadership appears content to continue operating in the dark, carefully avoiding the bright light of public scrutiny. I call upon them to deliver a full and open debate on how best to strengthen and improve Medicare, Medicaid, and the country's public health system. And in the meantime, I urge my colleagues to join me in performing emergency surgery on this Republican budget resolution by defeating the conference report.

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

Mr. Speaker, first let me congratulate my friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for what in his point of view has to be an outstanding job of negotiation. The gentleman has worked very hard, and I have fundamental problems with this budget resolution, as I will explain, but the gentleman did an exceptional job in representing the position of the majority in the House and negotiations with the Senate. I say to the gentleman, "You took them to the cleaners, my friend, and as an observer of the process, I admire the skill with which you represented your point of view and the point of view of the majority in the House. You were exceptionally skillful."

Mr. Speaker, a budget represents much more than simply numbers on paper. It is a statement about what we stand for as a government and what we value as Americans. It is real things to real people.

At its best, it sets out our priorities, addresses our problems and helps create opportunity where none existed before.

Today, as we consider the conference agreement fashioned by our Republican colleagues, we have to look at what it stands for: Its values, its priorities, and what it means for the future of our country.

When I do that, I see a budget that fails the test of fairness, and I see a document that slams the door of opportunity in the face of millions of working Americans.

Mr. Speaker and Members, when I look at this budget, the rich get richer. Millions of struggling working Americans and poor folks will simply find that the struggle gets more difficult.

It also affects communities. Those communities in our country that are in declining urban areas or in poorer rural

areas with declining population and economic base will find it much more difficult to reverse that decline.

This budget will escalate what has become a central problem in our economy and our society: the expanding income gap between the richest and poorest Americans.

In the last 20 years, the rich have gotten richer, while most working families have seen their incomes stagnate or decline. This budget will intensify that trend and all the problems it brings to our society.

This conference agreement expresses the wrong priorities for our country. When it cuts health care by \$450 billion and Medicare and Medicaid for the poorest, most vulnerable in our society to pay for billions in new tax breaks for the most affluent, the massive tax breaks for the affluent will also force draconian cuts in needed Federal spending.

□ 1400

The \$189 billion in cuts from nondefense discretionary programs, will seriously erode national support for transportation, housing, communication, education and training, basic science, community development, energy, and the environment. At a time when the world economy is becoming more competitive, this budget abandons the traditional Federal commitment to help American businesses, farmers, and citizens to compete around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, the last time we tried to balance the budget by starting with a big tax cut was in 1981, and we are still suffering from the disastrous deficits that package cost. This budget risks repeating that history all over again. It is not only unfair, it is fiscally imprudent.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the misplaced priorities and the fundamental unfairness in the Republican budget. Vote "no," my friends.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, the budget conference report we are voting on today is truly an extraordinary document that speaks well of the commitment this U.S. Congress has had of the goal of balancing the Federal budget by the year 2002 and preserving the economic health of our Nation for our next generation.

Last month I stood in this Chamber holding my granddaughter, Katy, while I cast my vote for the House's balanced budget resolution. I have kept Katy in my mind and the children of her generation as we worked to forge the budget resolution, and then worked as a member of the Budget Committee conference committee. Katy and the children of her age are why we are here doing this today, preserving the future of young Americans is our underlying goal.

Like my fellow conference committee members, I went to the conference committee committed to balanced the Federal budget and seeing the provisions of the House budget were implemented. I am proud to say that our Senate colleagues shared our commitment to a balanced budget and agreed with many of the key points of our plan. Each side in the conference was miles apart when we started on many issues, most noticeably the tax cut plan. However, these differences of opinion were not the stumbling block many critics thought they would be. We found agreement on most important issues and reached a compromise on others.

Overall, however, I believe the principles laid out in the House plan were respected by the Senate, and our priorities received the attention they needed. This conference report is a testament to the spirit of cooperation and proof of what can happen when the good of the American people is kept as the leading priority. The report is fair and it is balanced. I encourage my colleagues to support it. We are keeping our promises to the American people.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the chairman of the Committee on Science, and a 1995 academy award winner.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, I think.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first balanced budget that has been produced for real, in about 25 years, and we have actually done it. After all the years of hearing on the floor that it takes courage to balance budgets, we finally have seen a group come together that actually had the courage to produce a balanced budget, and we have proven all the naysayers wrong. We followed through on the promises that we made that this could actually be done.

In this particular budget it is balanced by the year 2002. While we do that, we provide a \$245-billion tax cut, while the Federal Government continues to grow, albeit slower than it would have grown otherwise.

I am amused when I hear the ranking member of the committee come to the floor and talk about all these rich people that are going to get the tax breaks. Yes, these are the people that the Democrats regard as rich. They are the \$50,000-a-year working family, the \$30,000-a-year working family. They are the people they regard as so rich they do not deserve a tax cut, because those are the people who benefit most from the \$500-per-child tax credit. In fact, the capital gains tax cut goes mostly to people who make working-family wages. Democrats regard them as rich; always have. That is the reason why they are always raising their taxes. We are lowering the taxes for those people.

In our budget we save Medicare. We terminate the Department of Commerce, and will continue to pursue separately from the Senate the terminations of other departments and agencies of the Government.

In the science area, where I am familiar as being speaker of the committee, I am happy to say that the conference has accepted the House position on the need for supporting basic research. The House numbers were acceded to on everything except NASA, and on NASA we did accept a number that was \$2 billion higher, because we found out that NASA has been doing double counting on the figures that the administration sent up here for us on their management plan. We did not want to do something totally unrealistic, so those numbers are adjusted.

This shows that the careful work of the House Committee on the Budget was recognized as being completely appropriate, and was a thoughtful way of reprioritizing basic research in science.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and am delighted to support the budget. Vote "yes."

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, over half the cuts in the Republican tax bill go to people with incomes over \$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], who has done more in support of the balanced budget than any other Member of the House.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67, laying out the Federal budget for 1996.

I have had high hopes all year long about the possibility of actually voting for a balanced budget this year. I did offer and vote for one balanced budget that I believed in a month ago and, with a sense of incurable optimism, I expect to vote for a balanced budget reconciliation bill before this year is over. But this conference agreement before us is not a budget I can vote for.

First and foremost, I cannot vote for it because I am not convinced it will in fact reach balance. The deficit reduction does not even come until the third year out. The tax cuts, of course, come immediately and with the rule we passed just now, the budget doesn't even have to meet an honest CBO test as has been advertised.

Second, I cannot vote for this budget because I honestly don't understand it. The conference report tells us what outlays, revenues and the deficit will be, but it does not tell us what reductions must be made. I will use Agriculture as an example because that is the subject I know best but still I cannot understand the requirements on ag in this conference agreement.

The report instructs the Committee on Agriculture to "report changes in laws within its jurisdiction" such that outlays do not exceed \$10.5 billion in

fiscal year 1996, \$44.7 billion from fiscal year 1996-2000, and \$59.2 billion from fiscal year 1996-2002 for direct spending programs other than food stamps. Does this mean the Committee on Agriculture is to rewrite all direct spending legislation, whether it is being reduced or not? This is a tall—many would say impossible—order to accomplish before September 22.

Or, are we to infer some reduction from baseline spending—a reduction which cannot be calculated from this conference report? Or, is there a far greater reduction than the \$1 billion reduction in fiscal year 1996 and \$8.5 billion reduction over 5 years that we've been told this budget requires?

Mandatory spending other than food stamps for the Agriculture Committee totals \$26.9 billion in fiscal year 1996 and \$136.4 billion through fiscal year 2002, according to Congressional Budget Office computer runs. That means this budget will force a reduction of \$16.4 billion in fiscal year 1996 and \$91.7 billion over 5 years—numbers which are wildly off from the cuts stated by Republicans. I would love to have clarification from the chairman about the task my committee will have before us, as I am sure all other committees would like as well.

Third, I cannot vote for this budget because I cannot accept the level of reductions in Medicaid, Medicare, Education, and Agriculture which are required to meet the demands of the tax cut included.

And finally, I cannot vote for this budget because I believe this budget is a political statement, not realistic policy. Absolutely everyone knows that a reconciliation bill which follows the guidelines included in this budget cannot possibly be signed into law. That means we are just here playing a political game, making a political statement to be used at the polls. Reconciliation will be passed, the President will veto it, the veto will be sustained, and then everyone, having made their political statements, will finally get down to business. Why do we have to play that game? Why can't we just get down to making policy for the good of our country from the start? If it takes a budget summit, let's get one started. But for the sake of our country, let us get beyond statements and into doing the right thing.

Unfortunately, I must urge my colleagues to vote no on this budget so that we can get to work on the ultimate real budget that everyone knows must be agreed to.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for yielding the time. I would like to speak to the area of national defense for just a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 10 years, we have seen a substantial reduction in

each of the 10 years in our national defense budget. The President's budget request for fiscal year 1996 would have been the 11th year that there would have been a decline in our defense budget, at the same time that our deployments are increasing. The President just today announced another \$50 million worth of commitment to a rapid reaction force for Bosnia. I just want to tell my colleagues. That we cannot continue to do more with less.

We had hoped to make a strong turn in the direction of our national defense this year, and thanks to Speaker GINGRICH, and chairman KASICH we are going to be able to do that. We are going to make that change. During the discussion and debate with the other body and the budgeteers there, Speaker GINGRICH was very persuasive and argued strongly for keeping a strong national defense number.

But I think our colleagues need to know that the 602(b) allocation that my subcommittee had under the original budget resolution was about \$2.5 billion under what you included in the authorizing bill a few weeks ago. And we anticipate that our new 602(b) number will be, based on this conference report, will be \$2.5 billion less than that, or a total of \$5 billion less than what we voted in the authorization bill here just a few weeks ago.

The point is that a lot of things that Members would like to do and see included in the defense appropriations bill are not going to be done, because the money is just not going to be there under this budget resolution.

I am going to vote for it, because it does make the change in the direction. So this will not be an 11th year decline.

But Members need to be aware, there is just not going to be as much defense money out there to spend as many of our colleagues believe that there will be.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I compliment the gentleman and the Speaker for the good job they have done in helping to hold the defense number in conference as well as they did.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, today we will consider the short-sighted conference report on the 1996 federal budget resolution.

One of its many misjudgments is its failure to invest in the census and related statistics-gathering programs.

Yesterday, the Appropriations Committee cut the budget request for the Census Bureau by almost 25 percent—a cut that would severely damage the chance for an accurate census in the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, in the realm of statistics, what you measure is what you get. By failing to provide adequate funding for the census, this budget resolution ensures that we will get an

inaccurate portrait of our Nation in the year 2000. Those inaccuracies will affect the many national decisions that are based on census data—from deciding where to build roads, schools, and hospitals, to deciding how to shape the very districts we represent, an issue of particular currency in light of this morning's Supreme Court decision.

Mr. Speaker, 1996 will be a pivotal year for the Census Bureau, as it moves from the planning stage into the operational mode for the 2000 enumeration. In 1996, the Census Bureau must design the next census, and procure the new technologies to carry it out. Moreover, in 1996, the Census Bureau must evaluate the data gathered this year from three test Census sites around the country, where the Bureau has conducted surveys that will help refine the census process for the nationwide enumeration at the turn of the century. Mr. Speaker, this under-funding of the census is just one of the many areas where the Republican budget plan would enforce misguided priorities. And it is just one of the many reasons that I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting "No" on this conference report.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], one of the senior members of our committee, an outstanding member of the Committee on the Budget and a good friend.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we are really embarking on a crusade here today of sorts. Unfortunately, we do not know what the results are going to be.

Mr. Speaker, do senior citizens understand that that Republican budget resolution conference report means higher out-of-pocket health care costs for millions of seniors on fixed incomes? It's true; the average senior will pay between \$2,500 and \$3,500 more each year. And senior citizens' traditional rights under Medicare to choose their own doctor could also be threatened.

Do middle-class families understand what \$10 billion in cuts to the Student Loan Program could mean to their efforts to educate their sons and daughters?

The Republicans are telling the American people that Medicare is being protected by these cutbacks. But people have to wonder how this can be, when Medicare will be left with barely enough funding to keep up with inflation. There will not be enough money to keep pace with higher medical inflation; or with the cost of new, life-saving technologies; or with the growth in Medicare population numbers. And that means either benefits will be cut back, or seniors will have to pay more.

Do Americans understand where these dramatic cuts to health, education, research, and development are going? The answer is simple: The extra \$100 billion is going to subsidize Republican tax breaks for big business and the wealthy.

The American people are bound to ask themselves, "Where were the Republicans in 1993?"—when not a single one voted for the tough OBRA 1993 plan

that both protected Medicare's solvency through the end of the decade, and produced nearly one-half trillion dollars in deficit reduction?

That is why it is all the more ironic that today, the Republicans are demanding that we slash the heart out of Medicare; cut \$10 billion from the Student Loan Program; cut one-third of Federal funding for nondefense research and development; and keep the National Institutes of Health from expanding its research on women's health, breast cancer, heart disease, and prostate cancer. All this is supposed to be necessary in order to help protect our future.

Don't you believe it. Don't let the Republicans make Medicare, student loans, and other valuable investment programs into a cash cow, simply in order to fulfill their campaign promises. The American people will understand what we do here today, and they will thank us for voting "no" on this misguided budget resolution.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1415

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

I might just add, parenthetically at the outset of my remarks, the comments that were made by the chairman and ranking member about each other and about the work of this committee I think is perhaps a lesson that all of us, considering the last 24 hours in this body, might take to heart. We can have differences; we can have good philosophical discussions about those differences, but we can do it in the context of advancing the agenda for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution conference report—a historic agreement that establishes a 7-year balanced budget framework.

This conference report provides much-needed tax relief to America's families by allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned money in their pockets. It encourages economic growth by reducing Government regulation and eliminating inefficient programs. It protects and preserves Medicare—a system that will go broke in 7 years. And it puts our States and the American people—not the Federal Government—back in the driver's seat where they belong. Simply put, this agreement is more than a fiscal strategy for 1996-2002. It is a document that conveys an underlying philosophy about limiting Government's role in America's future.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans took their lead from the November elections and set out early this year to offer the American people a vision for our children's future. We asked ourselves fundamental questions about what role

the Federal Government ought to play in our lives because, clearly, it had overstepped its bounds. The result of months of review and discussions is the document before us today—which makes fundamental, systemic reforms that gets the Federal Government back to living within its means.

Make no mistake, this blueprint reflects decisions that were both sensible and painstaking. And as expected, reaction has been both supportive and critical. Critics are welcome to challenge this plan, in its scope or its detail; that is part of the needed debate. But in fairness, a principle set down by the President in 1993 ought to be followed: Those who would criticize this plan should be required to offer their own alternative—with the same level of comprehensiveness and specificity—to balance the Federal budget by 2002. That didn't occur—at least not until the process was so advanced that the President's proposal was meaningless.

If you believe in lifting the yoke of dependency fashioned by the welfare state and replacing it with an opportunity society; if you believe in restoring freedom by ending centralized bureaucratic micromanagement; if you believe in enhancing prosperity, economic growth, and take-home pay by reducing taxes, litigation, and regulation; then vote for this conference report.

The pursuit of a balanced budget is much more than a numbers game. It is a catalyst for reevaluating the Government down to its core and getting Government back to living within its means. This conference report achieves this goal. And while passage of this conference agreement is just one step in a long process, it moves us one step closer to accountability—fiscal accountability—which has evaded Congress for far too long.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution conference agreement.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], the new father in our caucus, the person who does not put Will to sleep by singing lullabies but by giving him a lecture on the budget process. And it works.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. I oppose this resolution for the simple reason that it makes no progress in reducing the deficit over the next 2 years. This budget is a clear triumph of rhetoric over achievement.

The official numbers released to the press show modest deficit reduction over the next few years. However, these numbers do not include the effect of the \$245 billion in tax cuts contained in the budget. This understates the projected deficits by at least \$75 billion. Worse, if the CBO economic bonus never materializes, this understates the deficit by \$245 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this violates the principle of "pay as you go." Worse, it hides the true reality of the deficits in the conference report. Because after adding in tax cuts, even with the economic bonus, the Republican budget projections show that we will only reduce the deficit from \$175 billion today to \$174.2 billion 2 years from now.

At this rate of deficit reduction, the deficit will not be eliminated for 437 years. Even more disturbing is the fact that if interest rates do not fall significantly or we have a recession, the deficit will actually go up.

Words are cheap. Performance is what counts. I refer you to this chart.

Since President Clinton took office in 1992, with democratic leadership in Congress, we have reduced the deficit from \$290 billion in 1992 to \$175 billion in the current fiscal year. That is a 40 percent reduction. Under the conference report, if everything goes right, if interest rates fall dramatically, if we avoid a recession, if we make deficit cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and education, all called for in the budget, we will make absolutely no progress on deficit reduction in the next 2 years.

This Congress will be able to go home, having cut taxes but not cut the deficit. I urge a no vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996.

I oppose this resolution for the simple reason that it does not make progress in reducing the deficit over the next 2 to 3 years. The budget we will be voting on today is a clear triumph of rhetoric over achievement, and it has been presented in a way that is nothing more than blue smoke and mirrors.

Let me explain why. The official numbers released to the press show modest deficit reduction over the next few years. However, these numbers do not include the effect of the \$245 billion in tax cuts that are contained in the budget.

Let me repeat; that the numbers being presented on the floor of the House today deliberately omit the effect of the \$245 billion in tax cuts called for in the resolution. This understates the projected deficits by at least \$75 billion. Worse, if the CBO economic bonus never materializes, this understates the deficit by \$245 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this violates the principle of pay-as-you-go. Worse, it masks the true reality of the deficits in the conference report. Because, after adding in tax cuts, even with economic bonus, the Republican budget projections show that we will only reduce the deficit from \$175 billion today to \$174.2 billion 2 years from now, a reduction of a mere \$800 million over the next 2 years.

At this rate of deficit reduction, the deficit will not be eliminated for 437 years. Even more disturbing is the fact that if interest rates do not fall significantly or if a recession occurs, the deficit will actually go up over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, words are cheap, performance is what counts. I call your attention to the following chart. Since President Clinton took over in 1992, while the Democrats were in power, we have reduced the Federal deficit from

\$290.4 billion in fiscal year 1992 to a projected deficit of \$175 billion in the current fiscal year. This is a reduction of 40 percent.

Now let's look at the conference report. If everything goes right—if interest rates fall dramatically, if we avoid a recession, if we make the significant cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and education called for in the budget—we will make absolutely no progress on deficit reduction in the next 2 years. And, if there is the slightest blip in the economy, or the projections don't come true, deficits will actually increase.

Last month, I co-offered the coalition budget resolution. It is clear that the coalition budget offers a far superior approach for deficit reduction and for fair and shared sacrifice. Like the Conference report, the coalition budget projects a balance by 2002. However the coalition budget cuts deficits by \$100 billion more than the conference report. It provides a true glidepath—not the cliff of deficit reduction in the conference report. And, it cuts \$35 billion from the deficit over the next 2 years, real progress compared to the running in place approach of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough of tax cuts first, followed by the mere promise of deficit reduction. The people have had enough of multiyear budgets that promise the world in the out years, but make no interim progress. Let's reject this budget and pass one with meaningful progress on deficit reduction.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference budget report.

There is a new breeze coming across this land. The tax and spend policies of the Democrats is over and the "balance the budget and reduce the burden first" policy is in place. No nation has ever taxed itself into prosperity. Who knew that better than President Kennedy, the leader of your party.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed budget delineates the boldest, most ambitious fiscal blueprint this body has seen in decades. I assure you our plan will turn our country around, propelling America into the next century, once again as the world's strongest and most prosperous nation.

My colleagues, I urge you and implore you to pass this budget. If you look at this chart, you will see there is indeed a path, not 432 years, as mentioned by the opposition, the loyal opposition, but, indeed, we do balance the budget.

My colleagues, many of our Nation's governors, including Governors Whitman, Weld, Engler, and Thompson have included tax breaks as integral components of their State economic growth plan as well as President Kennedy.

There is no good reason to accept the premise, they said in a letter to the Committee on the Budget, "that current taxes are set at exactly the right level. We think taxes are too high.

It is no coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of Governor Whit-

man's state of New Jersey are among the wealthiest in the nation. We must follow through with our tax cut. Do not listen to the rhetoric that taxes are only for the rich. They benefit all Americans, all working Americans. We must decrease their burden.

In the end, we must keep our promise to America. When we do so, let us not expect the American people to thank us. For all we have done, it is really nothing more than simply returning to them what is rightfully theirs.

Mr. Speaker, the 1980's should have taught us all a very valuable lesson. The 1981 Reagan tax cut sparked the longest peacetime economic expansion in U.S. history. If there were any skeptics about the power of tax cuts to boost economic growth before the 1980's, they certainly were silenced by the Reagan revolution's sterling success. This is not mere ideological grandstanding, Mr. Chairman, this is fact. All Americans—even those in the lowest income brackets—experienced real and dramatic growth while Reagan was president.

It is unfortunate, but these lessons went unlearned by the Bush and Clinton administrations. Their capitulation to demands by Democratic-controlled Congresses that Federal spending and taxes increase produced significant economic difficulties, including a prolonged recession and income stagnation. Amazingly, under the Clinton administration, incomes decreased while the economy grew.

Tax-and-spend policies simply do not work. On the contrary, it is only by reducing taxes that we can spur economic growth and increase American wages. No nation has ever taxed itself into prosperity. Kennedy knew it, Reagan knew it, and this House knows it: tax cuts work.

Mr. Chairman, the House-passed budget delineates the boldest, most ambitious fiscal blueprint that this body has seen in decades. I assure you, our plan would turn our country around, propelling America into the next century once again as the world's strongest and most prosperous Nation. My colleagues, I urge you, I implore you: this plan and adopt the House-passed tax cuts without—I repeat, without—conditions.

The Senate plan throws the baby out with the bath water. It is premised on the notion that we have a deficit not because the Government spends too much, but because the American people are taxed too little. I couldn't disagree more. The tax burden on the American people is too high. In 1948, the average family in America paid 3 percent of its income to the Federal Government. Today that same family is forced to pay 25 percent. My colleagues, the Speaker has called tax cuts the crown jewel of the Contract With America, but they are more than the crown jewel, they are the whole tiara.

My colleagues, we must understand that tax cuts and deficit reduction are not an either/or proposition. We can do both, and we should do both. Despite the protests of those who embrace a static view of the economy, tax cuts will not only spur the economy forward, they will yield the Treasury additional revenue as well. Many of our Nation's governors, including Governors Whitman, Weld, Engler, and Thompson, have included tax breaks as integral components of their State economic-growth plans. As they wrote in a recent letter

to Congress, "There is no good reason to accept the premise that current taxes are set at exactly the right level. We think * * * taxes are too high." It is no coincidence, Mr. Chairman, that the citizens of Governor Whitman's State of New Jersey are among the wealthiest in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues have argued eloquently today that now is not the time for tax cuts, that we cannot afford them. My colleagues, the fact is we cannot afford not to cut taxes. Now is no time for cold feet. We must follow through with our tax cuts. We must decrease the tax burden on families. We must keep our promise to the American people. And when we do so, let us not expect the people to thank us, for we will have done nothing great; we will have simply returned to them what is rightfully theirs.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from my native State of North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the budget represented in the conference report.

There were several ways this Congress could have reached a balanced budget, including a proposal I supported in the House, one introduced by Senator CONRAD in the Senate and the one advanced by President Clinton. Unfortunately, Speaker GINGRICH has put before us the version that gives tax breaks to America's most privileged while socking it to the middle class with deep reductions in the Medicare Program, cuts in student loans and many, many other vital areas.

I doubt there are hard-working middle-class families anywhere in this country that will take it harder than those I represent, those working very hard on family farms across North Dakota.

Under this plan, funding for agriculture is dangerously, recklessly slashed. According to an analysis of their proposal by North Dakota State University, it projects land values falling 50 percent as farmers can no longer make an adequate income in light of the sharp reductions. Farmers that have farmed their land for generations will be forced off their lands, not just in North Dakota but across rural America.

It is not just farmers either that are taking these vicious hits. It is the very warp and fabric of rural America. The Medicare cuts will close rural hospitals. The Medicaid cuts will close nursing homes. Rural development assistance, so vital to diversifying our economies, also due to be slashed.

One Republican suburban Member of this body revealed the thinking of the majority as they hit rural America so completely. He says, and I quote:

Not everyone needs to be connected to the U.S. Postal Service. If it is too expensive to deliver to some spot in North Dakota, then those residents can do without it.

This budget will take away farms. This budget will take away rural hospitals. This budget will wipe out critical services in rural America, some even advocate eliminating postal service.

Rural America has been sold out. It is a bad budget for our country.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], a freshman Member.

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

I was hesitant at first to support this budget resolution. While I stand among revolutionaries, I did not think this was revolutionary enough. The people on November 8 wanted us to change the way Government was running. They wanted us to downsize Government and give Government back to the people.

I am heading up a task force of great Americans that is trying to abolish the Department of Energy because, according to Vice President GORE, it is 40 percent inefficient. Over the next 30 years it is going to cost us \$70 billion unless we do something with it. I did not see it initially in this budget resolution. But after looking through the details, I found out that this is a very good plan, and it is in the details. The Senate is not as excited about it yet, but there is room to work with these details.

This starts the process of giving Government back to the people. I think that is what people want here in America. That is what they said on November 8. It balances the budget in 7 years.

It returns hope to World War II generations, my father. It returns hope to me, the babyboomer generation. And it returns hope to generation X, my children, so that we do not pass the burden on to them.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], one of the very able new Members of our committee who represents her state of California in distinguished fashion.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, once again with this conference report the House is being asked to vote yes or no on the following question: Should we take child nutrition away from our kids, college aid away from our students and their families, and health care away from seniors so that the wealthy special interests can get a tax giveaway? And once again, I expect that Members of the Republican majority will answer with a resounding yes.

Despite public opposition, they probably have the votes to pass this conference report and continue their assault on America's children, seniors, and middle income families. But let me promise the authors of this reckless budget, on behalf of the millions of Americans who will be hurt by it, we will be back.

This vote is just one step in the budget process, Mr. Speaker. We have a long summer ahead of us. The final details will not be settled until the fall. But every day families are learning that this budget takes food away from their children. Every day college students are organizing, and they will keep fighting until the Republican majority

realizes the insanity involved in shutting the classroom door on college kids in order to open up tax loopholes for large profitable corporations. We all know that America's seniors will not sit quietly this summer while Republicans take away their health security.

We have a long way to go before this reckless budget becomes a reality, Mr. Speaker. I promise you that we will be back.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report, a report that takes away from children, seniors, and middle income families to give tax breaks to the wealthiest.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], a member of the Committee on the Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, last fall we promised the American people we would reduce the size of government, zero out the deficit and provide tax relief. And today we are keeping that promise. While this joint budget agreement does not go as far as some of us may have liked, I believe this agreement is a major victory. This budget puts us on a path to a zero budget by the year 2002 and begins to move people from welfare to work, saving \$100 billion. We have cut discretionary spending by \$190 billion, and we have already started to cut back foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, this budget provides \$245 billion in tax relief, including a \$500-per-child tax credit, tax relief for our seniors and incentives for economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our children and our grandchildren, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this balanced budget.

□ 1430

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. This bill is ill-advised and should be defeated.

I strongly support balancing the Federal budget. Earlier this year I voted for the Orton-Stenholm balanced budget, which reduced Federal spending in an equitable and responsible manner. There is a right way and wrong way to balance the budget and this budget before us is the wrong way.

This agreement assumes a tax cut of \$245 billion over 7 years. It is wrong to cut benefits for seniors, low-income families, veterans, college students, NASA, and medical research to pay for a tax cut that will benefit the wealthiest in our society.

All Americans are willing to sacrifice to balance the budget, but this is not a fair budget. This budget agreement will hurt Texas, and I cannot support it.

The budget agreement will cut \$270 billion in Medicare over 7 years. The agreement will cut Medicaid by \$182 billion over 7 years.

Senior citizens under Medicare will pay more for the same benefits. Seniors will pay higher deductibles, copayments, and premiums. Additionally, senior citizens who rely on Medicaid for long-term care in nursing homes will see their benefits cut and fewer families will receive this necessary care.

These cuts in Medicare will also affect teaching hospitals and providers. Reductions in Medicare will cut \$2.4 billion in lower reimbursements for indirect medical education and direct medical education. The University of Texas system has estimated it will lose funding of \$21 million. These teaching facilities, which I represent, cannot replace these dollars. Private insurers are not willing to pay for this medical education which we benefit from.

These cuts in Medicaid will reduce reimbursements funding for 13 of Houston's hospitals by \$1.16 billion. Estimates of these cuts are a reduction of \$196 million for Harris County Hospital District, \$163 million cut from Texas Children's Hospital, \$141 million cut from Hermann Hospital, \$31 million cut from M.D. Anderson Hospital, \$17 million cut from St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital, and \$17 million cut from Methodist Hospital.

The budget agreement will reduce spending for NASA, a major employer for the Houston area which I represent. NASA recently experienced cuts of 3,200 personnel at the Johnson Space Center. Under this budget, NASA will receive \$700 million less next year to build the space station and continue important scientific research. In future years, the cuts for NASA are even higher. Administrator Dan Goldin has told me that NASA cannot absorb these cuts without massive personnel cuts, and will have to eliminate centers and programs to meet these targets.

This budget agreement assumes that college students should start paying interest on their student loans before they attend a class, or buy a book. This is short sighted and wrong. An average student will pay \$5000 more for their education. Many middle-class families cannot afford these increased costs. It makes no sense to argue that this budget resolution will increase investment through tax breaks for the wealthy while cutting student loans and education programs which invest in the future of our people, the most vital ingredient of our Nation's economy.

This budget agreement will reduce funding for medical research. The agreement cuts \$100 million next year and even more in the following years from the National Institutes of Health. Medical research centers such as the Texas Medical Center cannot sustain these cuts. Valuable research projects will be stopped and new investments in cures for dreaded diseases such as cancer and AIDS will not be made.

Finally, I am concerned that this budget agreement will not reduce our Federal deficit quickly. The conference report cuts the deficit by \$800 million over 2 years. In order to balance the budget, we need to reduce spending by \$1 trillion over 7 years. \$800 million is not a good down-payment on paying down our debt. The Orton-Stenholm balanced budget will result in \$100 billion lower cumulative deficits than the conference report. Let me repeat that, \$100 billion less in debt. The Orton-Stenholm budget also cuts \$100 billion less in Medicare than the conference report, and \$43 billion less in Medicaid.

The conference report delays making the tough choices, which Congress must act upon. The Republican budget does not cut programs until years 5, 6, and 7 of the budget cycle. I believe that Congress will not follow through with these difficult cuts. If we enact tax cuts, we will have fewer revenues to lower our Federal debt.

I believe that all Americans are willing to sacrifice and share in the burden to balance the budget. However, this agreement failed to fairly distribute these cuts. It trades severe cuts in Medicare, veterans, and students for tax cuts for the wealthy and continues to expand our debt. That is wrong, and I urge the defeat of this budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD], a very thoughtful, hard-working new member of our committee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Republican conference report that pays for a \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, by slashing services and incentives for the elderly, the young, and the working poor.

Our Nation's greatness is not measured by improving the living standards of just the wealthy but of all Americans. This budget cuts investments in health care, child nutrition, and work incentives.

First, Medicaid that mainly serves poor seniors, disabled, and children, is capped at 4 percent. This is simply insufficient to offset the rapid growth of the needy and rising health care costs.

Second, it cuts nutrition programs in a way that threatens the health of children and, eventually, the health of our economy. Hungry children cannot learn and grow into productive working adults.

Third, proposed cuts in the earned income tax credit [EITC] will weaken an important incentive for people to work. President Reagan called the EITC "the best job-creation measure to come out of Congress."

These misguided cuts to benefit the wealthy are indefensible. I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget conference agreement.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Washington, Ms. JENNIFER DUNN.

Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, today we take a historic step in reducing the size of the Federal Government, providing families and employers with badly needed tax relief and erasing the Federal budget deficit. Today we are outlining a path to the future that restores both hope and opportunity for future generations.

We are dramatically changing the fiscal direction of our country. From a path of out-of-control growth of Government to a path of sustained expansion of the economy and job creation. Achieving a balanced budget will produce lower interest rates, higher productivity, improved purchasing power for all Americans, more exports and accelerated long-term growth. That will revive the American Dream.

In addition to reducing Government spending and eliminating the deficit, we are providing incentives for growth of our economy. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, the Clinton administration imposed the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, placed squarely on the backs of the American people. Those tax increases took real money out of the pockets of real American families. Recent estimates suggest that with a balanced budget, our GDP would rise by an extra 2.5 percent over the next decade. This translates into an extra \$1,000 a year for every American family household.

This budget resolution unlocks the door to a prosperous, deficit-free future. Real incomes will grow faster, long-term interest rates will fall significantly, and Americans can once again look forward to their children doing better than they. With my two sons in mind as well as the generation that will follow them, I am proud to support this balanced budget resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], an enthusiastic, hard-working new member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, just a word about the tax-and-spend Republican budget resolution. Yes, tax and spend. That is a term we hear so much thrown against this side, but this is a tax-and-spend budget resolution for many Americans. It has been interesting, in listening through the course of this debate, not to have heard one word from our Republican colleagues about the 14 million American families that the Treasury Department estimates will have their taxes not cut but increased through what is being proposed in this budget resolution, about the earned income tax credit, the earned income tax credit, something that no less a revolutionary than Ronald Reagan described as the best jobs program ever devised by man. That program they propose to give a good whack to.

I have been concerned about the impact of raising, not lowering taxes, for people like the Kierklewski family, that are struggling to get up the economic ladder, that are struggling to reach retirement. Of course, there are some who will benefit from their version of eliminating tax and spend. The large corporations that will not have to pay a nickel with their elimination of the minimum tax credit, they are getting a tax break, but not the Kierklewski family.

What about the spend part of their resolution? Yes, they are cutting some Government spending, but they are going to spend a little more of Mr. Kierklewski's money. If he wants to go to his own doctor, he is going to have to pay maybe \$20 a month more just for the opportunity to do that, as a Medicare recipient. If he wants home health care, they are going to spend more of

his money if he wants to get the same level of service.

What is so unfortunate about that for retirees, Mr. Speaker, is that they are already having to pay 21 percent of their health care costs. One out of every \$5 already being spent by Medicare recipients is their money, so the tax-and-spend budget resolution needs to be rejected, even if we have to stay here all of another night to fight this stacking of the committees that will implement this resolution.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the committee and thank the chairman for their great work. We have been on track from the very start, right through the conference committee. That was that we have a balanced budget by 2002.

We have kept our word. We have dealt with real numbers. We have said, "Okay, we can create a good balance in this particular budget proposal by saying we need tax cuts. If we keep more of the revenue at home we can create more opportunity by cutting spending, so people lean more on their own shoulders instead of having to lean on the shoulders of government."

I really, honestly believe this is an opportunity budget. We are creating more opportunity and more freedoms for Americans. Mr. Speaker, we heard testimony in committee that said that the one thing we could do to really create confidence in America would be to balance our budget. It was Alan Greenspan who said that. We are doing that. We are putting us on track to restore confidence in this country, and to make people more responsible for their own lives.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the conference report on the budget, because I want to balance the budget and I want to be fair. Although the language in the conference report is an improvement over the House budget resolution, it still contains a fatal flaw, \$245 billion in tax cuts which will delay the benefit our constituents will get from deficit reduction.

As someone who voted for both rescission bills this year, I do not believe that tax cuts are warranted until we have implemented tough spending decisions. Taxes today, and we should remember this, take out of the economy less than they did 25 years ago. When Richard Nixon was President in 1970,

Federal taxes consumed 19.6 percent of the gross domestic product. Today the percentage is smaller, 19.2 percent.

What is more, the Republican plan backloads deficit reduction until after the year 2000, but gives away an easy tax cut immediately. The tax cut increases the deficit in 1997, and hopes to pay for deficit reduction in the final 2 years.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished young gentleman from the Empire State, New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know everyone is very tired after being in for over 30 hours, but it is important to straighten out certain misconceptions that have been laid out on the floor so far by some of my friends. For example, there has been some criticism, some implicit criticism that somehow the numbers do not add up for the Republican budget.

Let me tell the Members, those numbers do not come from Republican staffers, they come from the Congressional Budget Office, the same Congressional Budget Office that President Clinton in this room lectured Republican Members about the accuracy, how important that was and how accurate those numbers are. These are numbers that come from the Congressional Budget Office. They verify that we get to a balanced budget by 2002.

There are some people who have talked about cutting student aid and cutting student loans. There are no cuts in any student aid package in this budget. There has been some suggestion somehow that tax cuts go to the wealthy. Eighty-seven and a half percent of the child tax credits for young working families are going to go to families making under \$75,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a positive budget for the average people of America. Economists agree that a balanced budget will lower interest rates, increase investment, allow for a higher standard of living for our children and grandchildren. According to Alan Greenspan, who testified before our committee, productivity would accelerate, the inflation rate would be subdued, financial markets would be more solid, and the underlying outlook would be generally improved for underlying economic growth if this budget is balanced. Is that something we could not all agree on as an objective? Real incomes would improve, taxes would fall, and Americans will be able to look forward to their children doing better than they. What better promise can we deliver for our children?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support the conference agreement on House Concurrent Resolution 67, which steers us on a true course toward a balanced budget in 2002. This historic budget resolution accomplishes many goals, but one of the most important is that it demonstrates our strong commitment to keeping the promises we made to the American people.

We promised to balance the budget, and this is the crucial first step in that process. It

is a tough, but fair and forward-thinking plan. Every part of the country—urban and rural—is impacted.

This budget achieves a zero deficit by 2002 without touching Social Security, while at the same time cutting taxes for America's hard-working families, and preserving, protecting, and strengthening the Medicare program.

Although President Clinton's second budget proposal fails to reach balance, at least he finally agrees with Congress and the American people that the budget needs to be balanced, middle-class families need tax relief, and that the Medicare and Medicaid programs need to be strengthened in order to preserve their existence.

A balanced budget is the surest strategy to increase productivity and living standards by increasing national savings in America.

Although this is an important landmark, we must remember that our work has only just begun. Only when the budget is totally balanced will we have completely fulfilled our mandate and protected the future of our children.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago this body faced a difficult task when the American savings and loan industry had to be rescued. Leaders in Congress and elsewhere ignored warnings that something was wrong and continued business as usual, recognizing the crisis only after it had happened. The result was a disaster that cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to say it is happening again. We are facing a crisis that is even more inevitable than what we faced with the savings and loans: HUD's portfolio of insured section 8 project-based properties.

The tale of how we got where we are is a classic example of the law of unintended consequences. Few in 1974, when the authorizing legislation was passed, could have foreseen what would happen to the real estate market in the 1980's, nor could they reliably predict other elements in the market.

What the Congress created in 1974 was meant to provide affordable housing to needy Americans. It has become, however, a financial time bomb that is about to explode with tens of billions of dollars in consequences.

The problem with the combination of section 8 subsidies and FHA multifamily mortgage insurance is that it places the Government on both ends of the deal. It's a catch-22: we have to lower the inflated subsidies to market rates in order to achieve savings, but if we lower the subsidies thoughtlessly we risk defaults that could cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars.

When the House Budget Committee, of which I am a member, met this spring to discuss budget options, I raised the section 8 contract renewal issue. It is a problem without an easy solution and, try as we did, there is no way to show short-term savings.

I supported resolving the situation created by section 8 and FHA multifamily insurance by returning the properties to market discipline because it is the least objectionable of the choices we face. I am glad to say that my colleagues on the House Budget Committee realized the gravity of the situation and were willing to address the crisis honestly. We may not like it, but it may well be our only alternative.

But we cannot be swayed from addressing this situation honestly. We need to resolve this problem now because if we don't mark these

properties to market, we are only holding off the inevitable for a few years at best. It could also mean we would risk consequences far more severe than purely financial—we risk the displacement of hundreds of thousands of families.

We should realize that nearly half of these units house elderly or disabled people. Throwing these people out on the street for short-term budgetary gain is not an acceptable option.

I am disappointed in the other body for their support of the status quo throughout the budget conference. Simply renewing the contracts may temporarily hold off the flood, but what we are really doing is nothing more than putting our finger in the dike and ignoring the fact that, finger or no finger, the seawall is crumbling around us.

We had hoped to address this issue in the reconciliation process because of the pay-go rules. As it is, we cannot avoid a mandatory expense because cutting subsidies will mean claims against the FHA fund. There is no way around that.

We have to be honest and realize that the solution, in the short term, may be more expensive than the status quo. But not resolving this quickly will mean we are only continuing along a path of short-sighted quick-fixes that fail us in the long run.

The current system is bad for tenants, bad for the markets, and is downright irresponsible to the taxpayers of this country.

When American voters spoke last November, they asked us to be honest and make tough choices. The time has come to make good on our promise to do just that. As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, I intend to make sure that happens in a balanced, fair manner.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I, like everyone else in this Congress, have a family, and I think we all do our utmost to make sure that, as we balance our family budgets, as we must do at the end of every year, we have planned for our future, not just for our present.

I must tell the Members, when I take a look at what is before us today in terms of a budget for the family of America, I do not see this comporting to what the needs are for all the families of America. In my family, as my parents did, our parents did, I plan for the two children that I have right now to go on to college. I prepare for the illnesses that my spouse, my wife or my kids may face. We must plan for that day when it rains a little bit more than we expect, and we need that extra cash.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see this in this budget. What I do see is \$245 billion in tax breaks, mostly going to people who are wealthy in this country. I do see cuts of \$10 billion, yes, \$10 billion in cuts for education, for college, and I see \$270 billion in cuts for Medicare, for our elderly, and \$180 billion in Medicaid for our elderly and our poor.

That is not planning the way my parents would do it, the way my family

would do it, not any family in America would do it. I urge the Members to reject this budget proposal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Cleveland, OH [Mr. HOKE], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, maybe it is that we have been up all night, but this debate has been kind of snoozy. The fact is that we are doing something that is so extraordinary and so unusual. There are some of us who are a little upset about it, because 7 years is a long time. If this was the private sector, if this was business, and we had to downsize over a 7-year period to get our books in order, we would be out of business. We would be kaput.

It is government, so we are going to drag our heels a little bit and take time, but we are doing it. We are doing it. It is the first time in 25 years. It is phenomenal. It is incredible. I admit, we have all been up all night long, 38 hours, 36 hours, whatever. The fact is we are going to have a balanced budget for the United States of America, for our children, for our grandchildren. We are actually recapitulating what we done over 200 years ago, no taxation without representation. Let us celebrate it.

For heaven's sakes, please, if Members honestly believe that this somehow drags money out of the mouths of babes and the elderly, they have always got to see the glass as being completely half empty.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. What we are facing here is class warfare, and the warfare is on the middle class, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. On page 74 of the conference report, it talks about \$10 billion in outlays over the next 7 years being reduced from the student loan program, a 20-percent cut in job training funds, \$270 billion cut out of Medicare, so what are we doing here? We are going to cut taxes for the top 1 percent, your mother and father are going to lose Medicare benefits, your kids are not going to be able to get a student loan, and when you lose your job and try to get job training funds, they are going to be gone, too.

□ 1445

So what are we doing here? It is very simple. This is a war on the middle class so that we can get a tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent again. It is just what they did in the early 1980's. It ballooned the deficit. It did not balance it. And it hurts the country.

People who work for a living have a right to expect that their parents will get decent medical care, that their kids can go to college, and that they can get retrained.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is about time. This budget resolution reduces the annual deficit over 7 years and reaches a balanced budget in 2002, without attempting a tax increase. Indeed, it contemplates a cumulative tax reduction of approximately \$245 billion over the 7 years of the budget as a partial offset to the huge tax increase of 2 years ago. This is a very positive step and signifies a turning of the ship of state from what Hayek called the Road to Serfdom in his classic 1945 work of government overspending. But, in another sense, it showcases the growth of our Federal Government over the last 25 years. This budget calls for total outlays of \$1.587 trillion in 1996, and is seen as a bare bones budget. To put this in perspective, total Federal outlays did not reach \$100 billion until 1962. It then only took a little more than a quarter of a century to reach \$1 trillion. Seventeen years later, we have a situation where net interest on the national debt exceeds the entire Federal budget of 1974.

The passage of this budget resolution is a signal that the new Congress has recognized the effects of our huge Federal debt, yet, by the time the debt stops growing in 2002, the debt will have grown to \$6.7 trillion. While this budget accomplishes a great deal, there is a great deal more to be done. As we move forward we should keep in mind the words of Dr. DICK ARMEY, in his book he wrote in the 20th century "The Freedom Revolution": "The people themselves, not their government, should be trusted with spending their own money and making their own decisions."

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I along with a lot of my colleagues very much want to support a responsible, reasonable and balanced plan to balance the budget. While there are many positive aspects of this budget, and it represents a clear improvement over the budget that was initially passed by the House, I have concluded that the conference report still falls far short of its goal.

Under this conference report, 2 years from now the budget deficit will be the same as it is today. More importantly, this budget takes credit for \$170 billion of economic bonus whether or not CBO concludes that it deserves the credit.

While I agree that we need to reform Medicare and Medicaid, I have not been convinced that we can achieve savings in these programs of the magnitude required in this budget without doing harm to our health care system. I also have serious concerns about the cuts in agricultural programs in this budget. Cuts of this magnitude will unilaterally disarm American agriculture in the battle of the global economy.

Finally, I do not understand why the conferees continued to insist on savings in education programs. If there is one place we agree, it is that we need to have an opportunity for our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is with disappointment that I rise in opposition to this conference report. I strongly support the goal of balancing the budget by 2002 and am committed to finding a bipartisan solution to our deficit problem. I very much want to support a reasonable, balanced, and responsible plan to balance the budget. While there are many positive aspects of this budget and it represents a clear improvement over the budget initially passed by the House, I have concluded that this conference report still falls short of this goal.

This budget falls well short of the goal of putting the budget on a responsible path toward balance. The conference report backloads the deficit reduction in the last 2 years. In fact, under this conference report, 2 years from now the budget deficit will be the same as it is today. Although the conferees initially reported that tax cuts would be postponed until CBO has certified that we have produced sufficient spending cuts to balance the budget, the conference report before us now does not include this provision. The Ways and Means Committee will not need to wait until CBO certifies that we have put the budget on a credible glide path toward balance before enacting tax cuts. More importantly, this budget takes credit for the \$170 billion economic bonus whether or not CBO concludes that we deserve credit.

I agree that it is imperative that the budget control the growth of Medicare and Medicaid by reforming these programs to reduce their rapid growth. However, I have not been convinced that we can achieve savings in the Medicare and Medicaid programs of the magnitude required in this budget without doing harm to our health care system and shifting costs to States and local governments and the private sector. I am particularly concerned about the impact that Medicare and Medicaid could have on critical rural hospitals.

I also have serious concerns about the cuts in agricultural programs in this budget. Once again, agriculture is being asked to bear more than its fair share of cuts. Cuts of this magnitude will unilaterally disarm American farmers in the battle in the global economy.

Finally, I do not understand why the conferees continued to insist on savings in education programs. If there is one priority in the budget that everyone should be able to agree on, it is that we should help younger generations receive the education they need to provide for a strong future for this Nation. The education cuts, particularly in student loans, will make it much more difficult for students to help themselves by receiving an education.

The budget alternative offered by the coalition earlier this year met the goal of balancing the budget by 2002 through responsible reforms of government programs while avoiding the ill-advised cuts in agriculture, Medicare, Medicaid, and education programs in this conference report. I continue to believe that the coalition budget represents the reasonable middle ground that can be the basis for a consensus on this issue. I intend to work with the President and the leadership of Congress in a

constructive manner to put together a plan to balance the budget that can receive strong support within Congress and among the American public and which can be enacted into law.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, one of America's real war heroes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe people are talking about not giving money back to the people of America. It is your money. We need to give it back to you. It is not Government's money.

Mr. Speaker, today Republicans will pass the first plan in 26 years that balances the Federal budget. This budget ensures a secure future for this country and protects the children of tomorrow by eliminating the debt of today.

This budget is proof that Republicans, unlike the President, are serious about eliminating the deficit, downsizing the Government, and giving much needed tax relief to all Americans. This budget is fair, it is balanced and it is the right thing to do.

I consider this one of the most important votes we will ever make in the Congress. We hold America's future in our hands. This is the greatest Nation on Earth and this budget will ensure that it will have the financial security to stay that way.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for prosperity, vote for our future, and to vote for our children. Vote "yes" on this budget, our country deserves it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the distinguished senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, Speaker GINGRICH, and also Senator GRAMM. I do not think in our lifetime or perhaps in history have they gone out of their way to show you the difference between the Democrat and the Republican. I think that is important.

As I understand the argument, if you are sick, if you are poor, if you are blind or disabled, that is not a Federal problem and it entitles you to absolutely nothing. The fact is, as the Speaker said before, it is time to give the tax money back to those people that earn it. The fact that rich people earn it means you give it back to rich people. Therefore, the poor should rely more on charitable organizations, not-for-profit organizations, even though I understand the Republicans want a flat tax that would even withdraw the incentives to make contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe that what is going on now is revolutionary. The Supreme Court has said that you cannot elect people based on their color. We are going after affirmative action and now we are going after the rest of the poor. Congratulations, you have made history.

Mr. Speaker, the way I look at it, while it is so easy to identify the poor among us sometimes, when people real-

ly see that we are making these cuts in order to return this money to the rich, that ultimately the poor, the sick, and the aged are not going to go away.

True, when you give a block grant, you say that we do not have any responsibility; let the Governors do it. After all, they are closer to the problem. The Governors will say let the mayors do it, and the mayors will say let the churches and the synagogues and the temples do it.

Even when someone comes back and they say they want to change, the Democrats didn't do the right thing, they never meant that we would just take our responsibility and throw it back to the communities that cannot afford to raise the taxes to do what has to be done.

I do hope when the American people finally wake up and see exactly what we are doing to them, it is clearly supporting tax breaks for those whom God has blessed with the riches among us, and going after programs and saying it is not a Federal entitlement, leave it up to the charitable organizations.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. I thank the gentleman, the chairman, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in proud support of the conference committee report. As one of the 72 new Republicans who were elected in November, no group stands more solidly behind change here in Congress. Indeed, as the distinguished gentleman from New York has pointed out, there is a difference between Republicans and Democrats.

We believe in thoughtful spending. We do not believe in funding it and forgetting it. We believe in fiscal sanity. We believe in a balanced budget, and we believe that the American people sent a clear message to Congress that they want change. That is what we represent here in Congress.

I urge adoption of the committee conference report.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] pointed out earlier, that the debate is a little bit stale. I think it is stale because the folks on the other side are missing two points.

No. 1, they are missing the point that the American people do not believe that they are out to save the middle class. They realize that they define redistribution in such a way that everybody is wealthy in their book.

The second reason is I think the American people realize it is time for us to do something. That is what we are doing on this side, and it is very exciting to be part of this historic effort to balance the budget over 7 years.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Cincinnati, OH [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I want to commend him and his bipartisan team that put together this budget. They have done a great job. Let us not forget, as someone has mentioned, we have not had a balanced budget around here since 1969, so this is historic.

Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on the Budget revealed to me that in his first budget he wrote, which was in about 1969 in the Ohio State Senate, he got one vote. It was his own. Today he is probably going to get about 250 times that amount. He gets the most improved award, I guess.

The reason he is going to get that kind of support is because this document is fair. Despite what my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means from New York said, it is fair. It is fair in that everything is on the table. It is fair in that everybody makes a sacrifice for the future of the country and, yes, it is fair because it is fair to the next generation of Americans who otherwise would be burdened with skyrocketing taxes and a failing economy because of our irresponsible and reckless spending.

Our real challenge is going to be to keep our resolve 2 years from now, 4 years from now, 6 years from now. I think we will do it but we need the momentum today to be able to do it. It is not going to be easy but nothing is more important.

I urge everyone to support this document because it is fair, it is a great start, and again I want to commend the bipartisan team.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, for 13 years I served in the State House and I watched Congress deficit-spend, and I wondered if I would ever have the chance to be part of a movement in Congress to get our financial house in order.

When I was first elected, I noticed this young man named JOHN KASICH, who was coming in with these budgets to balance, to get our financial house in order, and only about 30 people were supporting him. He kept working at it and we are at this day today, which is very historic.

I have waited 20 years and I have worked for 20 years to finally be able to vote for a budget that is balanced. The challenge we have is when I listen to my colleagues and they say we are not taking care of the sick or poor, they simply are distorting the issue when they say we are cutting Medicare or Medicaid.

The fact is with Medicaid we are going to go from \$89 billion to \$124 billion. Only in Washington when you spend more do people call it a cut. We

are going to spend \$329 billion more in the next 7 years on Medicaid.

Then we have the challenge of Medicare. Medicare is going bankrupt in 7 years. The White House, Congress, the minority party wanted to ignore it. We weighed in and said we need to slow the growth of Medicare. We are going to slow the growth, but it is still going to go from \$178 billion to \$274 billion. Only in Washington when you spend more money do people call it a cut.

We are going to spend \$675 billion more for Medicare in the next 7 years than we did in the last 7 years. Social Security is going to go up 5.3 percent each year for the next 7 years; Medicare, an average of 6.3 percent each year for the next 7 years; Medicaid, an average of 4.9 percent each year for the next 7 years. Other entitlements are going to go up at 4.1 percent.

What we are cutting is Government. We are going to downsize Government. We are going to make it smaller. The school lunch program is going to go up. Our health care programs are going to go up, but we are going to make this Government smaller. In the process, we are going to change this caretaking society to a caring society.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], a very hard-working, enthusiastic Member.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, what my colleague who just finished talking failed to realize is that none of the increases that they are talking about have anything to do with increased enrollment, whether it is students or increased enrollment of seniors in Medicare or any increase in any inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican plan to cut Medicare to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy.

Make no mistake about it, that is what this budget resolution is all about. It is not about reducing the budget deficit. It is not about fixing Medicare. It is about cutting Medicare by \$270 billion in order to pay for tax breaks for big corporations and the wealthiest Americans.

No matter how you disguise it, this budget resolution is a frontal assault on America's 37 million senior citizens—people like Julius and Dottie Ruskin in my district in West Haven, CT.

Julius and Dottie live on Social Security and his company pension for a total income of about \$14,000 a year. Julius' medical bills this year have already totaled more than \$10,000, and Medicare pays for 80 percent of these costs. Julius and Dottie simply cannot afford to pay \$3,400 more out-of-pocket for their health care over the next 7 years, but that is what the Republican cuts to Medicare will mean for the average senior. They will pay more, but they will get fewer benefits and restrictions on their choice of their own doctor.

The Republicans may be keeping their promises to the rich and power-

ful. But they are breaking our Nation's historic promise to the health and welfare of senior citizens like Julius and Dottie Ruskin.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

□ 1500

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the statement of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] who said we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid and not looking into consideration of increases. Medicare goes up from \$4,800 per beneficiary to \$6,734 per beneficiary. We are providing more per beneficiary each and every year.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], a Member who is very concerned about education.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget calls for \$100 billion in cuts in low-income assistance programs including aid to families with dependent children, food stamps, supplemental security income, child welfare programs, and the earned income tax credit.

These programs are left unscathed by the alternative budget which the CBC prepared earlier. Republicans have continually assaulted these welfare programs, as they call them, since the beginning of the Congress but have neglected to seriously attack other forms of welfare.

For example, the abuses in farm subsidy programs are widespread and well-known and they have not been attacked. Republicans also have not attacked corporate welfare. The problem of corporate welfare was at least recognized in the House-passed budget. The House did include at least \$25 billion in corporate welfare cuts when the bill left here and the Senate also enacted their version, it had \$9.4 billion in corporate welfare cuts.

But somehow in the conference all of this was dropped and there are zero cuts in corporate welfare at this point. To add insult to injury, after we vote on this budget agreement we will also have a rescissions package brought back. I urge a "no" vote on this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67, the conference agreement on the fiscal year budget resolution. This budget decimates virtually every major social program on which working families rely. The budget inflicts immense pain on those least able to withstand it while perpetuating corporate welfare, increasing defense spending, and cutting taxes for the wealthiest individuals.

First and foremost, the conference agreement calls for cuts for \$10 billion in outlays for student aid and a 33-percent cut in discretionary spending for education and training programs over the next 7 years. Due to

spending caps, we would lose \$4 to \$5 billion in education funding in fiscal year 1996 alone.

In stark contrast to the Republican scheme, the President, the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC], and the Progressive Caucus have made the education and job training portion of the budget their top priority—a view which is in line with the majority of the American people. Both the President's proposed budget plan and the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget include tens of billions of dollars in spending increases for education and job training, while the Republican plan proposes to cut spending on these programs by similar amounts.

Second, the Republican budget slashes Medicare by \$270 billion and Medicaid by \$182 billion. The Medicare cuts translate into \$150 month out of the pocket of the average senior citizen, and the Medicaid cuts mean that 800,000 to 1 million seniors and individuals with disabilities will lose health care coverage completely. The CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget, on the other hand, leaves these vital programs intact with no decreases in funding.

Third, the Republican budget calls for \$100 billion in cuts in low-income assistance programs, including aid to families with dependent children [AFDC], food stamps, supplemental security income [SSI], child welfare programs, and the earned income tax credit [EITC]. Again, these programs are left unscathed by the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget.

Republicans have continually assaulted these welfare programs since the beginning of the Congress but have neglected to seriously attack other forms of welfare. For example, the abuses in farm subsidy programs are widespread and well-known. Today, the environmental working group once again is releasing a report which details such abuses. In this report, the "Fox in the Henhouse," it is revealed that local, federally paid, Department of Agriculture employees who run farm subsidy programs routinely practice fraud, extortion, and embezzlement. In just one incident in California, four employees fraudulently issued 17 Federal farm subsidy checks worth more than \$270,000, using the cash to buy illegal drugs.

Republicans also should be ashamed to bring a budget plan to the floor which drastically reduces funding for every program for the working poor and does not strip a single cent from corporate welfare. That is right—not a single cent. The House-passed budget resolution included \$25 billion in corporate welfare cuts, and the Senate-passed version included \$9.4 billion, but somehow all of that was dropped in conference.

America's working families know that we can do better than that. The dirty little secret of corporate welfare is out of the bag. The CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget includes \$500 billion in corporate welfare cuts, so the people know that it can be done. And it is not just Democrats who are pushing for an end to corporate welfare. Even the very conservative Heritage Foundation is on board with the idea.

To add insult to injury, after we vote on this budget agreement, we will vote on the new Republican version of the rescissions package that President Clinton vetoed earlier this month. Unfortunately, the new bill is only slightly better. It is like telling the American

people that we are going to give them one cyanide pill instead of two. The rescissions bill remains completely unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to reject the budget conference agreement and the rescissions package, both of which deliver a sharp blow to the stomachs of the most vulnerable Americans without equitably distributing the pain necessary to move toward a balanced budget.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 455]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—411

Abercrombie	Combest	Gilman
Ackerman	Condit	Gonzalez
Allard	Conyers	Goodlatte
Andrews	Cooley	Goodling
Armey	Costello	Gordon
Bachus	Cox	Goss
Baesler	Cramer	Graham
Baker (CA)	Crane	Green
Baker (LA)	Crapo	Greenwood
Baldacci	Creameans	Gunderson
Ballenger	Cubin	Gutierrez
Barcia	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Barr	Danner	Hall (OH)
Barrett (NE)	Davis	Hall (TX)
Barrett (WI)	de la Garza	Hamilton
Bartlett	Deal	Hancock
Barton	DeFazio	Hansen
Bass	DeLauro	Harman
Bateman	DeLay	Hastert
Becerra	Dellums	Hastings (FL)
Beilenson	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bentsen	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bereuter	Dickey	Hayworth
Berman	Dicks	Hefley
Bevill	Dingell	Hefner
Bilbray	Dixon	Heineman
Bilirakis	Doggett	Herger
Bishop	Dooley	Hilleary
Bliley	Doolittle	Hilliard
Blute	Dornan	Hinchey
Boehkert	Doyle	Hobson
Boehner	Dreier	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Dunn	Hoke
Bonior	Durbin	Holden
Bono	Edwards	Horn
Borski	Ehlers	Houghton
Boucher	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Brewster	Emerson	Hunter
Browder	Engel	Hutchinson
Brown (CA)	English	Hyde
Brown (FL)	Ensign	Inglis
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Brownback	Evans	Jacobs
Bryant (TN)	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bryant (TX)	Ewing	Johnson (SD)
Bunn	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Bunning	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Burr	Fawell	Johnston
Burton	Fazio	Jones
Buyer	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski
Callahan	Filner	Kaptur
Calvert	Flake	Kasich
Camp	Flanagan	Kelly
Canady	Foglietta	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Foley	Kennedy (RI)
Castle	Ford	Kennelly
Chabot	Fowler	Kildee
Chambliss	Fox	Kim
Chapman	Franks (CT)	King
Chenoweth	Franks (NJ)	Kingston
Christensen	Frelinghuysen	Klecicka
Chryslers	Frisa	Klink
Clay	Frost	Klug
Clayton	Funderburk	Knollenberg
Clement	Furse	Kolbe
Clinger	Galleghy	LaFalce
Clyburn	Ganske	LaHood
Coble	Gejdenson	Lantos
Coburn	Gekas	Largent
Coleman	Gephardt	Latham
Collins (GA)	Geren	LaTourette
Collins (IL)	Gilchrest	Laughlin
Collins (MI)	Gillmor	Lazio

Leach	Olver	Smith (MI)
Levin	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Smith (TX)
Lewis (GA)	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Lewis (KY)	Packard	Solomon
Lightfoot	Pallone	Souder
Lincoln	Parker	Spence
Linder	Pastor	Spratt
Lipinski	Paxon	Stearns
Livingston	Payne (NJ)	Stenholm
LoBiondo	Payne (VA)	Stockman
Lofgren	Pelosi	Stokes
Longley	Peterson (FL)	Studds
Lowe	Peterson (MN)	Stump
Lucas	Petri	Stupak
Luther	Pickett	Talent
Maloney	Pombo	Tanner
Manton	Pomeroy	Tate
Manzullo	Porter	Taylor (MS)
Markey	Portman	Taylor (NC)
Martinez	Poshard	Tejeda
Martini	Pryce	Thomas
Mascara	Quillen	Thompson
Matsui	Quinn	Thornberry
McCarthy	Radanovich	Thornton
McCrery	Rahall	Thurman
McDade	Ramstad	Tiahrt
McDermott	Rangel	Torkildsen
McHale	Reed	Torres
McHugh	Regula	Torrice
McInnis	Richardson	Towns
McIntosh	Rivers	Traficant
Cox	Roberts	Upton
McKeon	Roemer	Velazquez
McNulty	Rogers	Vento
Meehan	Meek	Rohrabacher
Menendez	Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen
Metcalfe	Metcalfe	Rose
Meyers	Meyers	Roth
Mfume	Mfume	Roukema
Mica	Mica	Roybal-Allard
Miller (CA)	Miller (CA)	Royce
Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Rush
Mineta	Mineta	Sabo
Minge	Minge	Salmon
Mink	Mink	Sanders
Molinari	Molinari	Sanford
Mollohan	Mollohan	Sawyer
Montgomery	Montgomery	Saxton
Moorhead	Moorhead	Schaefer
Moran	Moran	Schiff
Morella	Morella	Schroeder
Murtha	Murtha	Schumer
Myers	Myers	Seastrand
Myrick	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Nadler	Nadler	Serrano
Neal	Neal	Shadegg
Nethercutt	Nethercutt	Shaw
Neumann	Neumann	Shays
Ney	Ney	Sisisky
Norwood	Norwood	Skaggs
Nussle	Nussle	Skeen
Oberstar	Oberstar	Skelton
Obey	Obey	Slaughter
		Zimmer

□ 1521

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). On this rollcall, 411 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEARS 1996-2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 5 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report and would point out that this budget resolution will inflict a brutal blow on Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the budget resolution because of the cuts it imposes on our Nation's Federal employees.

The budget resolution increases the contributions that Federal employees pay into their retirement system. The Republicans have pledged to make the Federal Government work more like the private sector. But in the private sector, 97 percent of all medium and large companies fully finance their employees' pension plan. Federal employee contributions to their retirement system are among the highest in the Nation. The resolution increases those contributions.

For their increased contributions to their pension plans, Federal employees will receive less. The Congressional Research Service has already estimated that Federal pensions are less generous than comparable private sector pension. We are going to make these pensions even worse by changing the accrual formula from high three to high five. This will reduce the Federal annuity by 4 percent. Republicans talk about the need to operate the Federal retirement system like a private pension plan. But this change would be illegal in the private sector.

Finally, the Republicans are proposing draconian cuts in the operation of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. The budget resolution proposes to cap the government investment at \$1,535 for individuals and \$3,430 for families. This cap grows with inflation over the next 7 years. While this sounds reasonable, this proposal will have serious consequences for the average Federal employee and his family. As we all know, health care inflation is much higher than changes in the Consumer Price Index. As time goes by, the employees out of pocket expenses will grow. By the year 2000, the average Federal employee will be losing \$500 per year. The senior citizen on the plan will be facing even worse consequences because the Medicare cuts proposed in this resolution will force up the costs of the Federal Health Plan. Those individuals living on a fixed income will be forced to either pay a greater share of their income on health care or change to a program that does not meet their needs.

The Republicans talk about making contracts and keeping promises. But this is only talk. When it comes down to action, the Republicans are breaking their promises and violating the contracts we have with our Nation's Federal employees. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this budget resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and share the views of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican's budget conference report which will have a devastating effect on my constituents and all America.

Last Monday, I held a townhall meeting on the budget cuts in Jacksonville, FL. Mr. Speaker, I had so many people show up that I had to turn busloads away. The people are very concerned about how these severe budget cuts will affect themselves, their parents, and their children.

Our seniors, who rely so heavily on Medicare and Medicaid will be especially hard hit. Medicare and Medicaid will be reduced to second-rate health care systems so the Republicans can pay for the crown jewel of the Republican Contract on America, a multibillion-dollar tax cut for the wealthy.

In my State of Florida alone, Medicare will be cut by \$29 billion by the year 2002, and Medicaid will be slashed by \$9.2 billion. By the year 2002, seniors will pay \$1,060 more in out-of-pocket expenses for second-rate Medicare.

In addition to cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, this mean-spirited budget cuts education \$10 billion. It also cuts veterans' programs by \$32 billion over the next 7 years. This is truly a case of the haves taking from the have-nots.

Mr. Speaker, we have not only let the fox guard the hen house—we have let the fox take charge.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 and to delineate for my colleagues the specific impacts this budget resolution is likely to have on the Federal Aviation Administration.

I say, is likely to have, because the conference report does not spell out the details of the cuts proposed for the FAA budget; but, given the general numbers and spending targets set down in the budget agreement we can calculate what the effects will be on specific FAA programs, such as the agency's new zero accident goal.

As ranking member of the House Aviation Subcommittee I want all my House colleagues to understand the critical mission of the FAA. This agency manages the world's largest air traffic control system, through which move half of all the one billion passengers who travel world-wide every year by air. They operate the Air Traffic Control system 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, handling, on average, two flights every second.

On an average day, FAA safety and security professionals will conduct nearly 1,000 inspec-

tions on pilots, planes and airports, ensuring that they remain air worthy and safe.

FAA maintains over 30,000 pieces of complex safety equipment and facilities across this Nation, operating at a reliability factor of 99.4 percent—a safety record envied by the rest of the world.

FAA issues more than 1,000 airport grants annually to improve airport safety and infrastructure.

FAA conducts 355,000 inspections annually to enforce safety standards and to issue certificates and licenses for aviation products and operators. FAA takes more than 12,000 enforcement actions each year.

The FAA has taken its share of cuts in the last 2 years as its contribution toward deficit reduction: FAA has cut 5,000 employees since 1993 for a current total of 48,000 total employees. Of that number 36,000 have direct hands-on involvement in the ATC system, which includes 14 of the 15 busiest airports in the world.

In this era of deregulation with extraordinary growth in both passengers and air traffic operations, we have seen a growth of 6 percent in air traffic during the last 2 years as the airlines have recovered from the serious economic decline and \$12 billion in losses of 1990–92. But while air traffic has jumped 6 percent these last 2 years, the FAA budget has suffered a real decline of 6 percent, which translates into a \$600 million cut.

This budget resolution conference agreement chops an additional \$10 billion from transportation spending, which if spread, as expected, to the FAA will jeopardize the safety and efficiency of the Nation's aviation system.

Under this budget resolution FAA's ability to improve weather and safety equipment and prevent accidents would be compromised.

Introduction of global positioning satellite navigation technology would be delayed at least 5 years, costing airlines millions of dollars a year in lost efficiency.

The ability of the aviation security system to maintain its vigilance against domestic and international terrorism would be cut by one-third.

FAA's obligation to certify new aircraft engines and parts would be greatly compromised and might even have to be contracted out to private interests which, in my judgment, clearly is not in the best interest of safety.

The weather services to general aviation and to commercial aviation provided through the Nation's flight service stations would be greatly impaired as FSS and control towers would be closed, costing jobs and air traffic services to hundreds of communities in all 50 States, and delays to an estimated 105,000 flights annually, at an estimated costs to carriers and passengers of more than \$2.3 billion.

I am just touching the tip of the iceberg on the impact of these cuts projected out over the next several years for the FAA as a result of this budget resolution.

The dedicated professionals of the FAA deserve better. They deserve our full support for full funding out of the aviation trust fund to maintain our air traffic control system at its highest level of safety and efficiency.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise against this bill that devastates Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67, the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution. This bill was terrible when it passed the House in May and it is just as awful today.

What you will hear about this budget resolution is that it balances the budget by the year 2002. Clearly, this is an important and extremely worthy goal. What you will not hear about is how it balances the budget—on the backs of senior citizens, college students, the working poor, and children with mothers and fathers on welfare. Rather than cutting the bloated defense budget, or ending corporate welfare, House Concurrent Resolution 67 attacks Medicare, guaranteed student loans, the earned income tax credit, public transportation, and lunches for school children to bear the brunt of the budget hatchet.

Today, you will also hear about how responsible this budget is. You'll hear many Members congratulating each other for addressing the budget deficit responsibly. Well, if this were true, we could all be proud of the budget before us today. Unfortunately, House Concurrent Resolution 67 is extremely irresponsible. It provides a \$245 billion tax cut to Americans who least need it at a time when we can least afford it. In order to fund this tax cut and balance the budget, House Concurrent Resolution 67 cuts critical Federal investments in the future of this country.

Let's look at exactly what this budget resolution proposes and who will be hurt by it. House Concurrent Resolution 67 cuts Medicare spending by \$270 billion over the next 7 years. Judging from the letters and calls that have been pouring into my office about Medicare funding, this is not a cut that the senior citizens in my congressional district can afford. Higher out-of-pocket costs for Medicare benefits will be devastating to many 7th Congressional District senior citizens on fixed incomes.

This budget also cuts funding for student aid by \$10 billion over the next years. How the budget cutters decided that it is responsible and sensible to cut opportunities for young people to attend college is completely unclear to me. These cuts will prevent even more young people from attending college in the years ahead. Already, many families in my congressional district cannot afford to send their children to college. Other families take out large student loans that their children must pay back of a 10-year period.

Federal TRIO programs have helped approximately 9 million young people complete high school or graduate from college since they were established. It is likely that these programs may be completely eliminated, leaving first-generation college students without the support and assistance needed to help them obtain their college degree.

In addition, this budget proposes that we cut community development block grants [CDBG's] by nearly 30 percent. Last year, my State of Illinois received \$42,500,000 that was

distributed to community development organizations across the 7th Congressional District and throughout the State to help create jobs, rehabilitate single family housing units, improve infrastructure and reduce threats to public health and safety, et cetera. A 30-percent cut will dramatically reduce the important work that CDBG's can do.

House Concurrent Resolution 67 also proposes making other cuts that could impact the future of our economy and work force. It cuts job training program funding by 20 percent and would completely eliminate the Department of Commerce. During the past 2 years, the Department of Commerce has helped the private sector create jobs through export promotion and programs like the manufacturer's extension partnership. As the Illinois District Export Council in Illinois indicated in a letter to me, "Part of America's future is in exporting. Export promotion programs not only create jobs and strengthens communities today, but they lay the foundation for strong, competitive, U.S. companies and jobs into the next century." Does it make sense to disarm ourselves when we most need to compete in global workplace?

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 67 also reduces funding for grants for energy conservation programs, phases out Federal funding for mass transit, and proposes a number of other short-sighted, irresponsible cuts.

I urge my colleagues to reject this foolish budget proposal. It will give America's richest and wealthiest citizens all the breaks and leave America's most vulnerable citizens with nothing. This, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not responsible and it is definitely nothing to be proud of.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference committee report.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of this conference report for two very simple and understandable reasons. I believe this conference report and this budget is extreme. I do not believe that we have to, in order to balance the budget, take the kind of actions that are being taken in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that it is a budget that is unfair and I say that for one simple reason above others. If you take the tax break that is in this budget, it comes to about \$245 billion over the period of years. If you take the Medicare cut, it is a little more than that; about \$270 billion.

As I will explain in a moment, the cuts in Medicare will be extremely harmful to ordinary American families. If we could reduce the tax break down to a more manageable level and focus it at middle-income families, we would not need to have Medicare cuts that are so severe and so deep in this budget.

Let me be more precise about what this means to ordinary families. Let me take what it means to the COLA increase on millions of seniors in our country. In the year 2002, they will get an annual COLA of about \$327, but because of the out-of-pocket increases that must be caused with this large of a cut in Medicare, they will face a cut in their COLA of \$157. In other words, half their COLA in the year 2002 will be taken away.

My colleagues may say \$150 is not a lot of money, but remember we are talking about people who are living on Social Security. It is the only check they get. It is the only income they have.

And why are we doing this? Why does it need to be this deep of a cut? Again, because we have a \$245 billion tax break, over half of which we believe goes to families who earn \$100,000 a year or more. That is extreme. That is unfair and that change, that one simple change in this budget, would have this kind of impact.

I want to take my colleagues back to people. This has to be looked at in terms of real people. Cecil Whitener and his wife Ethel live in Afton, MO, in my district. He fought in five major battles in World War II. He worked hard in a grocery store. He paid his taxes and paid into Medicare and Social Security all of his life.

In the year 2002, their benefit in Medicare will be \$850 a year less. Or put it another way, they will have to come up with \$850 more than they would under present law. That is a real life impact to these people.

□ 1530

But before we assume that this cut in Medicare is simply a problem for these folks who are today's senior citizens, let us understand that the impact of this is for all American families. This is Gina Stacer, who is trying to save for her twins' education. She and her husband live paycheck to paycheck. Her parents pay their medical bills with Medicare and social security.

Now, think about her and her husband and these kids and think about their middle-class status and what is going to happen if this budget conference report passes. It means people who are in middle-class squeeze are going to be squeezed even much more than they have been in the past because if she has to help pick up \$850 for her parents because of the cut in Medicare and because she gets cut in school lunches or cut in student loans where these kids hopefully soon will be able to go to school, she gets hit from both ends. And so what is now middle-class

squeeze becomes middle-class squash, and that is something that we should not allow to happen to the middle-income people of this country.

I say to you, my friends, we can do better than this. We can put together a budget that is fair for middle-income Americans, fair for people that have been stuck in place for the last 10 years making the same amount of money.

We do not have to have a budget that gives huge tax breaks to people who already have it made and take it out of the hide of the hard-working middle-income people of this country.

Vote down this conference report, and we can do better than this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. One simple little question: If they say that we could do it, we can balance the budget, why have not they done it for 25 years? I cannot figure it out.

Now, we have been in for less than 6 months, and we are going to do it.

Let me say a couple of things. First of all, we signed a contract last fall, last September. We made promises to the American people: Balance the budget, line item veto, commonsense legal reform, welfare reform, cut taxes, cut committees, cut bureaucracy. They said it could not be done. We did it in 100 days for one reason: because we believe in keeping our promises. We believe in real results. We did it, and the American people appreciate the fact that we are politicians where our deeds are meeting our rhetoric.

Is it not just great that you make a promise and you can come here to this House and you can deliver on it? And what we are about to do today is to deliver on something that all of the skeptics said could not be done. You think about that list of what we have already delivered on, the commonsense legal reform, cutting committees, cutting bureaucracy, giving tax relief to Americans, welfare reform, this is what Americans want.

You know, some people accuse us of getting this from a pollster. Yes, we got it from pollsters. We got it when we went to the supermarket. We got it when we went to the gym. We got it when we rode the bus. We got it on the plane, because we listened to Americans who get up and go to work every day and said, "That is our agenda." We made it our agenda. We delivered to the American people, and we are here today to balance the budget, provide tax relief, and keep the greatest of all of our promises, and we ought to feel very good about it.

I want to thank the Democrats who joined us on the contract and thank the Democrats who joined us when we passed this house budget resolution.

Now, why are we balancing the budget? Well, Greenspan, Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, probably said it best, "Children will have a higher standard of living than

their parents." That is America's greatest legacy, your kids will be better off than you. They will have more opportunity than you had. Your legacy will be that you left a healthier America for your children.

Second, improvement in the purchasing power of incomes, greater exports, significant drop in interest rates. That is homes for everybody. That is new businesses.

But let us get to the bottom line about this budget proposal. We heard about how draconian it is. First of all, Medicare: In our plan, we will go from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion. The only people who think that going from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion are living, I do not know, maybe in the 1950's, because, you see, we do not use this language anymore in America, in Arizona, in Michigan, in Florida, in Ohio, all across this country. When you go from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion, that is an increase; that is an increase.

Now, we hear the talk about those that want to go to \$1.8 trillion, and the talk about those two senior citizens. If we do not fix Medicare by the year 2002, there will not be any left for them, and we are doing this to preserve the Medicare system and to show the greatest amount of compassion that is possible within the dollars that we have and to serve Americans with quality care and choice.

Now, folks, when you get down to the issue of total spending in the Federal Government, we are going to grow from \$9,500,000,000,000 to \$12 trillion. Can you believe that? From \$9.5 trillion to \$12 trillion, and there are some that say that is not enough. Do you know what Americans are saying when they see those numbers? "Why are you spending so much? Why are you spending so much?" The reason? Because we are on a glide path to balance this budget by downsizing government, eliminating duplication and red tape, providing tax relief, and achieving what Alan Greenspan said was imperative for saving the next generation.

We can do it, ladies and gentlemen, by just slowing the growth in government. That is what it takes.

This is not a dire budget. This is not a revolutionary budget. This is a commonsense budget to get us in balance.

Now, let me suggest to all of you that this balanced budget is designed to achieve two things: One, it is about the children and the next generation. And do you know what Americans tell me, and they are telling all of you as you go through airports? Do you know what they do? They grab you by the wrists and they say, "Don't stop. Do not give in. Don't cave in. Please keep it going. Balance the budget. Save my kids. Fix America. Ignore the special interests." That is what they are telling us as we go through the airports and the communities of our country.

And we also want to give them a little of their money back. As SAM JOHNSON put it, it is their money not our money.

You know what I want to close with as we look forward to bipartisan support, we run for office, we leave our families, we get on planes, we run all over, and we wonder sometimes why we do it. Today we are making history. Today this is a giant step for saving America, and every Member should leave this Chamber today with their heads held high, realizing this is why we came, to put America over politics, to put the future over the present, and, frankly, folks, the American people appreciate it.

God bless America. God bless this Congress in taking this giant step because we are about to guarantee a prosperous America and a better planet.

Vote for the resolution.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, last year we promised Americans certain tax cuts: to working parents we promised a \$500 tax credit for their children, and we promised to end the tax penalty against married couples. To older Americans we promised to repeal President Clinton's massive tax increase on Social Security. And we promised to end the unfair rules that penalize retired Americans who work part time. Finally we promised that we would create economic growth and new jobs by reducing taxes on savings and capital investment.

More than 80 Members of this House sent a letter to the Speaker seeking from the budget conference a balanced budget by the year 2002 and the tax cuts promised by the Contract With America. We resolved that we can and that we must do both. The text of the letter will be inserted in the RECORD.

Unfortunately, this conference report misses the mark. While it does include \$245 billion in tax relief for families and businessmen and women, it fails to roll back the President's massive 1993 tax increase on seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the most consistent theme I hear from the lunch counters of Muncie, IN, to the factory cafeteria in Anderson, IN, is that every American is overtaxed.

I will support this rule and the underlying conference report because it is a significant step in the right direction. We have all summer to continue to cut spending and to seek greater tax cuts in the budget reconciliation bill this fall. And so I will support this rule and this conference report because it establishes a 7-year balanced budget plan does offer some tax relief.

Let this also be a notice, however, that many freshmen and senior Members alike intend to keep our promises to the American people. We would not support any reconciliation bill that fails to keep our promise to offer all of the child tax cuts and capital gains tax cuts and fails to eliminate Clinton's Social Security tax increase. Moreover, in our minds this resolution establishes a floor—a level of tax relief under which we will not go—and we will fight to restore all of the Contract's tax cuts this fall.

MAY 25, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are writing to express our strong support for your courageous and successful efforts to pass a budget resolution which ensures a balanced budget by 2002 and retains the full value of tax relief passed earlier by the House of Representatives.

We are strongly convinced that America will thrive in the next century only if governed by a limited and responsible federal government. The federal government must live within its means and must not crush the prosperity of its citizens. Deficit spending and excessive taxation have together served to expand the power of the government while reducing the power of the people. A balanced budget and tax relief are not only compatible, but they are also essential for restoring the American dream.

Our Founding Fathers organized this republic to: establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. This inheritance has been neglected. For too long Congress has sought to protect the state more fiercely than it has sought to serve the people. We must persevere to restore government of, by and for the people.

You can count on our votes against any budget resolution conference report that fails to balance the budget or significantly diminishes the tax relief passed by the House.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with this conference report. I have been a strong supporter of a balanced budget. However, we must ensure fairness and equity in achieving it. The American public is ready to tighten its belt as long as we all shoulder part of the load. The Coalition, a group of conservative Democrats which I helped form, proposed an alternative budget earlier this year which is based on fairness.

This conference report is simply not fair. Foreign aid, which is about 1 percent of the total budget is being cut by \$1.8 billion this year while agriculture, which is also about 1 percent of the budget, sustains \$13.3 billion in cuts over the next 7 years. This budget takes the strap to American farmers while sparing dozens of foreign subsidy programs. Medicare and Medicaid recipients stand to lose \$450 billion over the next 7 years under this proposal, at least \$75 billion more than is necessary to save the program. Students will lose \$10 billion in loan assistance to attend schools, when this is one of the most rewarding investments our Government can make. I supported the Coalition alternative because it is tough and honest. It is less Government. Most importantly, it is fair.

This conference report reserves the greatest amount of spending cuts for the last 2 years. This means we run the risk that future Congresses might not be willing to make the tough cuts. I am a strong supporter of tax relief, but in order to achieve it, the committee bill has inequitably targeted agriculture, education, job training, and Medicare among other things. We first need to ensure the future of our children, and then give tax relief to ourselves.

I hope my colleagues join me in voting against this report because a more intelligent, equitable balanced budget proposal exists, namely the one put forward by the Coalition.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996. This measure will cut \$1.2 trillion from quality of life programs for the primary purpose of funding a tax cut to the wealthy. The tax cut is proudly touted by our republican colleagues as the crown jewel in the GOP Contract With America. I strongly believe that hard-working American families do not want to pay for a tax break for the wealth-

iest individuals on the backs of the weakest in our society. That is just wrong, immoral, and unfair.

Yesterday, the Members of the House spoke with righteous indignation about the burning of the American flag. My colleagues, I ask that you have righteous indignation against making life-threatening cuts in vital quality-of-life programs on behalf of those in the dawn of life; our children—on behalf of those in the twilight of life; the elderly; and on behalf of those who are in the shadow of life—the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

We must not let politics outweigh the needs of the American people. We must not ignore the pain and suffering that will result from the devastating cuts in vital human capital programs including health care, housing, food and nutrition, human services, education, and employment training.

The \$270 billion cut in Medicare funding means that the elderly would have to pay nearly \$3,000 more for health care services in the form of higher premiums, deductibles, and coinsurance. This increased cost of health care could eat up nearly 40 to 50 percent of their Social Security COLA.

The \$182 billion cut in Medicaid means that nearly 7 million children and nearly 1 million elderly disabled would lose health care coverage. Tens of millions of Americans would lose important benefits such as preventive screening services for children, home care, and hospice.

For each \$10 million cut in the Healthy Start Program, 33,000 prenatal visits would be eliminated, 3,000 pediatric appointments would be eliminated, 5,800 clients would not receive child care, and 3,200 clients would not receive skill and job training services. The 50 percent cut in funding for the National Health Service Corps would eliminate primary health care services to 500,000 people living in medically underserved urban and rural areas.

The 33-percent cut in education and related programs would deny millions of students vital education needs including safe and drug-free schools; concentrated educational instruction in reading and math; and education technology. In addition, access to and success in postsecondary education for the neediest students is imperiled by drastic funding cuts in the TRIO program. The \$10 billion cut in student aid and threats to the continued viability of the Pell grant and campus-based student aid programs will saddle students with increasingly heavy loan debt and crushing interest payments. The increased debt burden places at risk and out of reach the dream of a college education.

The nearly \$19 billion cut to school lunch, school breakfast, summer food, special milk, child and adult food services would force millions of needy Americans to have to choose between food and housing. Without the low-income home energy assistance, millions of elderly would be forced to choose between food and heat. My colleagues, these are not choices.

The 20-percent cut in employment training programs will deny millions of Americans the essential job training services they need to succeed in the labor market; it will deny displaced workers the re-employment opportunities they so desperately need; and will deny summer jobs to over 600,000 youth who need and want to work.

Mr. Speaker, we must not force the weak to carry the weight of the strong. The Republican

budget will weaken the foundation of our economy and place our children's future at risk. House Concurrent Resolution 67 is irresponsible and devastating to the lives of ordinary Americans. If these are the results of the Republicans' promise made-promise kept philosophy, surely some promises are definitely meant to be broken.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to show compassion and to stand up in defense of our Nation's children, elderly, veterans, and hard-working families. Vote against the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference committee report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, a historic budget resolution.

For the first time in more than a generation, the House of Representatives stands ready to adopt a budget resolution that provides for a balanced Federal budget by the year 2002.

The goal of a balanced budget is not just an abstract exercise that some economists or green-eye-shade types thought up in their ivory tower.

It is an essential economic tool to get the savings and capital investment we desperately need for research and development, and new plant and equipment to rebuild the American economy; keep us competitive in the global economy; and create the good jobs at good wages we need for this generation and those to come.

Earlier this year, I voted once again in support of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I did so because I believe that our country's long-term economic health demands that the Federal Government's fiscal house be put in order.

While the balanced budget amendment was narrowly defeated in the Senate, the need for Congress to do the right thing, and enact legislation that brings the budget into balance, remains as strong today as it was then.

Our interest payments on the public debt, currently exceed \$200 billion a year, and are projected to increase to a mind-boggling \$310 billion within the next 4 years! Much of these interest payments are going abroad to foreign investors who buy our Treasury notes. In other words, this capital is being drained out of our economy and exported.

If nothing is done, our country is headed for a fiscal disaster.

At the same time, in order to avoid this calamity, balancing the budget will require everyone in the United States to share some of the sacrifice associated with reducing the Federal Government's projected increases in spending by more than \$900 billion over the next 7 years.

While I recognize that the opponents of House Concurrent Resolution 67 can point to this particular detail or that specific detail as unacceptable, the fact remains that the Budget Committee's plan does not give anyone a free ride as we struggle toward a balanced budget.

The domestic discretionary budget, which provides funds for most Federal education, housing, environmental, and health programs, will have to make do with \$190 billion less over the next 7 years than originally anticipated.

The non-health care entitlement programs, such as Federal employees' pensions, crop subsidies, and welfare programs to name just a few, are facing \$174 billion less in funding than originally assumed.

And, while I would support additional reductions in the defense budget, this budget plan does exert continued downward pressure on defense spending. No department can be exempt from budget cutbacks if we are to ever reach a balanced budget.

And Medicare and Medicaid, the Federal health care programs for the elderly and low-income respectively, will be asked to make due with \$450 billion in less spending than current budget trends allow for.

Without question, this area of savings raises the most concern for me, and I must state my serious skepticism about how much of these truly dramatic changes can, or should, be accomplished in the near-term, if at all. By no means will I balance the budget on the backs of the sick elderly. We must proceed with great caution.

Some of the specific Medicare and Medicaid reform recommendations that have been discussed in recent weeks will be subject to intense analysis by this Member of Congress as the House Ways and Means and Commerce Committees wrestle with the reconciliation instructions they will receive from this document.

But, absent some significant reform what will happen to these essential programs?

Well, for the second year in a row, the trustees for the Medicare program have concluded that the program will go bankrupt in 7 years if nothing is changed.

Clearly, strong action and bold leadership is needed to ensure that our elderly will be able to receive necessary medical treatment through the Medicare program, and that Medicare will be there for many hard-working families who will become eligible for Medicare in the next 10 or 20 years.

Again we must proceed in good faith—keep our promises to our elderly.

I, for one, support the establishment of a Bipartisan Blue Ribbon Medicare Commission—modeled after the very successful Greenspan Commission on Social Security in the mid-1980's—to make recommendations for preserving and protecting this vital program, which the Congress could enact confident that there is not any hidden political agenda to the recommendations.

All too often, members have implied that there can be short-term quick fixes to the program's current structure. There are no easy, quick fixes here.

When we talk about preserving and protecting Medicare's long-term solvency, let's do it right and put aside partisan wrangling. The American people are tired of partisan bickering and sniping. They want us to face the issues intelligently and fairly.

While the Budget Committee's plan does call for some dramatic changes to these programs, we must keep in mind that the alternative is completely unacceptable: a bankrupt Medicare program that does not help the elderly and is not there for anyone else either.

With respect to the ongoing efforts to provide middle-class families with some tax relief, I supported H.R. 1215 earlier this year because it contained many elements—such as expanded Individual Retirement Accounts, capital gains tax relief, expanded capital investment deductions for small businesses—of a save and invest in America agenda, which I have long advocated.

However, I was one of a small group of Republicans that petitioned our leadership to

defer any tax reductions until the Congressional Budget Office had certified that the budget was, in fact, going to be balanced. Unfortunately, these preconditions have been significantly modified in the final version of House Concurrent Resolution 67.

Consequently, we must be mindful that the enactment of tax relief legislation will result in lower Federal revenues in the short term, which in turn requires that the Congress cut spending further in order to offset these losses.

The final conference committee report provides for no more than \$245 billion in tax relief, meaning that the Congress will not have to find an additional \$110 billion spending cuts over 7 years to compensate for the tax relief package as originally proposed by the House.

I would add that I have joined other Republicans who are already moving to limit the so-called family tax credit to families with incomes of less than \$100,000. I fully support this effort and working to see it adopted.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, approving the Budget Committee's conference report represents the first step in our annual budget process. The 13 regular appropriations bills, combined with an omnibus budget reconciliation package, will be where the nitty-gritty details of this budget plan are hashed-out.

That process will not be without difficulty, but as we prepare to enact legislation that balances the Federal budget we should not kid ourselves into thinking that it will be easy to do. At the same time, we should acknowledge the terrible cost to our Nation if we do nothing.

Balancing the Federal budget is essential to protect our Nation's long-term financial health, and to ensure that the country our children and grandchildren inherit is as great as the one our parents gave us.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, I rise today to speak against the cuts this budget resolution inflicts on the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA].

While we all support sound and responsible spending, the cuts to the FAA budget are neither. The result of these cuts will give us skies that are more crowded, equipment that is older, air traffic control personnel that are even more overworked, and air travel that is more dangerous.

While air traffic has grown more than 6 percent over the last 2 years, the FAA budget experienced a real decline of 6 percent—that's a \$600 million decrease.

The budget resolution conference agreement cuts an additional \$10 billion from transportation spending, cuts which will jeopardize the safety and efficiency of the aviation system proposed by the President.

Under this budget proposal—a safe and efficient aviation system for the nation will be dramatically jeopardized.

The FAA's ability to improve weather safety equipment and to prevent accidents would be compromised.

Introduction of satellite navigation technology would be delayed at least 5 years, costing air carriers millions of dollars per year in efficiencies.

The FAA would be less able to respond to domestic and international terrorism. Security specialists would be cut by one-third, ending the FAA's ability to assure compliance with security regulations to provide on-site monitoring and to assist air carriers experiencing major terrorist threats. We need look no further than

the current pall of fear that hangs over Los Angeles International airport to imagine the likely effect of security cutbacks.

The FAA would no longer be able to certify new aircraft, engines, or parts. These responsibilities would be transferred to private interests.

All FAA international offices would be closed, eliminating FAA's international presence for safety, security, and certification functions and undermining our goal of ensuring U.S. passenger safety worldwide.

Research into better methods of protecting passengers from inflight and post-crash fires would end altogether.

From fiscal year 1995 to 2002, the work force of air traffic controllers and flight service technicians would be reduced 44 percent—despite a 34-percent increase in the number of passengers and a 17-percent increase in commercial operations.

Flight service stations and control towers would be closed to the detriment of general aviation and small communities. Hundreds of communities in all 50 States would lose jobs and air traffic services. And, almost 105,000 flights would be delayed annually, at a cost to carriers and passengers that exceeds \$2.3 billion.

Equipment-related delays—caused by funding shortfalls for new technology and skilled maintenance technicians—would rise dramatically from 4,000 to 50,000 per year, and additional operating costs would grow for carriers and passengers.

We are all aware of the desperate need to guarantee 100 percent safety for the flying public. We are too familiar with the tragic consequences when that safety is compromised.

Mr. Speaker, we all benefit from the FAA's ability to provide safe and timely travel—let's not jeopardize that by approving this budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to keep the skies friendly—and safe—and reject this budget resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution conference agreement.

I am committed to balancing the budget. That requires difficult choices, and over the years I have not shied away from the tough votes to cut spending. In fact, I have voted for every serious comprehensive deficit reduction proposal—under both Republican and Democratic Presidents—since coming to Congress.

But this budget proposal, although well-intentioned, is poorly conceived.

This resolution calls for making \$270 billion in cuts from Medicare, yet, the Republicans have not produced a single specific proposal on how to achieve these savings. When taken together with the \$180 billion in cuts to Medicaid, these cuts could jeopardize the well-being of the best health care system in the world, to say nothing of what it can do to the affordability of health care for seniors, the ability of seniors to use the doctor of their choice, and the viability of teaching hospitals and the medical education programs they support. Finally, the ability of the aged and the disabled to receive the nursing home care they so desperately need will be jeopardized.

And why would we place Medicare and Medicaid including long-term care in such peril? So that the Republicans can pay for an ill-conceived tax break mainly for the privileged few.

At a time when U.S. income inequality is the worst among industrialized nations and is at

its greatest level since records have been kept, this budget handsomely rewards the privileged few at the expense of everybody else.

The Treasury warned that over half of the benefits of the original House plan would go to the top 12 percent of taxpayers, and there's no indication that this package will be any different. Yet this is the only group whose incomes went up and whose effective tax rates went down over the past decade and a half.

The rest of America, whose incomes stagnated or declined during the same period, not only get the crumbs in terms of tax breaks, but bear the brunt of paying for the whole tax package through greater cuts in Medicare, student loans, veterans benefits, and other middle-class programs.

Further, this budget will dull the edge of America's future competitiveness by gutting our Nation's investment in education across-the-board, at a time when more and more jobs call for greater skills and abilities.

And for what? I am willing to accept a modest increase in inequality if there's a reasonable prospect of significantly greater economic growth for all. But these tax cuts can't deliver. Treasury, CBO, CRS, and Joint Committee on Taxation, and a host of economists across the political spectrum have all concluded that the benefits, if any, are likely to be quite small.

Finally, I think the American people have the right to know the exact price for these tax cuts and for balancing the budget generally. Republicans claim that they've paid for the tax cuts and that they've committed themselves to achieving a balanced budget by 2002. The truth is that the major offset in the bill is a promise to cut spending in the future, and that the commitment to balance the budget rests still more promises to cut in the future.

None of these promises are backed by specific spending cuts. To make matters worse, Republicans have gerry-rigged the tax cuts so that most of the revenue loss comes in the years beyond the budget window, so under House rules they don't have to pay for the full cost of these tax cuts.

I am all for real, responsible deficit reduction. But this budget in many ways is not real, and in any event is not responsible.

That is why I am voting against the budget resolution conference agreement.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, the 1996 budget resolution. It is imperative that we take steps to correct our current budget dilemma. I believe today is as good as any day to set in motion a plan which will bring our government back to an environment of fiscal responsibility.

Many folks are concerned this legislation will take away benefits which they now receive. In reality, if we do not make a concerted effort to balance our budget by encouraging efficiency of Government services, we will be unable to offer any assistance in the near future as a result of irresponsible budget decisions. It is my belief this budget resolution will allow those decisions to be made at the appropriate committee level.

The projected savings in Medicare and Medicaid are most troubling to me, as their numbers are so high. However, there is nothing in the budget resolution that requires the committee of jurisdiction on which I serve to adopt the assumptions used in reaching the \$270 and \$180 billion savings. We must look

at all options while keeping in mind our commitment to the American people who contributed to the Medicare insurance program throughout their working lives, and those low-income individuals who need the helping hand of the Government. I believe all of us recognize the merits of these programs as well as the need to insure their solvency by slowing the rate of growth in these programs, by asking health care providers and beneficiaries to help us find fair ways to make the program solvent for future generations; and by increasing choice and individual responsibility without decreasing benefits and access to the best health care system in the world.

I urge my colleagues to act in a bipartisan manner and vote in favor of this resolution, which will allow the important process of balancing our budget to move forward as well as allow future generations to have the opportunity to enjoy the American Dream.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 budget. I strongly disagree with the priorities laid out in this document—especially the policy of gutting Federal health, education, and safety-net programs for average Americans in order to provide tax cuts for the most affluent members of our society.

Now is not the time for massive tax cuts. We desperately need to reduce the growing Federal deficit. The budget plan contained in this conference report would reduce Federal receipts by \$245 billion over 7 years. Such tax cuts would force deep, irresponsible cuts in Medicare and Medicaid—as well as other important Federal programs like education, training, infrastructure, and nutrition programs.

We all know that we must reduce the Federal Government's massive structural deficit. To do that, we have to make difficult choices about worthwhile programs and scarce resources. However, I don't think that many of my colleagues really understand the magnitude of the cuts required under this budget resolution—or the impact that such changes would have on the vast majority of people in this country. The cuts proposed for Medicare, Medicaid, education and training programs, urban redevelopment, and Federal safety-net programs will devastate millions of families.

Moreover, if the experience of the last 15 years has taught us anything, it is that we never have as good a grip on deficit reduction as we think we do. We should have learned to err on the side of caution and conservatism when estimating deficits 5—or 7—years down the line. Consequently, I believe that it is irresponsible to adopt a massive tax cut at this time.

Finally, I believe that the tax cuts proposed in this budget are distributionally unfair. These tax cuts are targeted toward the rich; many working-class families won't see a penny from them. If we want to reduce the tax burden on the hard-pressed middle class, we should rethink our approach. Honest hard-working families that often hold down several jobs—and still have to struggle to make ends meet—need tax relief a lot more than America's most affluent families.

For these reasons, I urge the House to reject the conference report on the budget resolution and to begin again. It's not too late to draw up a budget that cuts the deficit responsibly without stabbing middle-class families and the elderly in the back.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in somewhat reluctant opposition to this budget resolution.

Without a doubt, the time to act on slowing the growth of Federal spending and Federal programs is upon us. We cannot continue to borrow and spend and push our country into bankruptcy.

Today we are faced with the blueprint for how the Republican leadership plans to reach a balanced budget in 7 years. I've spent enough time studying the issues and talking about them with people in my district that I could be a budget architect, and if I had a seat at the table, I would make a few changes in the design.

I would soften the blow on working families who struggle to save and invest enough to send their kids to college and pay their rent or mortgages. And I would tell them that the best tax cut we can give them and their children is real deficit reduction.

I have held countless town meetings to discuss with the people of the 19th District the very real budget decisions which we must make. People in my part of Illinois are not clamoring for tax cuts which cannot be afforded any more than they want to keep open obsolete agencies or continue to fund ineffective programs. They want to make sure the priority needs are met and put a brake on spending which we can't afford.

Balancing the budget won't be easy and it won't come without the loss of some programs and activities which people in the 19th District appreciate. I am more than willing to shoulder that responsibility because the deficit and accumulated debt is the No. 1 problem facing this country. But one of my great regrets is that the highly-charged partisan atmosphere in Congress won't allow us to craft a plan which would have broad, bipartisan support. I credit the Republican leadership for putting this package together, with the regret that we could not find more middle ground on some of our basic concerns.

The real disappointment is that all of what is being done today will be nothing but empty rhetoric when it comes time to put it into law. The Congress will pass legislation which follows the unfair and unrealistic instructions contained in this resolution, the President will, rightly so, veto those bills, those vetoes will stand and we will have to come back and do what we should be doing right now, which is working in a bipartisan way to balance the budget. I stand ready to assist in that effort. And so, it is with reluctance that I vote against the resolution, in hopes that we work together to address the budget crisis facing this country.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to remind my colleagues of what carried a Republican majority to the House of Representatives: it was an electorate demanding fundamental changes in failed government agencies and policies, and a vast reduction of the growing Federal deficit.

The budget resolution before us certainly creates a clear path to fiscal soundness. However, we continue to face the difficult challenge of implementing this plan, including the restructuring of our Federal departments and agencies. As chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and on behalf of its Republican members, I would like to reaffirm our commitment toward creating a

new 21st Century Government that is less intrusive, less costly and more responsive to the American taxpayer.

The American people have lost patience with a government that grows in size but not in service. For instance, the U.S. General Accounting Office has documented the problem of massive duplication within our Federal departments in reporting that the Department of Commerce shares its mission with at least 71 Federal departments, agencies, and offices. As a result of this duplication and other inefficiencies within the Federal Government, the American taxpayer and future generations will bear the burden of a U.S. tax receipt system that is 13 times the size it was in 1960.

I support the budget resolution's goal of eliminating the Department of Commerce as an initial step in the overall restructuring process. The next crucial step is determining whether consolidation, privatization, localization, or elimination will produce the most effective and innovative results within each agency. Republican members of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee pledge to continue these reorganization efforts by evaluating all Federal agencies and departments to determine if their missions and functions are still viable resources to the American public.

In fact, next month, the Committee will begin a series of nationwide field hearings that will serve as an open forum for experts in organizational management, as well as the public, to voice their ideas about what they want their government to do for them and what their government should look like. Let's allow the American public to have a voice in this historic process of change.

In closing, I would like to reiterate the significant amount of resources that can be saved, over the long-term, through the restructuring of inefficient Federal Government agencies. I remain dedicated to creating an innovative government through the use and guidance of private and public sector experts in the restructuring field.

The time has come for citizens, experts, and lawmakers to join together in the common cause of creating a 21st Century Government. Through a collaborative effort the Government we create can be as effective and innovative as the Government we envision.

I thank the Chairman and yield back.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker. The conference agreement on the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution includes proposed savings of about \$4.4 billion over the next 7 years from the assumption that the Davis-Bacon Act will be repealed. However, the specific assumption for repeal of the Act is not binding on the committees of jurisdiction over Davis-Bacon and does not prejudice the enactment of legislation to repeal the Act. With this in mind, I plan to support the Conferees' Report.

However, I would like to be very clear in stating that I have serious doubts as to whether the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act will actually result in any serious savings—let alone savings amounting to \$4.4 billion—and I question the need for this language in the Conferees' Report. Several studies have indicated that repealing the Act would be, at best, neutral with respect to Federal construction costs when compared to lost revenue due to reduced wages.

The Davis-Bacon Act has been a focus of congressional consideration since the 1950's. There appears to be little indisputable evi-

dence with respect to its impact. In light of this, some have called the Act a Special Interest 'dole-out' that is earmarked specifically for organized labor. But this is an unfair assessment. If there is any clear evidence with respect to the Davis-Bacon Act, it is that the Act has effectively taken the wages of working men and women out of the Federal construction bidding process. I hope that my colleagues understand this. And I urge them to vote against any measures to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my great appreciation to Mr. KASICH, the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, on his efforts to maintain Congress' commitment to our Nation's veterans during this extremely difficult process of balancing the budget.

The other members of the Budget Committee, especially Mr. HOKE, Mrs. MOLINARI, and Mr. BASS of the National Security Budget Task Force, also deserve great credit for their efforts.

These Members worked long and hard to assure that veterans were not unfairly singled out for any new cuts, and that the budget was not balanced on the backs of veterans.

Unfortunately demagoguery and misinformation about this resolution have been used by the administration to scare veterans into fearing the absolute worst about this budget.

These have been desperate administration tactics to confuse veterans and steer their attention away from the administration's own budget proposals which in some ways would be worse for veterans than the recommendations of this conference report.

In unprecedented partisan fashion administration officials have talked about a mean spirit on Capitol Hill toward veterans.

When the reality has been that the mandatory savings provisions proposed by the House Budget Committee have simply extended current law and items passed by previous Congresses.

Additionally, most of these proposals were signed into law by President Clinton in 1993, and included in both of his budget proposals submitted this year.

The reality is that this conference agreement recommends an increase in annual veterans' spending from \$36.9 billion to \$40.4 billion per year over the next 7 years.

This amounts to a total of \$276 billion—an increase of \$39.5 billion over the last 7 years.

This is during a period when the veteran population is rapidly declining.

The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that between 1990 and the year 2010, the veteran population will decrease by 7 million, or 26 percent.

There were dire predictions earlier this year that the budget would contain entitlement reform proposals devastating veterans benefits.

The veterans organizations testified in great opposition to means testing disability compensation, taxing veterans benefits, or removing 10 and 20 percent service-connected disabled veterans from the compensation roles.

None of these proposals are included in this budget conference report.

And based on my dealings with the Budget chairman over the past few months, I can assure veterans that none of them were ever se-

riously considered by the House Budget Committee.

The conference report does mandate reconciliation savings of \$6.4 billion over 7 years.

This is about the same amount of savings achieved by the Reconciliation Acts passed in 1990 and 1993.

Many Members, who are now complaining about this budget's impact upon veterans voted for these same proposals in 1990 and 1993.

They may want to check their prior votes.

All veterans will benefit from the financial improvements balancing the budget can bring to the American economy.

Younger veterans with families and children will certainly benefit from the \$500 per child tax credit, regardless of their income.

Additionally, this budget protects the Social Security benefits of older veterans.

Others have highlighted the list of economic benefits a balanced budget will provide so I will not repeat them at this time.

The latest dire predictions veterans have been scared by is that this budget resolution results in closed VA medical centers.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

As a matter of fact, over the next 5 years, the President's budget proposes \$339 million less for VA health care than this conference report.

It is contradictory for administration officials to claim the budget conference agreement results in hospital closures over 7 years and that the President's budget proposal would not.

One could certainly ask how many hospitals would have closed if funding were at the President's recommended level of the 10 years of his latest budget plan.

This resolution does not mandate or require any specific level of spending on VA health care.

As all Members and administration officials know, the appropriation bill sets the specific spending level for VA health care.

The appropriators will make decisions on spending levels for VA health care next month.

I will work with the Appropriations Committee in the same manner as I have with the Budget Committee to assure adequate spending levels for VA health care programs.

I encourage all Members to make their priorities known to the Appropriations Committee.

The rising national debt and interest on that debt have created a crisis which Congress must face now.

It is truly a matter of saving our country from financial ruin.

Our children and grandchildren will either inherit a declining standard of living or gain freedom from the financial excesses of our generation.

We can either pass a balanced budget and work to protect high priority veterans programs, or go with the President's budget, ignore our national financial crisis, and add over a trillion dollars to the debt our children will have to repay.

I urge Members to support the conference report, to save our country's financial future and protect our veterans.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House-Senate Republican budget conference report.

This proposal, a compromise written by the House and Senate Budget Committees, would give the very wealthy an enormous tax break

while at the same time devastating Medicare and other vital programs. I voted against this package as a conferee and will vote no on final passage in the House.

The goal of this budget proposal is one I share: balancing the federal budget by the year 2002. In January, I voted for a constitutional amendment to balance our federal budget. I believe we must end the continued policy of running billion-dollar deficits every year which add to the national debt that must be paid by our children and grandchildren.

But we should not balance the budget by cutting student loans, Medicare, Social Security, funding for veterans and infrastructure while offering a \$245 billion tax cut. This outrageous cut will give the wealthiest families a cut of over \$15,000 while giving most middle-income families an average of only \$500 in tax relief.

We must also balance our budget in a way which does not put such a tremendous burden on our nation's elderly. Last fall, during town meetings with my constituents, I talked about the "Contract with America," and its potential impact on Social Security and Medicare. I suggested that if the Republican plan were enacted, our seniors would see huge Medicare cuts, higher Medicare premiums and out-of-pocket costs, and an effort to cut Social Security. If you examine the Republican budget closely, it does all three.

It cuts \$270 billion from Medicare over seven years, meaning that the service currently provided by Medicare will be significantly less in 2002. By cutting the Medicare program by 25 percent in 2002, out-of-pocket costs for seniors will increase by over \$1000 in 2002. And, this budget begins the dangerous concept of reducing Social Security cost-of-living-adjustments, beginning in 1999, by altering the Consumer Price Index. This will reduce the average benefit by \$240 per person.

The Republicans have also suggested this plan will actually balance the budget in 2002. Unfortunately, their proposal relies on unsound economics and budget gimmicks to reach a balanced budget. This budget assumes a \$170 billion "economic bonus" between 1996 and 2002 for attempting to balance the budget. This is based on a rosy scenario that our financial markets would react to lower interest rates by an optimistic 2 percent in 2002. Without this bonus, the budget is not balanced, and the promises behind this budget remain unfulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget. I believe if we got rid of the \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthy and used those funds to help keep Medicare solvent; if we asked the very wealthy instead to pay their fair share; restored some funding for some of our most needed initiatives, such as student loans; and did not tamper with Social Security, we would reach this goal. Unfortunately, a majority of my colleagues did not agree with our efforts to make these changes in the Budget Committee.

Therefore, I intend to vote against the Kasich budget plan on the floor of the House.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference agreement on the budget that we have before us today. Like the Republican budget proposal which passed the House last month, this is a measure which seeks to pay for the Republicans' tax breaks for wealthy individuals on the backs of chil-

dren's nutrition and the elderly's Medicare and at the expense of sound education, health and welfare benefits.

The conference agreement worked out by the Republicans is, to say the least, disappointing. In this time of fiscal stringency, it makes no sense for the Republicans to continue to insist on providing costly unfair tax breaks to wealthier Americans and corporations while cutting off programs which invest in our nation's future, our children and our people. Yet that is what this conference agreement does. The size of the tax breaks is slightly different from the House-passed resolution, now they cost \$245 billion over just five years, but they remain unfair and slated for enactment before the budget paper promises are close to being fulfilled.

Surely, the Republicans do not expect the American people to believe that these huge unfair tax breaks, which are a throwback to the failed economic policies of the 1980's, will be an investment in our country's future? The Republicans make this claim even as they plot deep cuts in student loan funds by \$10 billion over seven years, as they cut funding for education across the board, which is one of the most important investments our country can make. At a time when jobs demand more preparation and the cost of a college education is rising twice as fast as income, cutting education funding is indeed a losing proposition. We need to support education as a budget priority, not as a political throwaway to pay for the wealthy's tax breaks. This conference agreement has it backward.

The GOP budget further digs the deficit hole deeper with seventy billion dollars more for the Pentagon, wed to cold war mentality.

At the same time this is a budget which not only slams doors shut on Americans wanting to gain an education, but sadly decimates programs which provide a safety net for our nation's elderly and poor. The budget cuts \$270 billion from Medicare, \$182 billion from Medicaid, \$100 billion from welfare programs, and another \$71 billion from other entitlement programs. In the seven year Republican paper promise to achieve a balance, ironically economists can often predict 7 months in advance much less seven years into the future.

In the absence of any real explanation, the Republicans simply split the difference on the cuts to Medicare and Medicaid between the House and Senate plans. Thus, the amount of the cuts were arbitrarily set, without rhyme, reason or thought as to the consequences on people today. Without contemplating the effects, the Republicans today promise draconian cuts that will mean fewer benefits, higher out-of-pocket costs for seniors, and less choice of doctors. This is the GOP blueprint. Nearly 83 percent of Medicare benefits go to seniors with incomes of \$25,000 or less. Just think about what that does to seniors who rely upon the Federal Medicare promise. The proposed reductions would have a devastating effect on these people. Likewise, Medicaid is the only major Federal source of funding for long-term care and the proposed cuts will have drastic results for our nation's seniors, with over one-half the benefits flowing to elderly Americans.

The irony of this is that in the last Congress, the Republicans refused to support meaningful comprehensive health care reform, saying there was no crisis in health care. Now they have conveniently discovered ironically a

slightly improved Medicare Trustees Annual Report and bemoan it as a crisis. Actually the 1995 report suggests a slight improvement over 1994. The GOP is going to solve this health care crisis by cutting benefits to seniors and reimbursements to health care providers while giving tax breaks to wealthy Americans. This is not the approach that will protect and preserve Medicare and the elderly and help finally to rationalize the health care system.

It's an unfair plan, it's unworkable but no doubt the GOP will score the political points and then try to dump the problem and duty on the President or the Democrats.

The priorities outlined in this budget agreement are outrageous. We ought to be offering hope by acknowledging the reality that the Federal Government needs to remain a partner in supporting the basic needs of our citizens. The people we represent. However, what I am seeing is an erosion of support for working families and an eradication of support for those who cannot make ends meet in order to give wealthier folks unreasonable tax breaks. Republican paper promises and up front tax breaks with back loaded deficit reduction don't signify political courage, as they would have us believe, but political pandering yet another postponement of fiscal reality. Republican priorities are focused on change at the bottom line, producing enough money for the Republican tax breaks today for well off Americans, not empowering families and compounding the serious deficit problems for tomorrow.

This proposition will abandon the policy track of the 1993 Democratic budget blueprint—which is exceeding its promise, a balanced Democrat 1993 budget package of tax fairness and reductions in spending, which would be a one trillion dollar deficit reduction in its seven year cycle—the Republicans may have the votes to hatch this ploy but beyond the tax breaks no stomach to carry out the plot.

I urge my colleagues today to reject the GOP scheme and get back to the real world of fiscal discipline, not political hyperbole.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this budget resolution.

I support a balanced budget amendment and am prepared to make the tough choices needed to stop the flow of red ink. But this budget is built on a faulty foundation and constructed with a tax break for the rich that we can not afford.

In the midst of a fiscal crisis is it responsible to give away \$245 billion in tax cuts? I do not think so. A tax break for the wealthy means less for everyone else. It means breaking our commitments to the American people. It says we no longer care about seniors who have built our country and we no longer care about educating our young people who will ensure our country's future.

Seniors must give up, get less, and pay more and college bound students must go it alone.

Mr. Speaker, we can reduce the deficit in a balanced and fair way—one that reduces spending while investing in our future.

My constituents care deeply about education, protection of our fragile environment, basic research, and fairness. They say cut and invest. This budget does neither and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a balanced budget. But I rise in

opposition to the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996–2002.

Make no mistake. This bill reflects Republican priorities. It is a Republican budget that rewards the well-off and sticks the less-fortunate with the bill.

Republican conferees had an impossible task. Dress up a bill that hurts the elderly, the young, and the disadvantaged. Dress up a bill that guts Medicare and Medicaid, forces seniors to pay more out-of-pocket costs for health care, and devastates rural and inner-city hospitals. Dress up a bill that makes it more difficult for our children to go to college and get the education they deserve. Dress up a bill that lines the pockets of wealthy Americans.

It should come as no surprise that they failed. This bill was just too ugly to dress-up. But the American people do not need me to tell them how bad this budget plan is. Listen to your friends, your neighbors, and your family.

In my district, I listened to the Hopkins family. They're the real experts. The Hopkins have been married for 40 years. Mr. Hopkins works part-time at McDonalds, as he has for 6 years.

Every dollar counts. Although Mr. Hopkins worked for many years for a small business, he does not have a pension to rely on. Instead the Hopkins depend on Social Security, and Mr. Hopkins small supplemental income.

With \$490 a month going towards rent, the Hopkins have little left over to cover the cost of medical emergencies.

Under the Republican plan, the Hopkins will pay as much as \$2,000 a year more to cover cuts in Medicare. Although they fortunately have no co-payments right now, an increase of this size would be devastating.

The Hopkins are not a special case. They have worked hard all their lives. They have made the right choices, and they have sacrificed when we have asked.

Mrs. Hopkins has a heart condition. She has asthma. And arthritis. She pays for her own medicine—about \$200 a month. This cost represents a sizable percentage of their monthly income. After paying for rent, utilities, and food, they have almost nothing left over for clothes.

Mrs. Hopkins told me: "Leave our Medicare alone. We could not make it without Medicare. My last trip to the hospital just about broke us." A recent trip to the hospital dramatized the Hopkins' precarious position. Although the ambulance and hospital stay were paid for, Mrs. Hopkins was required to pay an additional \$130 for twenty pills.

While the Hopkins work to make ends meet, with dignity and strength, the Republican's have decided that it's fair to make life more difficult for families like this one. The Hopkins are right on the margin.

The Hopkins do not have any room to give. How can we ask them to sacrifice, and, at the same time, reward the wealthiest members of our society with a generous tax cut. Will the Hopkins benefit from this tax cut? No. The Hopkins will pay more and get less.

I can not support a budget plan that doesn't put hard-working Americans first—that does not put the Hopkins first.

I will support a fiscally responsible and sensible budget. The budget offered by my colleague, Mr. STENHOLM, was just such a budget. By proposing sensible reforms in health

care programs, and preserving crucial funding for education, rural health, research, and economic development programs, the Stenholm budget achieved a zero deficit without permanently crippling our society.

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget. Do not let the American people down.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks. I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution because it makes massive cuts in Federal education and training programs. In addition, the Republicans are going to make it harder for children from middle class families to attend college—so it's easier for them to hand out tax cuts to the rich.

The Republican budget resolution reminds me of what Hall of Fame catcher Yogi Berra once said when he walked into a popular New York restaurant. He looked around the packed dining room and said: "No wonder no one comes here anymore, it's always crowded."

That about sums up the logic of the Republican about-face on its longtime support for Federal education programs, especially student financial aid. After discovering just how popular and successful the in-school interest subsidy has been the House Republicans proposed its complete elimination.

Their original proposal to cut student aid by \$18.7 billion was a foolish departure from the bipartisan, national policy to expand access to higher education that has existed since President Truman.

The conference agreement is hardly any better. Republicans will almost certainly have to eliminate the in-school interest subsidy for graduate and professional students.

More than 500,000 graduate students, all from needy families, will be affected by the loss of the subsidy. For some, Ph.D. students especially, the proposal will increase their loan payments by as much as \$375 per month and will increase total loan costs by \$45,000.

Despite what Republicans think, not every graduate student goes out and makes big bucks as a lawyer or stock broker. Many become teachers, ministers, social workers and, I might add, history professors, all of which are ordinarily not high-paying professions—unless, of course, they run for Congress, become Speaker and win a big, fat book contract.

The net result is that many young people who would have gone into these worthy professions will be forced to pursue higher-paying careers to be able to pay their loans back. That will mean more lawyers and fewer teachers. I guess this is what Republicans call progress.

Republicans still need to come up with another \$7 billion in student aid cuts to meet their budget target. They have not said how they will do it, but one thing is sure: Whatever they do will hurt students. The Republicans are going to make it harder for children from middle class families to attend college—so it's easier for them to hand out tax cuts to the rich.

The in-school interest subsidy helps tear down the financial barriers that would otherwise keep many deserving students from attending college and graduate programs. Moreover, taxpayers are paid back handsomely; college graduates earn higher incomes, and, consequently, pay higher taxes. Most graduate students who benefit from the subsidy will repay it in Federal income taxes within a few years.

For our society as a whole, the rate of return on this investment in education is overwhelming. Student aid has made our society more mobile, more prosperous, more stable, and, yes, more fair! Our economy is the strongest in the world, in large part, because our colleges have produced highly trained scientists, engineers, and managers.

In short, we are all better off, collectively and individually. Just ask Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader ARMEY, two former recipients of Federal student financial aid who went on to bigger and better things, due in no small part to the college education they received.

This debate, however, is about more than just economics. For generations a college degree has meant one thing: you have done everything possible to make sure your children have gotten off on the right foot in life. For parents and children alike, a college education has made dreams come true.

That is why the Democratic party has supported expanding access to higher education and why we believe that every person who wants to attend college and has the necessary intellectual capacity should attend college.

Finally, this budget should be defeated because of the massive cuts it makes in Federal education and training programs. President Clinton has correctly proposed massive increases in education and training spending—on the order of \$40 billion over 7 years. The Republicans will cut \$35 billion dollars.

Their cuts in the education and training account will reduce the real buying power of these programs by 33.2 percent in the year 2002. These cuts will have a devastating impact on a whole range of programs.

Republican budget cuts will harm efforts: to assist local schools and communities working to improve their schools, raise their standards and increase parental involvement, to make schools safer and drug free, to provide students access to computers and technology in the classroom, to help limited English speaking children meet challenging academic standards, and to help schools meet needs of disadvantaged native American children.

Education is perhaps the most important investment we can make in a global economy. If America is to compete, our workers must be the best educated in the world. This country wants and needs a strong Federal role in education. I urge the defeat of this budget resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time within which a rollcall vote by electronic device may be taken, without intervening business, on adoption of the conference report.

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

[Roll No. 456]

AYES—242

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

NOES—190

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

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

NOT VOTING—2

Moakley Reynolds

□ 1558

The previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] rise?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

AYES—236

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

NOES—191

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

Doggett Lantos Rangel Doolittle Jones Regula Mascara Payne (VA) Stenholm
 Dooley Levin Reed Dornan Kasich Matsui Pelosi Stokes
 Doyle Lewis (GA) Richardson Deraier Kelly McCarthy Peterson (FL) Studds
 Durbin Lincoln Rivers Duncan Kim McDermott Peterson (MN) Stupak
 Edwards Lipinski Roemer Dunn King Rohrabacher McHale Pickett Tejeda
 Engel Lofgren Rose Ehlert Kingston Ros-Lehtinen McKinney Pomeroy Thompson
 Eshoo Lowey Roybal-Allard Emerson Klug Roth Scarborough McNulty Poshard Thornton
 Evans Luther Rush Emery Knollenberg Roukema Royce Salmon Menendez Rangel Thurman
 Farr Maloney Sabo English Kolbe Royce Salmon Menendez Rangel Thurman
 Fattah Manton Sanders Ensign LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood
 Fazio Markey Sawyer Everett Largent Largent Largent Largent Largent Largent Largent
 Fields (LA) Martinez Schroeder Ewing Latham Latham Latham Latham Latham Latham Latham
 Filner Mascara Schumer Fawell Fields (TX) Laughlin Lazio Leach Lewis (CA) Lewis (KY)
 Flake Matsui Scott Foley Forbes Fowler Fox Franks (CT) Franks (NJ) Lightfoot Linder
 Foglietta McCarthy Serrano Siskisky Skaggs Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton
 Ford McDermott Siskisky Skaggs Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton
 Frank (MA) McHale Siskisky Skaggs Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton
 Frost McKinney Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton Skelton
 Furse McNulty Meehan Spratt Stark Stark Stark Stark Stark Stark Stark Stark Stark
 Gejdenson Meehan Meek Menendez Mfume Miller (CA) Mineta Minge Mink Moran Murtha
 Gephardt Meek Menendez Mfume Miller (CA) Mineta Minge Mink Moran Murtha
 Gonzalez Menendez Mfume Miller (CA) Mineta Minge Mink Moran Murtha
 Gordon Mfume Miller (CA) Mineta Minge Mink Moran Murtha
 Green Miller (CA) Mineta Minge Mink Moran Murtha
 Gutierrez Mineta Minge Mink Moran Murtha
 Hall (OH) Minge Mink Moran Murtha
 Harman Mink Moran Murtha
 Hastings (FL) Mollohan Montgomery Thornton
 Hayes Montgomery Thornton
 Hefner Moran Murtha
 Hilliard Murtha Nadler Torres
 Hinchey Nadler Torres
 Holden Neal Torricelli
 Hoyer Oberstar Towns
 Jackson-Lee Obey Tucker
 Jacobs Olver Velazquez
 Jefferson Ortiz Vento
 Johnson (SD) Owens Vislosky
 Johnson, E. B. Pallone Volkmer
 Johnston Pastor Ward
 Kanjorski Payne (NJ) Waters
 Kaptur Payne (VA) Watt (NC)
 Kennedy (MA) Pelosi Williams
 Kennedy (RI) Peterson (FL) Wilson
 Kennelly Peterson (MN) Wise
 Kildee Pickett Woolsey
 Kleczka Pomeroy Wyden
 Klink Poshard Wynn
 LaFalce Rahall Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Buyer Moakley Waxman
 Dornan Orton
 Gibbons Reynolds

□ 1616

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

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the conference report.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 194, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—239

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

Doolittle Jones Regula Mascara Payne (VA) Stenholm
 Dornan Kasich Matsui Pelosi Stokes
 Deraier Kelly McCarthy Peterson (FL) Studds
 Duncan Kim McDermott Peterson (MN) Stupak
 Dunn King Rohrabacher McHale Pickett Tejeda
 Ehlert Kingston Ros-Lehtinen McKinney Pomeroy Thompson
 Ehrlich Klug Roth Scarborough McNulty Poshard Thornton
 Emerson Knollenberg Roukema Royce Salmon Menendez Rangel Thurman
 English Kolbe Royce Salmon Menendez Rangel Thurman
 Ensign LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood LaHood
 Everett Largent Largent Largent Largent Largent Largent Largent
 Ewing Latham Latham Latham Latham Latham Latham Latham
 Fawell Fields (TX) Laughlin Lazio Leach Lewis (CA) Lewis (KY)
 Fields (TX) Laughlin Lazio Leach Lewis (CA) Lewis (KY)
 Foley Forbes Fowler Fox Franks (CT) Franks (NJ) Lightfoot Linder
 Franks (CT) Franks (NJ) Lightfoot Linder
 Franks (NJ) Lightfoot Linder
 Frelinghuysen Livingston LoBiondo
 Frisa Funderburk Longley
 Ganske Gallegly Longley
 Gekas Gekas Gekas Gekas Gekas Gekas Gekas Gekas
 Geren Gilchrest Gillmor Gilman
 Gilchrest Gillmor Gilman
 Gilman Gilman Gilman
 Gingrich Ginchich Ginchich Ginchich Ginchich Ginchich Ginchich
 Goodlatte Goodlatte Goodlatte Goodlatte Goodlatte Goodlatte Goodlatte
 Goodling Goodling Goodling Goodling Goodling Goodling Goodling
 Goss Goss Goss Goss Goss Goss Goss Goss
 Graham Greenwood Gunderson
 Greenwood Gunderson Gunderson
 Gunderson Gutknecht Hall (TX)
 Gutknecht Hall (TX) Moorhead
 Hancock Hansen Morella
 Hansen Morella Myers
 Hastert Hastings (WA) Myrick
 Hastings (WA) Myrick Myrick Myrick Myrick Myrick Myrick
 Hayworth Hefley Heineaman
 Hefley Heineaman Herger
 Heineaman Herger Hilleary
 Herger Hilleary Hobson
 Hilleary Hobson Hoekstra
 Hobson Hoekstra Hoke
 Hoekstra Hoke Horn
 Hoke Horn Hostettler
 Horn Hostettler Houghton
 Hostettler Houghton Hunter
 Houghton Hunter Hutchinson
 Hunter Hutchinson Hyde
 Hutchinson Hyde Inglis
 Hyde Inglis Istook
 Istook Johnson (CT) Johnson, Sam
 Johnson (CT) Johnson, Sam
 Johnson, Sam Ramstad

NAYS—194

Abercrombie de la Garza Hamilton
 Ackerman DeFazio Harman
 Andrews DeLauro Hastings (FL)
 Baesler Dellums Hayes
 Baldacci Deutsch Hefner
 Barcia Dicks Hilliard
 Barrett (WI) Dingell Hinchey
 Becerra Dixon Holden
 Beilenson Doggett Hoyer
 Benson Dooley Jackson-Lee
 Berman Doyle Jacobs
 Bevill Durbin Jefferson
 Bishop Edwards Johnson (SD)
 Bonior Engel Johnson, E. B.
 Borski Eshoo Johnston
 Boucher Evans Kanjorski
 Brewster Farr Kaptur
 Browder Fattah Kennedy (MA)
 Brown (CA) Fazio Kennedy (RI)
 Brown (FL) Fields (LA) Kennelly
 Brown (OH) Filner Kildee
 Bryant (TX) Flake Kleczka
 Cardin Flanagan Klink
 Chapman Foglietta LaFalce
 Clay Ford Lantos
 Clayton Frank (MA) Levin
 Clement Frost Lewis (GA)
 Clyburn Furse Lincoln
 Coleman Gejdenson Lipinski
 Collins (IL) Gephardt Lofgren
 Collins (MI) Gibbons Lowey
 Conyers Gonzalez Luther
 Costello Gordon Maloney
 Coyne Green Manton
 Cramer Gutierrez Mantoy
 Danner Hall (OH) Martinez

Mascara Payne (VA) Stenholm
 Matsui Pelosi Stokes
 McCarthy Peterson (FL) Studds
 McDermott Peterson (MN) Stupak
 McHale Pickett Tejeda
 McKinney Pomeroy Thompson
 McNulty Poshard Thornton
 Meehan Rahall Thurman
 Meek Rangel Torres
 Menendez Reed Torricelli
 Mfume Richardson Towns
 Miller (CA) Rivers Trafficant
 Mineta Roemer Tucker
 Minge Rose Velazquez
 Mink Roybal-Allard Vento
 Mollohan Rush
 Moran Sabo
 Murtha Sanders Volkmer
 Nadler Sawyer Ward
 Neal Schroeder Waters
 Oberstar Schumer Watt (NC)
 Obey Scott Waxman
 Olver Serrano Williams
 Ortiz Siskisky Wilson
 Orton Skaggs Wise
 Owens Skelton Woolsey
 Pallone Slaughter Wyden
 Pastor Spratt Wynn
 Payne (NJ) Stark Yates

NOT VOTING—2

Moakley Reynolds

□ 1629

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 310 AND H.R. 313

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 310 and H.R. 313.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-167) on the resolution (H. Res. 177) providing for the further consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE, FOR ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES, FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE RECOVERY FROM THE TRAGEDY THAT OCCURRED AT OKLAHOMA CITY, AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 176

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1944) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider an amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. That amendment (if offered) shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that amendment (if offered) and on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Woodland Hills, CA [Mr. BEILEN-SON], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1944, which largely consists of the rescission and supplemental appropriations contained in the conference report for H.R. 1158. The bill was vetoed by the President 4½ weeks ago. It was the first veto of his presidency. Unfortunately, there remain enough defenders of the status quo in this House that an override of that veto would have been impossible.

Facing an impasse, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been striving to find a compromise with the administration in order to provide needed disaster relief to 40 States, and to place a down payment on our balanced budget, which we have just been debating here over the past hour.

This modified closed rule, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of the bill that can break that impasse, with 1 hour of general debate in the House. The rule permits the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to offer

one amendment, which shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to amendment or division. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Members that in California, the message from the President's veto of H.R. 1158 was received loudly and clearly. The President talked a lot last year about standing behind the families, rebuilding their lives after facing the worst that nature could possibly throw at them. The Northridge earthquake was devastating for southern California, and I shall never forget the President's visit to that region, and how moved he was by those who were victimized.

Unfortunately, his veto pen spoke louder than those words, telling struggling communities that if providing assistance meant cutting his sacred Federal spending programs, that disaster relief really was not all that important.

H.R. 1944 is the product of the tireless effort of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to send a compromise bill to the President. The bill restores funding to a number of the education, training, and housing programs that the President said were the basis for his veto.

The language on striker replacement incorporated in H.R. 1158 was also dropped from this bill. As we know, the first time around the White House did not engage in negotiations on the rescission conference report until after the process was completed. No one in the administration was at all involved in the negotiating process. Instead, they waited until the process was completely over to issue a veto threat.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations reports that the administration has simply refused to come to closure on numerous provisions under endless negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to stop letting perfection be the enemy of the good. The rescissions most objectionable to the President have been addressed. They have been replaced with other spending reductions. H.R. 1944 will provide \$6.7 billion for much needed disaster relief in 40 States. It is not just California, this impacts 40 States. The bill also continues to place a \$9.2 billion downpayment on deficit reduction, which obviously is a goal to which we all seem to aspire, and that was evident from the debate on both sides of the aisle on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that the very responsible spending reductions in this bill, which account for a 1-percent reduction in fiscal year 1995 Federal outlays, are the product of a thorough, a very thorough review process conducted for months by members of the Committee on Appropriations.

I have said it before and I will say it again, the criteria used by the committee are clear, concise, and utterly reasonable to the American taxpayer. Rescissions were proposed when programs were not authorized, were duplicative, received large funding increases in fiscal year 1995, had unspent funds piling up from year to year, exceeded spending levels in the Clinton budget, and were wasteful or did not work.

Mr. Speaker, the President killed the balanced budget amendment by encouraging Senators in his party to flip-flop and oppose that amendment. The President opposed the specific balanced budget plans offered by the Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress. The President vetoed H.R. 1158 that started the country down the path towards a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, some cynics might conclude that the President can talk the talk but not walk the walk when it comes to controlling Federal spending. Even though the original objections to the rescission bill have been addressed in H.R. 1944, some administration officials are indicating that the bill just may be vetoed once again.

I would especially note that some in the administration consider minimal disagreements regarding the proper way to dispose of dead and rotting trees on Federal lands to be an excuse to kill this bill. Those people either have their priorities seriously misplaced, or this administration could never find a serious spending reduction plan that the President could possibly sign.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very fair and balanced rule for a very important bill that has come from the Committee on Appropriations. Once again, it will be up to the President to make the case that, despite all of his original concerns being met, that a 1-percent cut in the \$1.5 trillion in Federal outlays is too much for him to accept in order to fund much needed disaster relief.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the record the following document regarding the amendment process and special rules.

The document referred to is as follows:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 28, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	31	71
Modified Closed ³	49	47	12	27
Closed ⁴	9	9	1	2

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of June 28, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Totals:	104	100	44	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 28, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95)
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt.	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt.	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we do not oppose the rule, but we are troubled by the manner in which this bill is being brought forth for consideration by the House.

We understand the majority's desire to expedite consideration of this new version of H.R. 1158, the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill. However, Members have had virtually no opportunity to see the revised bill that this rule makes in order.

The bill has not been considered by, or reported from, the Appropriations Committee. From what we understand, no minority Members of the House have been involved in developing the new legislation. In fact, it appears that only a very few Members have had a role in negotiating this new bill.

While we understand that this is not an unusual process for making revisions to an appropriations bill, I simply want to point out that we are, in fact, considering a new bill that has had very little consideration, by only a few Members, up to this point.

Furthermore, the rule permits an amendment to be offered by Mr. LIVINGSTON, which is apparently intended to allow him to offer compromise language on the so-called salvage timber provision that was in the original bill. That allows a change to one of the most contentious provisions in the bill to be considered by the House with virtually no opportunity to review this important matter in advance.

Beyond our concerns with this rule, many of us oppose the bill that it makes in order for the same reasons that we opposed the original version of the legislation, H.R. 1158. Although H.R. 1944 is a modest improvement over the first bill, it still contains large spending cuts in many valuable programs.

Furthermore, like H.R. 1158, this bill continues to combine in one bill both

emergency disaster assistance and spending cuts, which does a grave injustice to the victims of the Northridge earthquake and other federally declared disasters. It has made the provision of the relief they need dependent upon cutting spending for housing assistance for the elderly, for education and job training, for veterans, for environmental protection, and for a great number of other valuable programs which serve many of our Nation's pressing needs.

Back in March, when the House considered the first rescissions bill, we predicted that pairing emergency disaster assistance with spending cuts—in essence, holding disaster assistance hostage to the politics of cutting spending—would likely delay the provision of emergency funds. That is exactly what has happened. It is now the end of June, and we still have not passed the emergency funding that is needed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and other federal

agencies to meet the needs of disaster victims.

The delay in approval of this bill stands in stark contrast to Congress' quick response to the provision of funds for disaster assistance when we did not insist upon including controversial spending cuts—as well as controversial unrelated legislation, such as the salvage timber provision—in an emergency disaster assistance bill. Members may recall that the original \$10 billion disaster-relief package for the Northridge earthquake was signed into law in less than one month after the earthquake struck on January 17 of last year. Our rapid response to that disaster was possible only because we deliberately refrained from including controversial spending cuts in the same legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat: we do not object to this rule, but we urge Members to vote "no" on the bill it makes in order.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from California, that he is absolutely right. It is much, much easier to deal with disasters by simply adding to the deficit. It is tougher.

However, the message that came through last November 8 was that business as usual has obviously got to come to an end. We had a big debate in the 103rd Congress on the issue of whether or not we would have offsets to deal with the Northridge earthquake. We lost that battle when it came up here.

Now, in the 104th Congress, with this new majority, we have made the determination that when we deal with these very tragic situations and we want to provide emergency assistance, we are only going to do it if we find offsets, and that is what we have done here, and we have successfully been able to more than offset the cost of the Northridge quake and the disasters that have taken place in 40 other States.

Mr. Speaker, I also should add that this bill is virtually identical to H.R. 1158, which has been considered by this House, exhaustive hearings on the issue, and we are simply making changes to try and address the concerns of the President, so we can get this measure signed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from Savannah, GA [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. This bill is a modest cut in the fiscal year 1995 budget. It reduces the budget by about 1 percent, or \$9.3 billion. It is not big money.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of important programs that have been reduced as a result of this. Yet, these are the

tough decisions that we have to make, because the American people have asked us to get our House in order. The President, of course, vetoed the first bill. He vetoed it because he was not satisfied with the cuts. He felt the cuts were too deep in education and training programs for the elderly, and in environmental programs and the salvage timber provisions.

□ 1645

What we have done in this bill is we went back and addressed his concerns. We did not cut these programs as much as we originally did in the first rescission bill. Yet even doing so, there still seems to be a void in the debate from the White House. We do not have a clear indication that they are going to support this bill, nor do we have a clear indication that they are going to veto the bill.

It is somewhat disappointing because my question would be to those who are in opposition to this bill, if not these cuts, which cuts? And if not now, when? That is not a profound statement, but it is something that we have to come around on. It is already late June. We have been debating this bill now for almost 6 months, and we still have yet to see a proposal, a concrete proposal from the White House about addressing these things.

I stand in support of it. Yet I do hope, now that things are kind of loosening up on Pennsylvania Avenue, the President has submitted a balanced budget, hopefully he will come in now and enter this rescission debate at least by supporting this.

The disaster money. The disaster money is necessary. We have flooding all over the country, particularly in Georgia, but Oklahoma City gets anti-terrorism measures paid for. We have already talked about the earthquake. These are important items.

This bill would save more money if it was not for the disasters, but as we know, Mr. Speaker, these disasters happen. We do not have a special fund set aside for them. We probably should do that at some point, but right now we do not. We have to reduce the budget, the spending, in order to help pay for some of these disasters. Again, these are tough decisions, but they are decisions that have to be made.

Let me conclude with this: It has been said that this rescission is too severe on the students, it is too severe on the elderly, it is too severe on the environment. But I would say that if you want to protect the environment, if you want to help out the students, if you want to protect the senior citizens, then you have to be sure that this country stays afloat.

In order to do so, we cannot continuously have deficit spending and overspending and spending on unauthorized projects, and continue to face the children and the senior citizens and the middle class of America and say, "We overspent, but we're going to get somebody else to pay for it." It is time for

us to come around and say, "You know, we're going to have to cut back a little bit in order to be there for you tomorrow."

I believe that this rescission bill, Mr. Speaker, is a responsible step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and then vote for the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 4 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that our Republican colleagues offer this bill in the spirit of the season. It is, of course, the season of television reruns, and this bill is a bit of a rerun, at least as regards the tactic that is employed because it has something in common with the approach that our colleagues have used with reference to the task force to cut Social Security or, rather, to cut Medicare—Social Security is probably next in line—the same approach that was used to prepare to stack the committees that will impact and implement the budget resolution, and now this approach.

They all have one thing in common: They rerun stealth, they rerun secrecy. It was Justice Brandeis who suggested that sunlight is the best disinfectant, that electric light is the best policeman, but his wisdom seems to have been lost on our colleagues, for it is for some reason that they hide their light under a bushel.

At 11 last night this bill was presented to the Committee on Rules. All 119 pages of this piece of legislation, which according to the bill as filed were apparently just introduced yesterday, were presented at 11 last night, so that somewhere near midnight this bill was voted out of the Committee on Rules.

I don't know if many Members of this House even know what is in this 119 pages. Indeed, we have been told by the distinguished gentleman from California that it is virtually identical to legislation that we have considered in this House before. I don't know what parts are identical, given the short period here, but I know one part that is not identical.

The vast majority of the Members of this House, when this bill was in front of us last time, voted to put a lock box on this piece of legislation to ensure that every dollar of cuts went to deficit reduction. I am advised, though I could not find it in the 119 pages, that that virtually identical provision is no longer in here. What is in here are contingent cuts to some of our education programs that I think are very vital.

I really liked the idea on day one in this Congress that we were going to

shake the piece up, that there was going to be a real revolution with regard to change and how business is conducted here. Yet this piece of legislation comes out, not in the bright light of day but, rather, at the midnight hour, coming back to us without ever having a hearing in front of the substantive committee but, rather, having been considered here in the midst of lengthy debate last night and presented on only a few hours' notice, and without one of the provisions that received really bipartisan support when this measure was in front of the House, that provision being the lock box provision.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I would like to ask him to turn to page 105 of the bill H.R. 1944 and look at section 2003. It is entitled "Downward Adjustments in Discretionary Spending Limits." The lock box is included in this measure, I would say to my friend.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me just inquire there, because if I have misstated it and it includes the lock box, that would be great. So every penny that is saved in this bill will go to deficit reduction and only deficit reduction, and not to pay for a tax hike?

Mr. DREIER. The lock box is included in this bill. If the gentleman would read section 2003, it is included in this measure. I would simply like to say that as we look at this new day, the negotiations which my friend says have not taken place in the light of day, we are simply trying to address the concerns of President Clinton, a member of your party. We want to work together with him so that we can get a bill that we can sign.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to hear the lock box is in here.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is there not a rule in the House or at least a practice in the House that prohibits Members from wearing pins while they are addressing the House from the well?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. Members should not wear badges or other indications of their positions on the floor.

Mr. WALKER. So the gentleman who just spoke prior to this was in fact in violation of the procedures of the House when he addressed the House; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise all of the Members that Members should not wear badges or other insignia while addressing the House.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Metairie, LA [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank my friend from California for yielding me the time. After listening to the debate of the last several minutes, I think I am watching a replay of Fantasy Island.

The gentleman from Texas ought to know that this bill is virtually word-for-word the very same bill as the conference report adopted by the House of Representatives May 18. In fact, he says it is a replay. It is a replay.

The only difference is those issues which were raised by the President of the United States, a member of his party, who resides over at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, which has been blocked off from traffic, incidentally. Perhaps that is why the gentleman did not know it. Maybe he could not get over there.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman has had his chance to speak and I am replying to the gentleman. I will yield to him after I am done. I will be happy to yield to him then.

The point is, if the gentleman would speak with the White House and the representatives of his party and the chief of staff of the White House, he would understand that this is virtually the same bill as the original bill, H.R. 1158, with the exception of those items that the White House was interested in changing.

The fact is this is a good effort. We debated it at length earlier in the year. The effort provides for funding for the Oklahoma bombing disaster in supplemental funding. It provides for supplemental funding for flood and fire and earthquake and pestilence that hit California and virtually 39 other States.

It provides for the funding that the President of the United States himself asked for debt relief for Jordan, in order to help resolve the Middle East conflict.

It provide for the placement of tens of thousands of people in the Northwest back in jobs that currently are lying fallow. They are just not in existence right now, but they would be. Those people would be working if this bill would pass and get the President's signature, because in fact all of those forests that were burned out in the last year and a half would be available for lumbering. Trees that were burned out could be salvaged and sent to the lumber mills and people could go to work.

The gentleman, if he had taken the time to examine H.R. 1158 would know fundamentally what is in H.R. 1944, is the same bill, except for the fact that there is additional money for job training, School-to-Work, Goals 2000, Safe and Drug Free Schools, National Community Service, safe drinking water, community development, and so forth, things that the President asked for.

There is one other major facet of H.R. 1158 that also is a replay in H.R. 1944. It is over \$9.1 billion in net savings over and above the \$7 billion in additional supplemental spending requested by this President, savings to the American taxpayer in fiscal year 1995.

Why is that significant? Because the majority in the House of Representatives and the majority in the Senate has said they can balance the budget within 7 years, even though the President in February gave us a budget that said he did not want to balance the budget between now and infinity, because he projected \$200 billion in deficits every year from now on, has now decided that he wants to balance the budget within 10 years.

If he wants to balance the budget in 10 years, guess where the best place to start is? Fiscal year 1995. He could have done it by signing H.R. 1158, which he has already vetoed, or by signing H.R. 1944, which does essentially the same thing.

Here he is getting disaster funding for floods that he asked for, funding for earthquakes that he asked for, funding for fire that he asked for, funding for Jordan that he asked for, funding for Oklahoma that he asked for. He is getting the opportunity to send tens of thousands of people in the Northwest back to work in the timber mills that presumably he wants, I would hope that he want that, and he is saving the American taxpayer over \$9.1 billion in unspent 1995 funds.

If this bill does not pass, as presumably the gentleman in the well might favor, them those savings will not occur. That funding for flood, fire, earthquake, Oklahoma bombing and Jordan would not be had. Those tens of thousands of people would not go back to the lumber mills, and would not be employed, and the gentleman could sit around and smile, and we would probably have to cut mercilessly in the fiscal year 1996 every one of the appropriation bills in order to meet our target to ultimately balance the budget by the year 2002. Just as mercilessly, frankly, in order to accomplish the President's goals to balance the budget by the year 2005.

I suggest to the gentleman, he can continue to cry about not knowing what is in this bill, but if he would like to know about 99 percent of what is in the bill, all he has to do is look at H.R. 1158 which presumably he would know about, since the President has taken the time to veto it.

I just am terribly concerned. This bill really should not be the subject of partisan politics. It should be a bipartisan effort, because it is not Republican people who are going to go back to the sawmills, or Democrat people. It is the American people. It is not Republicans or Democrats who are going to benefit from flood and fire and earthquake relief. It is the American people. It is not Republicans who were devastated in the Oklahoma bombing or Democrats

that were devastated. It is Oklahoma, American people that were devastated.

□ 1700

And they will all be assisted by this bill and, of course, it will be Republicans and Democrats, men, women and children throughout America that will benefit by the \$9.2 billion in savings.

So I would hope, I would hope the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] would stop posturing politically, take the time to read the bill, and when the gentleman does, endorse it. Endorse it. Get Members of his party to vote for it. Let us get it out of the House. Let us send it to the Senate and then let us send it to the President for his signature, not his veto as he did the last bill of this sort.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time briefly to say that the very distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has spoken a little longer than I had anticipated and I would hope that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] might be able to get some time.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, responding to the altar call of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and agreeing with his appeal for bipartisanship, since last night I only got to 103, and your colleague pointed me to 104.

Just tell me if on page 104, the provision to which the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] referred me, is that the same language that a bipartisan majority of this House, an overwhelming majority, approved? The language offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER]; is that language here?

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], it is the exact language that passed in H.R. 1158. It is the language that was sponsored by Senator BYRD. It is not the Brewster language.

Mr. DOGGETT. It is not the Brewster language. It is not the Brewster lockbox. That is the 1 percent that is different that some of us think is very important.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] has 24 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to restore an atmosphere in which perhaps Members will absorb a

little more information and a little less heat at the same time.

First of all, let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] my good friend who is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that after this is over, I would suggest that we both go have a sedative somewhere. I think we need it.

But let me say that I would respectfully point out that the problem that the gentleman is having with the Clinton administration is not due to numbers, as he knows. The problem is because the gentleman's party leadership decided that they were going to use the appropriations process, which is supposed to be used for budget matters, they decided to use that process instead to bulldoze through the Congress major changes in environmental laws.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to partially favor one of those changes. But I do not favor disrupting the entire budget process of the United States in order to accomplish it. As the gentleman very well knows, that is the major bone of contention, or at least one of the major bones of contention, between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the Clinton administration right now; not their lack of desire to cut the deficit.

Now, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I think when we had the last election and the public decided to put our good Republican friends in control for the first time in a long time, I think they did that because out of desperation they thought that that just might force both parties to work together, whether they liked it or not.

I would suggest that last night in the midst of swirling partisanship on other matters, this committee, the Committee on Appropriations, managed to work its way through a very contentious appropriation bill that deals with our international responsibilities in a very nonpartisan, bipartisan way. I wish that that were happening on the budget, but it is not.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is not because I think the product that is being produced on the budget is at great variance from that which the public expected when they voted in November. I think they wanted us to have an attack on the deficit. They wanted us to have an attack on waste. They wanted us to have an understanding that programs needed to be as well managed as they were well meaning. Instead, I think what they are getting is something that has come down to a near war on kids, on students, and on seniors.

The fundamental problem with this bill is that it is almost the same bill that it was when it left the House. It has been changed by about \$700 million from the conference report that the President vetoed; \$700 million or so out of a \$16 billion bill and it is largely a bill which takes away from seniors and takes away from education in order to finance a very large tax cut for some very rich people.

The Brewster amendment has been mentioned. The Brewster amendment

was the effort by our party to see to it that every dollar in this bill was used for deficit reduction, not for tax breaks that rich people don't need.

The Brewster amendment passed with less than 10 dissenting votes in this House and then one day after it passed, we were told by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, that after all, that was just a game to get votes to pass this vehicle.

Indeed, the language which was adopted in conference provides about \$5 billion in deficit reduction in terms of outlays from the first year's savings in this bill. But it provides between \$130 and \$140 billion in money to be used for that tax cut and 50 percent of that tax cut is going to the wealthiest people in this country, people who make more than \$100,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything against rich people. I would like everybody to be rich. That is the American dream. But I want to tell you why I do not think America's No. 1 need is to feed the desires of rich people to make more money, as this package will.

Workers are wondering in this country what happened to the American dream. They feel squeezed. They feel desperate. They do not know how they are going to take care of their parents and put their kids through an education at the same time. And I think the answer can be found in some Federal Reserve numbers. I do not happen to think much of Alan Greenspan's interest rate policy; I do think a lot of their ability to analyze where wealth has gone in this economy.

And what they have pointed out is that in the 1980's, or rather before the 1980's, or 3 decades following World War II, when workers productivity increased, they got that full productivity reflected in increased wages.

During the 1970's, workers got about half their productivity increases reflected in wages. During the 1980's and 1990's, worker productivity went up while wages went down. Productivity went up 18 percent; wages fell by 7 percent in real dollar terms.

Where did that money go? I will tell you where it went. If you exclude homes and cars from the net assets of households, nine-tenths of the increased wealth of this society in the 1980's went to the richest one-tenth of American families. But even more striking is the fact that the richest one half of 1 percent of households got 60 percent of the increase in individually held financial assets.

The half-million richest households increased their average net worth from \$8.7 million to \$12.7 million in those 6 years and as a group, their net worth increased by \$2 trillion, which is more than twice the entire increase in the national debt during that same period.

So that is where the American dream has gone. It has gone into the pockets of some of the wealthiest people in this society. And with all due respect, I do

not believe that this bill ought to add to their wealth at the expense of the middle-class and the workers in this country and that is what I suggest this bill is doing.

So, my colleagues can vote for it if they want, but do not pretend that the Brewster language is in here. It is not. They are taking the money which this House voted to use for deficit reduction and they are using it instead to finance tax cuts.

That is why we will use the previous question on the rule to try to break the stranglehold which the majority party has on this process. And if we are able to defeat the previous question on the rule, we will offer an amendment to reinstitute the Brewster amendment which will require that all of the dollars that are saved in this package go for deficit reduction. That is where you voted to put it in the first place, that is where we tried to put it in the first place, and that is where it ought to go tonight and that is where I hope you are willing to put it.

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

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, when my colleague discussed the movement of wealth to the upper income earners in the 1980's, in order to get that adjustment we have to include 1979 and 1980 in that equation, because if we take 1979 and 1980 out and use only 1981 through 1989, we do not get that same equation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am using the numbers in the Federal Reserve gathered data. They selected the breakpoints. And, I mean, you can define it any way you want, but does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] really deny that worker income has gone down in this country while corporate profits have hit record highs?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not deny that worker income has gone down. Most of that has to do with the increased tax burdens, the take-home pay is eaten up by tax burdens.

Would the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] agree that when we talk about the top 20 percent or the top half, we are talking about different people. We may talk about averages over a period of time, but the same people in the richest one-half or the one-tenth in 1990 were not the same people in 1980. For example, the richest person in the United States today was poor and broke in 1980.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the gentleman can cite any individual anomalies he desires, but all we have to do is ask the average worker on the street whether they think the rich have gotten richer while everybody else has stood still and we know that the answer will be. The answer will be, "You betcha."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California, [Mr. DREIER]

has 9½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILEN-SON] has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BEILEN-SON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes 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 rescission rule and frankly this rule would not even be needed if the rules of the House were being properly followed. Obviously, the fact is that they are not and this process is being abused.

The Republicans have decided to use the rescission process to make political points. That is what is going on here. They decided to jam through a number of policy changes that require the rule and need protection under the rule, not to go through the normal authorization and enactment process between the House and Senate and, further, to hold the disaster assistance programs hostage to a selective number of cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important and should be recognized by all concerned that most of these cuts come out of a very select group of programs. Most of them, in fact, were targeted at the very programs that the new administration put in place after a long-fought battle in 1993 and 1994; its programs like the National Service Program and Goals 2000 that are proposed to be cut, which has been just partially restored in this particular equation today.

But the fact is that the Republicans are negotiating with themselves. They are going down and saying, This is the list of proposals. This is what we are going to do. There is no agreement. They are saying, Let us try it this way, if we can get by with this set of changes.

There was no negotiation with the minority in the initial instance of this rescission bill and this disaster bill and there is no negotiation today and there is no agreement with the House minority. And, furthermore, some of the provisions that are being put in here are egregious.

They repeal decades of law that have stood and do work. The fact is with regards to the harvest program, the salvage program in the Pacific Northwest and across the country where this applies, it applies across the country, the fact is that a salvage forest health program and such policies have been put in place by the Clinton administration and Forest Chief Thomas, in December of 1994, before the GOP even assumed power.

□ 1715

And the fact is that such forest health program will work within limits. But what does this particular bill do? Well, this waives all the environmental laws. That is essentially correct—all environmental laws. A spe-

cific particular provision waives the Small Business Act so that they do not have to observe that. A particular provision in the bill waives the deficit timber sale which my colleague from Wisconsin is concerned about.

That fact is that this particular provision in this bill will in the end cost money. Timber prices are high today, but if you look at this in the long term view, you recognize that forest health is not what is being pursued here. Forest health is the excuse not the goal in this measure. What is being pursued is a quick harvest of some timber, getting in the receipts, then we have to share 25 percent of the receipts with the local government, which, again, costs the Federal Government money, plus we do not even include road construction in the budget analysis of what goes on.

Many of these areas are areas today that are roadless areas. They are roadless areas. It does not provide the other dollars needed to deal with the entire forest health question in terms of watershed restoration or selective tree harvest or thinning or reforestation, prescribed burning which are most of the elements that have to be done as part of forest health. So the quick buck, and then we pick up a big deficit down the road in dollars and lost natural resources.

Plus, of course, I think it is important to know this will destroy, of course, a great legacy, a great American natural resource legacy in this country. This is one of the many steps being taken which represent an assault by this new majority on the environmental laws and on the natural resources of this Nation, and that is not what the people voted for in November, Mr. Speaker. They voted, I think, I think they thought they were voting for some people that had still a conservation ethic, but we have yet to see the conservation ethic in these so-called conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, it has been one assault after the other on a whole series of environmental laws. The whole regulatory scheme tends to be that. This is an outrageous proposal that is before us. It is not one that has received compromise in terms of the overall rescission bill, the overall disaster assistance bill.

We know those funds are desperately needed for the people in California. We also recognize they should not be coming out of the backs of those others that need these programs in education and social areas and senior citizens' heating programs across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the timber salvage provision in this rescission bill had a bad odor the first time around and does not smell any better today. This provision is an outright assault on our public forests and environmental laws. There is absolutely no legitimate or desirable reason to go forth with the timber salvage provision. One can only conclude that this Congress is prepared to sell off our national forests to the timber industry.

This provision should be labeled for what it is—a boon to the timber industry, a revenue loser for the American taxpayer, and the permanent destruction of more of our American landscapes, the ecosystems and forest legacy.

The timber salvage provision pretends to address forest health problems and reduce forest fire potential. However, both arguments are transparent cover for exploiting our forests when held up to the light of day. The fig leaves used to cover up and justify such action, should get the authors arrested for indecent exposure.

This timber salvage language is simply a denial of the facts affecting forest ecosystems and the forest industry. Such an approach sacrifices long term common sense resource management for instant gratification—savaging not salvaging our national forests and costing precious taxpayer dollars and the legacy of future generations.

Perhaps the ultimate affront to the American people is the way in which this bill has been handled. By attaching these unacceptable amendments to the rescissions bill, some of our colleagues are using legislative extortion to lard a supposed budget cutting bill with budget busting programs.

These covert assaults on environmental protection have been a wake up call to citizens across the country who may have voted for change but did not vote for the exploitation and giveaway of their natural legacy. Passage of this bill would signal a serious problem about how our Government operates.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the great natural resource happens to be dead trees in those surrounding communities where the potential for fire is very great. They do not consider it a marvelous resource.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Sugar Land, TX [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished Republican whip and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate the work that he is doing.

Frankly, I respect the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. He really believes in the world as he sees it. I just see it from a different pair of eyes, and I think the American people do, too, as evidenced in the election last November.

The gentleman said the people, or he thought the people voted the way they did to make the two parties work together. I do not think that was it at all. I think the American people saw the party that was in power was driving them into such debt that they rejected everything that they stand for and did a historic thing and put the Republicans in power for the first time in 40 years.

This whole process that we find ourselves in now is a perfect example of

that. It is a perfect example of that. The President of the United States, in trying to become relevant to this process, presented to this body a request to pay for some disaster relief in California, and then the Oklahoma City disaster happened during the process, so he added that and other things that we desperately needed to pay for.

This body, under a new majority, took advantage of the situation to take care of some rescissions and spending that needed to be corrected this year. A lot of the spending in these rescissions are spending that would never be done this year, so we took advantage of that and set that aside, huge accounts in the HUD account that have been building up over the years but not obligated; a lot of this money is funds that cannot be obligated by the end of September. So we took advantage of that.

We sent the President a bill that got some significant real savings, and along with paying for, and always paying for, not adding to the deficit, those kinds of relief problems.

So we got to this point, and the President vetoes the bill, not out of substance, out of politics, out of politics. The President wanted to become relevant. He knew he was irrelevant in this process because he has chosen to be irrelevant, because he has not been part of the negotiation process of this bill. They have not told us what they wanted except to pay for this disaster relief. So the President vetoes and says, "I want all of this good spending, like adult job training."

Mr. Speaker, we have got hundreds of adult job training programs that are going on and were not stopped under the rescission bill, but the President wanted to add another \$40 million. He wanted Goals 2000. Most of the American people are against Goals 2000. So he puts in another \$60 million. Safe and drug-free schools, that may be okay. He tried to put back midnight basketball, something the American people overwhelmingly oppose. He wanted \$10 million for that. And I could go on through this, safe-drinking-water money, \$225 million. That cannot possibly be spent between now and the end of September. But he wanted to be the safe-drinking-water President.

This is a headline President and the talking point President. When you look under what he is talking about, you see there is no substance there at all. It is all politics.

Then he started pounding his chest about too much pork in this bill, had a bunch of Federal courthouses in here, "and I want to eliminate it." We asked him where are the courthouses? He has never yet given us a list of the courthouses.

Do you know what the President wanted? \$348 million cut out of the rescission bill and hand over to give the General Services Administration the opportunity to pick and choose where they think the courthouses ought to be cut. That is not the way the process works.

So now we find ourselves trying to pass a bill that gives us \$9.2 billion worth of real savings to the American family, plus an extra \$30 million in change and give back the President the opportunity to do some of his pork and his spending programs that have not proven to be effective, and he is still against the bill and still will not tell us what he is for.

That is not relevancy, ladies and gentlemen, it is not cutting spending to finance tax cuts. It is cutting spending to downsize the size of this Government so the American family can hang on to more of their hard-earned dollars.

The reason the family is having problems, Mr. Speaker, is that they are paying 52 percent of their income to the Government.

Support the rule and support the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I oppose this legislation for a number of reasons. But I have one that is parochial to Montana, and maybe to any of you who have visited Montana or any of you that care about that place which Americans call the last best place. That isn't our name for Montana, by the way. We call it Big Sky country. But Americans have called it the last best place. When we Montanans say that, we say it, not only with pride, but also with some sorrow.

One of the reasons Montana is the last best place is because we still have enormous wilderness areas out there, untrammelled, unroaded, with the great remaining wild land animals migrating and habitating through them and in them.

When this bill first came through the House, I thought there was simply an error in it, because it placed, naked to logging, a million acres of Montana that this House has voted to place in wilderness. We did so because the land had the highest characteristics of wilderness. Republicans and Democrats, as early as just a year ago in this House, voted overwhelmingly, 300 of us and more, to place 1,100,000 acres under protection from logging, and now this bill would open those areas to logging.

I do not think you could find 2 dozen Members of this House who would do that. And so we went to the Republican leadership. We tried to get them to change it. They would not do it. We went to the White House. I went to the White House. The White House agreed. The administration thought it was just an error and asked for compromise but they were refused.

Now, let me further explain. The 1,100,000 acres that this House has voted to protect from logging has not become law. But do we really want our prerogative removed to eventually declare these areas wilderness or otherwise protect them. The answer is "no." This House does not want to do that.

Yet this bill removes our prerogative by allowing logging in those areas. If

you came with me, I say to both sides of the aisle, and flew over or walked through those areas, you would come back here and say, "This bill is a mistake. We should not have done it." And yet we are going to do it.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. You mentioned this bill would allow us to log the salvage harvest in wilderness or areas designated as wilderness.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I did not say that. This is important to understand. I said areas this House has voted to put in wilderness but have not yet been signed into law.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield, those areas would be designated areas.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Brevard, NC [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement, and I do not doubt his sincerity, is wrong. I authored this bill, and it does not affect areas of wilderness or areas designated as wilderness, and the Secretary, if he has any idea that this House has acted on any wilderness, we cannot do salvage timber in it. Salvage can only be performed in that small 20 to 25 percent of the national forest where harvest is now allowed, and that is not allowed in areas either set aside as wildernesses or designated as wilderness.

Let me go on, because I want to move on with two other particular points.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will yield, I will just tell the gentleman that is not the issue. The issue is the gentleman is missing the point.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. First of all, the cry for the environment is really hollow. If you go downstairs and look at Brandeis's quote on stone, it says, "The greatest threat to liberty, lives, and the efforts of men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding," and I have never seen a situation as misunderstood as this salvage bill. We all know that we make products from wood. All these desks and chairs and so forth can be made from wood, plastic, or steel. If we do away with our forest harvest program in this country, that is the ultimate goal, then we must rely on finite products, and plastic must be oil we bring into the country, imported, we spill it two or three times along the way. How can that be a plus for the environment?

We are now harvesting 16 billion board feet, a third of our forest products from sensitive environmental areas all over the world. What about the great hue and cry about rainforest? That is where a lot of our 16 billion board feet are coming from. We have no control over that.

We do have substantial control in our own forest, and a great many environ-

mental controls. The forest health is a third important goal that we are going after. North Carolina State University, a respected university, with the largest school of forestry, over 100 years of silvicultural study and the largest extension program, recently pointed out in a statement that this salvage amendment is absolutely for forest health.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1992 and again in 1994, millions of Americans went to the polls and demanded fundamental change in what they called politics as usual. In 1992 they turned out an incumbent President, gave him only 38 percent of their vote. In 1994, as we well know, they turned out the majority in the House of Representatives and gave it to the new majority.

I wonder what those voters would say if they understood what was in this rule that is before us this afternoon. I wonder what they would say if they knew that their majority was about to spend \$7 billion and cut \$16 billion in a bill that was not even on this floor this morning when we went about our business, and many of us are reading it for the first time right now. I wonder what they would say if they knew that an important question which we just heard some debate about between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], about whether or not to log on federally owned lands, whether to permit timber practice on federally owned lands was not even going to be debated in this bill, that there will be one single up-down vote on the whole bill, and the debate that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] had will not get a vote, because the rule does not permit it.

I wonder what they would say if they knew that this bill took money out of the program that we used to help senior citizens pay their heating bill and their air-conditioning bill.

□ 1730

At the same time it forgives a \$275 million loan owed to the United States by the Government of Jordan. I wonder what they would say if they heard, Mr. Speaker, that we could not debate and take a separate vote on that. I think they would say that that is politics as usual. I think they would say that is exactly what they voted against in 1992 and 1994.

I do not know what the right answers are to those questions, Mr. Speaker, but I sure do know that those questions should be debated on this floor and voted on this floor, and my colleagues know, and I know, they will not be

under the terms of this rule, and that, Mr. Speaker, is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this suppressive and wrong-headed rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, Deficit hawks, if you were moved by the Budget Committee chairman's speech on the conference report on the budget resolution, as I was, you'll love this. We can do more to enact real and fair deficit reduction in this bill than we could in that one. How? By defeating the previous question so that the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment can be made in order.

Please join our effort. Otherwise another opportunity will be missed to allow our colleagues to vote on spending cuts that actually reduce the Federal deficit.

Let me cite an example for my colleagues. During Tuesday's consideration of the foreign operations appropriation bill, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues support cuts totaling \$65.069 million. Regrettably not one penny went to deficit reduction. Instead, under the budget rules, the funds freed up by these cut amendments will be reallocated by the Committee on Appropriations on other spending programs. I say to my colleagues, When you add in the \$20-plus million in cuts we made in the military construction appropriations bill and yesterday's cuts, those cuts total over a hundred million dollars that don't go to deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, we voted on the lockbox in March on a bill similar to the one we are considering now. The House vote was 418 to 5, including all members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that makes in order the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment in place of the weaker version contained in section 2003 and 2004 of this bill.

Vote "no" on the previous question. It is the only way to get a vote in the House on the real lockbox.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the text of the amendment we would offer at this point:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 176

On page 2, line 8 strike "tions. That amendment" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "tions and an amendment offered by Representative Brewster of Oklahoma and Representative Harman of California. Those amendments"

On page 2, line 11, strike "that amendment" and insert in lieu thereof "those amendments".

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Atlanta, GA [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the problem with cutting back on spending is

nobody wants to cut. We all talk about it, but nobody wants to cut, to cut. The gentleman from New Jersey said, "Just think. We're cutting heating oil help for the elderly to give away money to Jordan." The heating oil help for the elderly was a 1979 program for a temporary relief when the oil prices were way up. The oil prices are today below where they were then, but we cannot even cut that program out now. Now it is an entitlement.

The loan forgiveness to Jordan was negotiated by the Secretary of State. It is part of the peace process with Israel. It was signed by this President. Indeed the President did not think we forgave at all, and he was very upset, and called Israel, and complained about the Republicans in Congress not doing what he wanted to keep the process going, and I know that the gentleman from New Jersey is in support of the peace process with Israel and the Middle East because I heard him talk about it to two Jewish groups myself.

We simply have to get away from protecting individual programs and begin to cut spending for our children's future.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I really think that this is an historical bill. First of all, we are still trying to find out what it really says because it just got here. There are 119 pages. But as I glance through this summary, and, if it is wrong, I wish somebody would point it out, I must say we really need to vote down this rule and get to correcting it.

No. 1, it appears from my summary that we are still taking \$50 million out of veterans' medical care, \$50 million, and this is the week where people came to the floor and talked about the flag. This is the year where everybody has been celebrating World War II celebrations and all of these things. But as I look at this list, what we are doing is taking away from medical installations around this country much-needed equipment that keeps them in the state-of-the-art health care for people who put their health and their lives on the line for this great country and this great flag.

So, as my colleagues know, this is the substance of what this flag stands for, that when we tell veterans we are going to take care of them, we are really taking care of them, we do not get rid of it.

Well, the first thing that jumps off the page at me is that, and I do not see anybody disputing that that is wrong, so I guess that is true.

I also see us going after education big-time in here. I see that we are continuing to zero out the math and science training, the technology—

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, because at the

request of the President actually this increases the money for adult job training, School to Work, Goals 2000, which is an education program, safe and drug-free schools, drug courts, the phases, TRIO, the child-care block grant program. With the Goals 2000 it is specifically education.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Reclaiming my time, mine shows—it says that it was not cut as much as it was the last time. In other words, instead of cutting it \$92 million, it was only cut \$32 million.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. This still cuts \$574 million from education.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is exactly how I read it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on our side, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], a very able Member of this Congress.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me and allowing me to close. I rise to support the rule, and do so with a perspective that might be different from most Republicans.

I say to my colleagues, "You might remember that first rescission package I voted against. I identified two key provisions of it, LIHEAP, low-income heating assistance, and summer jobs, that were important to my district, and after voting against that, I worked with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to restore those in the conference report. We restored those in the conference report, and so I voted for that compromise version."

But while I was willing to identify the cuts that I thought we should make and the spending that I thought we should keep, President Clinton still has not signed his name to a package of spending cuts that he would support. He keeps saying things like, well, he likes the Senate version better, but he will not say what cuts he will support, what \$9 billion, or \$10 billion, or whatever number he likes. So the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been negotiating, but not able to make progress.

So, when I listen to my friend on the other side of the aisle saying, well, we wanted this point change and that point change, I say, "Why don't you go to the President and ask him to include those in whatever spending-cut bill he would like to recommend, because as of this point in time the President has not signed onto any spending cut at all."

I applaud the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for going the extra mile, saying we will give the President some of the things he said he would like to increase spending on, but for our children's future we have to cut spending.

So I would ask all Members to vote yes on the rule, vote yes on the rescis-

sion package itself, a first step to protecting our children.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge the Members to vote against the rule and against the previous question. It is an unfair rule, it is a closed rule, and, if the previous question is defeated, we shall offer, as Members have heard, an alternative rule that makes in order the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote for this very fair and balanced rule, and the conference report, and the previous question, and on any other procedural vote they might request on the other side of the aisle.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. 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 236, nays 194, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]
YEAS—236

Allard	Canady	Ensign
Archer	Castle	Everett
Armey	Chabot	Ewing
Bachus	Chambliss	Fawell
Baker (CA)	Chenoweth	Fields (TX)
Baker (LA)	Christensen	Flanagan
Ballenger	Chrysler	Foley
Barr	Clinger	Forbes
Barrett (NE)	Coble	Fowler
Bartlett	Coburn	Fox
Barton	Collins (GA)	Franks (CT)
Bass	Combest	Franks (NJ)
Bateman	Cooley	Frelinghuysen
Beilenson	Cox	Frisa
Bereuter	Crane	Funderburk
Bilbray	Crapo	Galleghy
Bilirakis	Creameans	Ganske
Bliley	Cubin	Gekas
Blute	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Boehlert	Davis	Gillmor
Boehner	Deal	Gilman
Bonilla	DeLay	Goodlatte
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Goodling
Brownback	Dickey	Goss
Bryant (TN)	Doolittle	Graham
Bunn	Dornan	Greenwood
Bunning	Dreier	Gunderson
Burr	Duncan	Gutknecht
Burton	Dunn	Hall (TX)
Buyer	Ehlers	Hancock
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hansen
Calvert	Emerson	Hastert
Camp	English	Hastings (WA)

Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
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
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff

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

Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento

Visclosky
Volkmmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

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

LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—4

Moakley
Reynolds

□ 1801

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Did the gentleman vote on the prevailing side?

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BEILENSEN moves to reconsider the vote on which the previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 193, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—235

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
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)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans

Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey

Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bilely
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)

Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chryslers
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo

Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Englert
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes

NOES—193

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

Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.

Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler

Neal	Roybal-Allard	Thornton
Oberstar	Rush	Thurman
Obey	Sabo	Torres
Olver	Sanders	Torricelli
Ortiz	Sawyer	Towns
Orton	Schroeder	Tucker
Owens	Schumer	Velazquez
Pallone	Scott	Vento
Pastor	Serrano	Visclosky
Payne (NJ)	Sisisky	Volkmer
Payne (VA)	Skaggs	Ward
Pelosi	Skelton	Waters
Peterson (FL)	Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Peterson (MN)	Spratt	Waxman
Pickett	Stark	Williams
Pomeroy	Stenholm	Wilson
Poshard	Stokes	Wise
Rahall	Studds	Woolsey
Rangel	Stupak	Wyden
Reed	Tanner	Wynn
Richardson	Taylor (MS)	Yates
Rivers	Tejeda	
Rose	Thompson	

NOT VOTING—6

Duncan	Hastert	Moakley
Durbin	Largent	Reynolds

□ 1819

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

1995 RESCISSION AND DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes, 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—234

Allard	Buyer	Doolittle
Archer	Callahan	Dornan
Armey	Calvert	Dreier
Bachus	Camp	Duncan
Baker (CA)	Canady	Dunn
Baker (LA)	Castle	Ehlers
Ballenger	Chabot	Ehrlich
Barr	Chambliss	Emerson
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth	English
Bartlett	Christensen	Ensign
Barton	Chrysler	Everett
Bass	Clinger	Ewing
Bateman	Coble	Fawell
Bereuter	Coburn	Fields (TX)
Bilbray	Collins (GA)	Flanagan
Bilirakis	Combest	Foley
Bliley	Cooley	Forbes
Blute	Cox	Fowler
Boehlert	Crane	Fox
Boehner	Crapo	Franks (NJ)
Bonilla	Creameans	Frelinghuysen
Bono	Cubin	Frisa
Brownback	Cunningham	Funderburk
Bryant (TN)	Davis	Galleghy
Bunn	Deal	Ganske
Bunning	DeLay	Gekas
Burr	Diaz-Balart	Gilchrest
Burton	Dickey	Gillmor

Gilman	Livingston	Salmon
Goodlatte	LoBiondo	Sanford
Goodling	Longley	Saxton
Goss	Lucas	Scarborough
Graham	Manzullo	Schaefer
Greenwood	Martini	Schiff
Handerson	McCollum	Seastrand
Gutknecht	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	McDade	Shadegg
Hancock	McHugh	Shaw
Hansen	McInnis	Shays
Hastert	McIntosh	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Skeen
Hayworth	Metcalf	Smith (MI)
Hefley	Meyers	Smith (NJ)
Heineman	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hерger	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hilleary	Molinari	Solomon
Hobson	Montgomery	Souder
Hoekstra	Moorhead	Spence
Horn	Morella	Stearns
Hostettler	Myers	Stockman
Houghton	Myrick	Stump
Hunter	Nethercutt	Talent
Hutchinson	Neumann	Tate
Hyde	Ney	Tauzin
Inglis	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Istook	Nussle	Thomas
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Thornberry
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Tiahrt
Johnston	Parker	Torkildsen
Jones	Paxon	Trafigant
Kasich	Petri	Upton
Kelly	Pombo	Vucanovich
Kim	Porter	Waldholtz
King	Portman	Walker
Kingston	Pryce	Walsh
Klug	Quillen	Wamp
Knollenberg	Quinn	Watts (OK)
Kolbe	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
LaHood	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
Latham	Regula	Weller
LaTourette	Riggs	White
Laughlin	Roberts	Whitfield
Lazio	Rogers	Wicker
Leach	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Lewis (KY)	Roth	Young (FL)
Lightfoot	Roukema	Zeliff
Linder	Royce	Zimmer

NOES—192

Abercrombie	Doyle	Lantos
Ackerman	Edwards	Levin
Andrews	Engel	Lewis (GA)
Baesler	Eshoo	Lincoln
Baldacci	Evans	Lipinski
Barcia	Farr	Lofgren
Barrett (WI)	Fattah	Lowey
Becerra	Fazio	Luther
Beilenson	Filner	Maloney
Bentsen	Flake	Manton
Berman	Foglietta	Markey
Bevill	Ford	Martinez
Bishop	Frank (MA)	Mascara
Bonior	Frost	Matsui
Borski	Furse	McCarthy
Boucher	Gejdenson	McDermott
Brewster	Gephardt	McHale
Browder	Geren	McKinney
Brown (CA)	Gibbons	McNulty
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Meehan
Brown (OH)	Gordon	Meek
Bryant (TX)	Green	Menendez
Cardin	Gutierrez	Mfume
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)
Clay	Hamilton	Mineta
Clayton	Harman	Minge
Clement	Hastings (FL)	Mink
Clyburn	Hayes	Mollohan
Coleman	Hefner	Moran
Collins (IL)	Hilliard	Murtha
Collins (MI)	Hinchey	Nadler
Condit	Holden	Neal
Conyers	Hoyer	Oberstar
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Coyne	Jacobs	Olver
Cramer	Jefferson	Ortiz
Danner	Johnson (SD)	Orton
de la Garza	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Pallone
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pastor
Dellums	Kennedy (MA)	Payne (NJ)
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Payne (VA)
Dicks	Kennelly	Pelosi
Dingell	Kildee	Peterson (FL)
Dixon	Klecza	Peterson (MN)
Doggett	Klink	Pickett
Dooley	LaFalce	Pomeroy

Poshard	Sisisky	Towns
Rahall	Skaggs	Tucker
Rangel	Skelton	Velazquez
Reed	Slaughter	Vento
Richardson	Spratt	Visclosky
Rivers	Stark	Volkmer
Roemer	Stenholm	Ward
Rose	Stokes	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Studds	Watt (NC)
Rush	Stupak	Waxman
Sabo	Tanner	Williams
Sanders	Tejeda	Wilson
Sawyer	Thompson	Wise
Schroeder	Thornton	Woolsey
Schumer	Thurman	Wyden
Scott	Torres	Wynn
Serrano	Torricelli	Yates

NOT VOTING—8

Durbin	Hoke	Reynolds
Fields (LA)	Largent	Taylor (NC)
Franks (CT)	Moakley	

□ 1829

Mr. DE LA GARZA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

□ 1830

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Objection is heard.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House agreed to House Resolution 176.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No 462]

AYES—236

Allard	Burr	Davis
Archer	Burton	Deal
Armey	Buyer	DeLay
Bachus	Callahan	Diaz-Balart
Baker (CA)	Calvert	Dickey
Baker (LA)	Camp	Doolittle
Ballenger	Canady	Dornan
Barr	Castle	Dreier
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Duncan
Bartlett	Chambliss	Dunn
Barton	Chenoweth	Ehlers
Bass	Christensen	Ehrlich
Bereuter	Chrysler	Emerson
Bilbray	Clinger	English
Bilirakis	Coble	Ensign
Bliley	Coburn	Everett
Blute	Collins (GA)	Ewing
Boehlert	Combest	Fawell
Boehner	Cooley	Fields (TX)
Bonilla	Cox	Flanagan
Bono	Crane	Foley
Brownback	Crapo	Forbes
Bryant (TN)	Creameans	Fowler
Bunn	Cubin	Fox
Bunning	Cunningham	Franks (CT)

Franks (NJ) Laughlin
 Frelinghuysen Lazo
 Frisa Leach
 Gallegly Lewis (CA)
 Ganske Lewis (KY)
 Gekas Lightfoot
 Gilchrest Linder
 Gillmor Livingston
 Gilman LoBiondo
 Goodlatte Longley
 Goodling Lucas
 Goss Manzullo
 Graham Martini
 Greenwood McCollum
 Gunderson McCrery
 Gutknecht McDade
 Hall (TX) McHugh
 Hamilton McLinnis
 Hancock McIntosh
 Hansen McKeon
 Hastert Metcalf
 Hastings (WA) Meyers
 Hayes Mica
 Hayworth Miller (FL)
 Hefley Molinari
 Heineman Moorhead
 Herger Morella
 Hilleary Myers
 Hobson Myrick
 Hoekstra Nethercutt
 Hoke Neumann
 Horn Ney
 Hostettler Norwood
 Houghton Nussle
 Hunter Oxley
 Hutchinson Packard
 Hyde Parker
 Inglis Paxon
 Istook Petri
 Jacobs Pombo
 Johnson (CT) Porter
 Johnson, Sam Portman
 Jones Pryce
 Kasich Quillen
 Kelly Quinn
 Kim Radanovich
 King Ramstad
 Kingston Regula
 Klug Riggs
 Knollenberg Roberts
 Kolbe Rogers
 LaHood Rohrabacher
 Latham Ros-Lehtinen
 LaTourette Roth

Roukema Owens
 Royce Pallone
 Salmon Pastore
 Sanford Payne (NJ)
 Saxton Payne (VA)
 Scarborough Pelosi
 Schaefer Peterson (FL)
 Schiff Peterson (MN)
 Seastrand Pickett
 Sensenbrenner Pomeroy
 Shadegg Poshard
 Shaw Rahall
 Shays Rangel
 Shuster Reed
 Sken Richardson
 Smith (MI) Rivers
 Smith (NJ) Roemer
 Smith (TX) Rose
 Smith (WA) Roybal-Allard
 Solomon Rush

Thornton Sabo
 Thurman Sanders
 Torres Sawyer
 Torricelli Schroeder
 Towns Schumer
 Tucker Scott
 Velázquez Serrano
 Vento Sisisky
 Visclosky Skaggs
 Volkmer Skelton
 Ward Slaughter
 Waters Spratt
 Watt (NC) Stark
 Waxman Stenholm
 Wilson Stokes
 Wise Studs
 Woolsey Stupak
 Wyden Tanner
 Wynn Tejada
 Yates Thompson

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman Frank (MA)
 Dooley Funderburk
 Durbin Largent

Moakley
 Reynolds
 Williams

□ 1847

So the motion to table was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-168) on the resolution (H. Res. 179) providing for immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to proceed to inform the Members, in consideration of the White House, who just in the last hour or so contacted the Speaker with respect to an effort to make further and final revisions, and I think conclusive revisions, in the rescission bill, we have undertaken negotiations with representatives of the White House. Although they are proceeding well, it is not possible for us at this time to bring that bill to the floor without biasing against our best efforts to work with the White House.

That being the case, I am going to be asking that we take a recess subject to the call of the Chair to give those negotiators an opportunity to complete this process in order that we might get the best possible rescission bill through the process.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], we had also had scheduled for the day the legisla-

tion commonly known as Medicare Select. Is it possible that we could take that up instead of going into recess?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, that would have been wonderful, but it is not possible to do so at this time. Certainly it is an important piece of legislation and one we intend to take up and complete this evening.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas if we are going to complete that this evening or tomorrow?

Mr. ARMEY. It is our intention to complete that this evening; I expect to do so.

Mr. VOLKMER. On Medicare Select?

Mr. ARMEY. On Medicare Select. Mr. VOLKMER. And the gentleman plans to also do the rescission bill yet this evening?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, we will do the rescission bill this evening.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you very much. I have no further questions.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, our committee has been called to the floor for purposes of handling the Medicare Select legislation. Could we have some appreciation of when we will be called back to do this, if we are not going to do it right now?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to complete our negotiations with the White House on the rescission bill in short order, in which case we would go to that immediately upon returning from the recess, and the Medicare Select would be taken up upon completion of the rescission bill.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I know that it is normal to recess subject to the call of the Chair, but I would like to inquire, does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] have any idea of the amount of time that we may be in recess before we would have to call back in, because some Members may desire to catch up a little bit from the sleep that they did not get last night.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, of course as my colleagues might guess, we want to get a rescission decision with precision as quickly as possible. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would announce that we are going to take a recess subject to the call of the Chair with every expectation that given a 15-minute notification, we might anticipate being back here at work within a half-hour.

Mr. VOLKMER. And there will be a 15-minute notification with the bells rung so the Members know?

Mr. ARMEY. Absolutely.

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

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask the gentleman from

NOES—189

Abercrombie Dingell
 Ackerman Dixon
 Andrews Doggett
 Baesler Doyle
 Baldacci Edwards
 Barcia Engel
 Barrett (WI) Eshoo
 Becerra Evans
 Beilenson Farr
 Bentsen Fattah
 Berman Fazio
 Bevil Fields (LA)
 Bishop Filner
 Bonior Flake
 Borski Foglietta
 Boucher Ford
 Brewster Frost
 Browder Furse
 Brown (CA) Gejdenson
 Brown (FL) Gephardt
 Brown (OH) Geren
 Bryant (TX) Gibbons
 Cardin Gonzalez
 Chapman Gordon
 Clay Green
 Clayton Gutierrez
 Clement Hall (OH)
 Clyburn Harman
 Coleman Hastings (FL)
 Collins (IL) Hefner
 Collins (MI) Hilliard
 Condit Hinchey
 Conyers Holden
 Costello Hoyer
 Coyne Jackson-Lee
 Cramer Jefferson
 Danner Johnson (SD)
 de la Garza Johnson, E. B.
 DeFazio Johnston
 DeLauro Kanjorski
 Dellums Kaptur
 Deutsch Kennedy (MA)
 Dicks Kennedy (RI)

Kennelly
 Kildee
 Kleczka
 Klink
 LaFalce
 Lantos
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lincoln
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Luther
 Maloney
 Manton
 Markey
 Martinez
 Mascara
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McDermott
 McHale
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek
 Menendez
 Mfume
 Miller (CA)
 Mineta
 Minge
 Mink
 Mollohan
 Montgomery
 Moran
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Neal
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Orton

Texas [Mr. ARMEY] the distinguished majority leader, I hate to forecast votes, but my suspicion is that the conference report on Medicare Select would pass. I think that everything that has to be said on it, I believe it has an hour of debate. And our champion, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is ready to go. And I might respectfully suggest that we could accomplish some work if the gentleman wanted to begin with that at this point.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's consideration. As soon as we are able to be confident that we are fully capable of moving forward with that bill, assuming no complications with respect to the rescission matter, we will do so.

But I must caution the gentleman, we have seen a great penchant in the last day or so for people to continue talking, even after it has been clear that all that needs to be said has been said. So we ought not be too optimistic about time.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, could the majority leader enlighten us a little bit about what the negotiations are about and what the sticking points might be or where there has been agreement, whether that has been on housing or national service or the timber program? Could he give us a little bit more information?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the inquiry, but no, I could not enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, would the majority leader attempt to enlighten us, then, would this delay affect our time to get out of town tomorrow at 3 o'clock at all?

Mr. ARMEY. If, in fact we have difficulty getting out of town at the appointed time tomorrow, this delay will be the least of the reason for that difficulty.

Mr. ROEMER. Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the majority leader, does he expect us, then, to continue these all-night sessions when we get back after the July work period or what can we expect with the schedule?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Indiana might be able to help us understand that better. I do intend to complete the people's work. It would by my hope and my intention to do so as cordially and as conveniently and as quickly as possible.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2015

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker p.t. [Mr. WALKER] at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

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 emergency supplemental and rescissions bill, H.R. 1944, and that I may be able to insert tabular material and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE RECOVERY FROM THE TRAGEDY THAT OCCURRED AT OKLAHOMA CITY, AND RESCISSIONS ACT 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the House Resolution 176 just adopted, I call up the bill (H.R. 1944) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 1944 is as follows:

H.R. 1944

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330 and subsequently transferred to "Nutrition Initiatives" are transferred to the Agricultural Research Service.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Food Safety and Inspection Service, \$9,082,000.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, \$5,000,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

FOOD FOR PROGRESS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 (exclusive of the cost of commodities in the fiscal year) may be used to carry out the Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o) with respect to commodities made available under section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949: *Provided*, That of this amount not more than \$20,000,000 may be used without regard to section 110(g) of the Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736(g)). The additional costs resulting from this provision shall be financed from funds credited to the Corporation pursuant to section 426 of Public Law 103-465.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The second paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-330 (108 Stat. 2441) is amended by inserting before the period at the end, the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding section 305(d)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, borrower interest rates may exceed 7 per centum per year".

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

The paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-330 (108 Stat. 2441) is amended by inserting before the period at the end, the following: "*Provided further*, That twenty per centum of any Commodity Supplemental Food Program funds carried over from fiscal year 1994 shall be available for administrative costs of the program".

GENERAL PROVISION

Section 715 of Public Law 103-330 is amended by deleting "\$85,500,000" and by inserting "\$110,000,000". The additional costs resulting from this provision shall be financed from funds credited to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to section 426 of Public Law 103-465.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$31,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture may be used to carry out activities under 7 U.S.C. 2257 without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

ALTERNATIVE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND COMMERCIALIZATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$1,500,000 are rescinded.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330 and other Acts, \$1,400,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That after completion of the construction of the National Swine Research Center Laboratory, all rights and title of the United States in that Center Laboratory shall be conveyed to Iowa State University.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$1,051,000 are

rescinded, including \$524,000 for contracts and grants for agricultural research under the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); and \$527,000 for necessary expenses of Cooperative State Research Service activities: *Provided*, That the amount of "\$9,917,000" available under this heading in Public Law 103-330 (108 Stat. 2441) for a program of capacity building grants to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890, is amended to read "\$9,207,000".

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330 and other Acts, \$2,184,000 are rescinded.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION
SERVICE

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$2,000,000 are rescinded.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$15,500,000 for the cost of section 515 rental housing loans are rescinded.

LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING
GRANTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$1,750,000 are rescinded.

ALCOHOL FUELS CREDIT GUARANTEE PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-341, \$9,000,000 are rescinded.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE
LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$1,500,000 for the cost of 5 per centum rural telephone loans are rescinded.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

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

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-111, \$20,000,000 are rescinded.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330, \$40,000,000 for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad, pursuant to title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, are rescinded.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE,
AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RE-
LATED AGENCIES

RELATED AGENCIES

NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY REVIEW COMMISSION
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the National Bankruptcy Review Commission as authorized by Public Law 103-394, \$1,000,000 shall be made available until expended, to be derived by transfer from unob-

ligated balances of the Working Capital Fund in the Department of Justice.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "International Broadcasting Operations", \$7,290,000, for transfer to the Board for International Broadcasting to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

DRUG COURTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in title VIII of Public Law 103-317, \$17,100,000 are rescinded.

OUNCE OF PREVENTION COUNCIL

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in title VIII of Public Law 103-317, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances in the Working Capital Fund, \$5,500,000 are rescinded.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$28,037,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND
TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND
SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$17,000,000 are rescinded.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$16,300,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$30,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$31,200,000 are rescinded, of which \$7,000,000 shall be derived from amounts made available for the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) program.

CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$15,000,000 are rescinded.

GOES SATELLITE CONTINGENCY FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$2,500,000 are rescinded.

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

UNDER SECRETARY FOR TECHNOLOGY/OFFICE
OF TECHNOLOGY POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$1,750,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
NTIS REVOLVING FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, and from offsetting collections available in the revolving fund, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND
INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$4,000,000 are rescinded.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMS

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Laws 103-75 and 102-368, \$5,250,000 are rescinded.

In addition, of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL
TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND
OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

DEFENDER SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$9,500,000 are rescinded.

FEEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCIES

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$6,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for grants to the National Center for Genome Resources in Public Law 103-121 and Public Law 103-317 shall be available to provide consulting assistance, information, and related services, and shall be available for other purposes, notwithstanding the limitations in said public laws.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES
CORPORATION

Public Law 104-6 is amended by adding after the word "rescinded" in the paragraph under the heading "Legal Services Corporation, Payment to the Legal Services Corporation, (Rescission)" the following: ", of

which \$4,802,000 are from funds made available for basic field programs; \$523,000 are from funds made available for Native American programs; \$1,071,000 are from funds made available for migrant programs; \$709,000 are from funds made available for law school clinics; \$31,000 are from funds made available for supplemental field programs; \$159,000 are from funds made available for regional training centers; \$2,691,000 are from funds made available for national support; \$2,212,000 are from funds made available for State support; \$785,000 are from funds made available for client initiatives; \$160,000 are from funds made available for the Clearinghouse; \$73,000 are from funds made available for computer assisted legal research regional centers; and \$1,784,000 are from funds made available for Corporation management and administration'.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$2,250,000 are rescinded.

ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS
ABROAD
(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$30,000,000 are rescinded.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND
CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL
PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$14,617,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCIES

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY
ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$4,000,000 are rescinded, of which \$2,500,000 are from funds made available for activities related to the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING
ISRAEL RELAY STATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$2,000,000 are rescinded.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE
PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

RADIO CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$16,000,000 are rescinded.

RADIO FREE ASIA
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-317, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER III

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316 and prior

years' Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316 and prior years' Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts, \$60,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316 and prior years' Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts, \$74,000,000 are rescinded.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE
PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316 and prior years' Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts, \$15,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316, \$20,000,000 are rescinded.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS
CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION
AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER
ADMINISTRATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316 and prior years' Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts, \$30,000,000 are rescinded.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-316, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
DEBT RESTRUCTURING
DEBT RELIEF FOR JORDAN

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, of modifying direct loans to Jordan issued by the Export-Import Bank or by the Agency for International Development or by the Department of Defense, or for the cost of modifying: (1) concessional loans authorized under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and (2) credits owed by Jordan to the Commodity Credit Corporation, as a result of the Corporation's status as a guarantor of credits in connection with export sales to Jordan; as authorized under subsection (a)

under the heading, "Debt Relief for Jordan", in title VI of Public Law 103-306, \$275,000,000.

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE
PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND
PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-306, \$15,000,000 are rescinded.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE
PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-306 and prior years' Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, \$41,300,000 are rescinded.

POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-306 and prior years' Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, \$19,000,000 are rescinded.

DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-306 and prior years' Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, \$21,000,000 are rescinded.

DEBT RESTRUCTURING UNDER THE ENTERPRISE
FOR THE AMERICAS INITIATIVE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-391, \$2,400,000 are rescinded.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-87 and prior years' Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts (excluding funds earmarked or otherwise made available to the Camp David countries), \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-306 and prior years' Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, \$2,000,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT
STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-306 and prior years' Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts for programs or projects to or through the Government of Russia, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE
PRESIDENT

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-306, \$3,000,000 are rescinded.

EXPORT ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE
PRESIDENT
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-87 and Public Law 103-306 and prior years' Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, \$4,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND
RELATED AGENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$70,000 are rescinded, to be derived from amounts available for developing and finalizing the Roswell Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement and the Carlsbad Resource Management Plan Amendment/Environmental Impact Statement: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in such Act or any other appropriations Act may be used for finalizing or implementing either such plan.

CONSTRUCTION AND ACCESS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, Public Law 103-138, and Public Law 102-381, \$900,000 are rescinded.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$2,500,000 are rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 102-381, Public Law 101-121, and Public Law 100-446, \$1,497,000 are rescinded.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading or the heading Construction and Anadromous Fish in Public Law 103-332, Public Law 103-211, Public Law 103-138, Public Law 103-75, Public Law 102-381, Public Law 102-154, Public Law 102-368, Public Law 101-512, Public Law 101-121, Public Law 100-446, and Public Law 100-202, \$12,415,000 are rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$1,076,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL BIOLOGICAL SURVEY
RESEARCH, INVENTORIES, AND SURVEYS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332 and Public Law 103-138, \$14,549,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$20,890,000 are rescinded.

URBAN PARK AND RECREATION FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$7,480,000 are rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$13,634,000 are rescinded.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS
MANAGEMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$514,000 are rescinded.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$4,850,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the first proviso under this heading in Public Law 103-332 is amended by striking "\$330,111,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$329,361,000".

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$9,571,000 are rescinded.

INDIAN DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$1,700,000 are rescinded.

TERRITORIAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$1,938,000 are rescinded.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 99-591, \$32,139,000 are rescinded.

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
FOREST RESEARCH
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$6,000,000 are rescinded.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, and Public Law 103-138, \$7,800,000 are rescinded.

INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$2,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$1,650,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, Public Law 103-138, and Public Law 102-381, \$6,072,000 are rescinded.

scinded: *Provided*, That the first proviso under this heading in Public Law 103-332 is amended by striking "1994" and inserting in lieu thereof "1995".

LAND ACQUISITION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, Public Law 103-138, and Public Law 102-381, \$1,429,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the Chief of the Forest Service shall not initiate any new purchases of private land in Washington County, Ohio and Lawrence County, Ohio during fiscal year 1995.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$18,100,000 are rescinded.

ENERGY CONSERVATION
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$35,928,000 are rescinded and of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-138, \$13,700,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION

INDIAN EDUCATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$2,000,000 are rescinded.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL
ZOOLOGICAL PARK
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 102-381 and Public Law 103-138, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, Public Law 102-381, Public Law 103-138, and Public Law 103-332, \$11,512,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF
BUILDINGS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$407,000 are rescinded.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE
PERFORMING ARTS

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading \$3,000,000 are rescinded.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR
SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103-332, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No funds made available in any appropriations Act may be used by the Department of the Interior, including but not limited to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Biological Service, to search for the Alabama sturgeon in the Alabama River, the Cahaba River, the Tombigbee River or the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in Alabama or Mississippi.

SEC. 502. (a) No funds available to the Forest Service may be used to implement Habitat Conservation Areas in the Tongass National Forest for species which have not been declared threatened or endangered pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, except that with respect to goshawks the Forest Service may impose interim Goshawk Habitat Conservation Areas not to exceed 300 acres per active nest consistent with the guidelines utilized for national forests in the continental United States.

(b) The Secretary shall notify Congress within 30 days of any timber sales which may be delayed or canceled due to the Goshawk Habitat Conservation Areas described in subsection (a).

SEC. 503. (a) As provided in subsection (b), an environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act or a subsistence evaluation prepared pursuant to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act for a timber sale or offering to one party shall be deemed sufficient if the Forest Service sells the timber to an alternate buyer.

(b) The provision of this section shall apply to the timber specified in the Final Supplement to 1981-86 and 1986-90 Operating Period EIS ("1989 SEIS"), November 1989; in the North and East Kuiu Final Environmental Impact Statement, January 1993; in the Southeast Chichagof Project Area Final Environmental Impact Statement, September 1992; and in the Kelp Bay Environmental Impact Statement, February 1992, and supplemental evaluations related thereto.

SEC. 504. (a) SCHEDULE FOR NEPA COMPLIANCE.—Each National Forest System unit shall establish and adhere to a schedule for the completion of National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) analysis and decisions on all allotments within the National Forest System unit for which NEPA analysis is needed. The schedule shall provide that not more than 20 percent of the allotments shall undergo NEPA analysis and decisions through fiscal year 1996.

(b) REISSUANCE PENDING NEPA COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding any other law, term grazing permits which expire or are waived before the NEPA analysis and decision pursuant to the schedule developed by individual Forest Service System units, shall be issued on the same terms and conditions and for the full term of the expired or waived permit. Upon completion of the scheduled NEPA analysis and decision for the allotment, the terms and conditions of existing grazing permits may be modified or reissued, if necessary to conform to such NEPA analysis.

(c) EXPIRED PERMITS.—This section shall only apply if a new term grazing permit has not been issued to replace an expired or waived term grazing permit solely because the analysis required by NEPA and other applicable laws has not been completed and

also shall include permits that expired or were waived in 1994 and 1995 before the date of enactment of this Act.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$1,349,115,000 are rescinded, including \$10,000,000 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of new Job Corps centers, \$2,500,000 for the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, \$4,293,000 for section 401 of the Job Training Partnership Act, \$5,743,000 for section 402 of such Act, \$3,861,000 for service delivery areas under section 101(a)(4)(A)(iii) of such Act, \$58,000,000 for carrying out title II, part A of such Act, \$272,010,000 for carrying out title II, part C of such Act, \$2,223,000 for the National Commission for Employment Policy and \$500,000 for the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee: *Provided*, That service delivery areas may transfer up to 50 percent of the amounts allocated for program years 1994 and 1995 between the title II-B and title II-C programs authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act, if such transfers are approved by the Governor.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available in the first paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$11,263,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available in the second paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$3,177,000 are rescinded.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$20,000,000 are rescinded, and amounts which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund are reduced from \$3,269,097,000 to \$3,201,397,000.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$700,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$41,350,000 are rescinded.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION
DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$2,300,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333 for extramural

facilities construction grants, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$60,000,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$1,400,000 are rescinded.

AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH
HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH
(RESCISSION)

Of the Federal funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$3,132,000 are rescinded.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
(RESCISSION)

Funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333 are reduced from \$2,207,135,000 to \$2,187,435,000, and funds transferred to this account as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act are reduced to the same amount.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, there is rescinded an amount equal to the total of the funds within each State's limitation for fiscal year 1995 that are not necessary to pay such State's allowable claims for such fiscal year.

Section 403(k)(3)(E) of the Social Security Act (as amended by Public Law 100-485) is amended by adding before the "and": "reduced by an amount equal to the total of those funds that are within each State's limitation for fiscal year 1995 that are not necessary to pay such State's allowable claims for such fiscal year (except that such amount for such year shall be deemed to be \$1,300,000,000 for the purpose of determining the amount of the payment under subsection (l) to which each State is entitled),".

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available in the third paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$319,204,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in the fourth paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$300,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1996.

STATE LEGALIZATION IMPACT-ASSISTANCE GRANTS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available in the second paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$2,000,000 are rescinded.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$13,387,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333 and reserved by the Secretary pursuant to section 674(a)(1) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, \$1,900,000 are rescinded.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333 to be derived

from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, \$15,900,000 are rescinded for carrying out the Community Schools Youth Services and Supervision Grant Program Act of 1994: *Provided*, That the funds available for obligation under this heading after this rescission may only be used for academic or tutorial programs.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING
AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$899,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
POLICY RESEARCH
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$4,018,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATION REFORM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$34,030,000 are rescinded, including \$10,000,000 from funds made available for State and local education systemic improvement, and \$21,530,000 from funds made available for Federal activities under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; and \$2,500,000 from funds made available under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act for National programs.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$4,606,000 are rescinded from part E, section 1501 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$182,940,000 are rescinded as follows: From the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title II-B, \$69,000,000, title IV, \$15,981,000, title V-C, \$16,000,000, title IX-B, \$3,000,000, title X-D, \$1,500,000, title X-G, \$1,185,000, section 10602, \$1,399,000, title XII, \$35,000,000, and title XIII-A, \$14,900,000; from the Higher Education Act, section 596, \$13,875,000; and from funds derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, \$11,100,000.

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$38,500,000 are rescinded from funding for title VII-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$90,607,000 are rescinded as follows: From the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, title III-A, and III-B, \$43,888,000, and from title IV-A, IV-B and IV-C, \$23,434,000; from the Adult Education Act, part B-7, \$7,787,000 and part C, section 371, \$6,000,000; and from the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, \$9,498,000.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$85,000,000 are rescinded from funding for the Higher Education Act, title IV, including \$65,000,000 from part A-1 and \$20,000,000 from part H-1: *Provided*, That of the funds remaining under this heading from Public Law 103-333, \$6,178,680,000 shall be for part A-1.

HIGHER EDUCATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$43,472,000 are rescinded as follows: From amounts available for Public Law 99-498, \$500,000; the Higher Education Act, title IV-A, chapter 5, \$496,000, title V-C, subparts 1 and 3, \$16,175,000, title IX-B, \$10,100,000, title IX-C, \$942,000, title IX-E, \$3,520,000, title IX-G, \$1,698,000, title X-D, \$2,920,000, and title XI-A, \$3,000,000; Public Law 102-325, \$1,000,000; and the Excellence in Mathematics, Science, and Engineering Education Act of 1990, \$3,121,000: *Provided*, That in carrying out title IX-B, the remaining appropriations shall not be available for awards for doctoral study: *Provided further*, That the funds remaining for Public Law 99-498 shall be available only for native Alaskans.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$1,800,000 are rescinded.

COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES
LOANS PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333 for the costs of direct loans, as authorized under part C of title VII of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$168,000 are rescinded, and the authority to subsidize gross loan obligations is repealed. In addition, \$264,000 appropriated for administrative expenses are rescinded.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND
IMPROVEMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$30,925,000 are rescinded as follows: From the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title III-A, \$17,500,000, title III-B, \$5,000,000, title III-D, \$1,125,000, title X-B, \$4,600,000 and title XIII-B, \$2,700,000: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, for title III-B, \$8,000,000 shall be reserved for additional projects that competed in the most recent competition for statewide fiber-optics projects.

RELATED AGENCIES

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-112, \$37,000,000 are rescinded. Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$55,000,000 are rescinded.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD
DUAL BENEFITS PAYMENTS ACCOUNT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$7,000,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

FEDERAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

SEC. 601. Section 458(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087h(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "\$345,000,000" and inserting "\$284,000,000"; and

(2) by striking "\$2,500,000,000" and inserting "\$2,439,000,000".

SEC. 602. None of the funds made available in any appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to promulgate or issue any proposed or final standard or guideline regarding ergonomic protection. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the Occupational Safety and Health

Administration from conducting any peer-reviewed risk assessment activity regarding ergonomics, including conducting peer reviews of the scientific basis for establishing any standard or guideline, direct or contracted research, or other activity necessary to fully establish the scientific basis for promulgating any standard or guideline on ergonomic protection.

CHAPTER VII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF
DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to the family trust of Dean A. Gallo, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, \$133,600.

JOINT ITEMS

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$460,000 are rescinded.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$238,137 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$650,000 are rescinded.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$187,000 are rescinded.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS
SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$850,000 are rescinded.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$1,650,000 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 701. Section 319 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (40 U.S.C. 162-1) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Office" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "office";

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (a)(2), by striking out "Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "commission"; and

(3) in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of subsection (a), by striking out "Administration" and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph, and inserting in lieu thereof "Oversight of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate."

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$600,000 are rescinded.

BOTANIC GARDEN
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of the funds made available until expended by transfer under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$4,000,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available until expended by transfer under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$3,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Buildings and Grounds, Capitol Complex Security Enhancements", and shall remain available until expended.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$150,000 are rescinded.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY
HANDICAPPED
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$100,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-283, \$2,617,000 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 702. The General Accounting Office may for such employees as it deems appropriate authorize a payment to employees who voluntarily separate before October 1, 1995, whether by retirement or resignation, which payment shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5597(d) of title 5, United States Code.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WORKING CAPITAL FUND
(RESCISSION)

The obligation authority under this heading in Public Law 103-331 is hereby reduced by \$6,000,000.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the funds made available under this account, \$5,300,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall not enter into any contracts for "Small Community Air Service" beyond September 30, 1995, which require compensation fixed and determined under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code (49 U.S.C. 41731-42) payable by the Department of Transportation.

COAST GUARD
OPERATING EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 103-331, \$4,300,000 are rescinded.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND
IMPROVEMENTS
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$35,314,000 are rescinded.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND
RESTORATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$2,500,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$24,850,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$7,500,000 are rescinded.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the available contract authority balances under this account, \$2,094,000,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING
EXPENSES
(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The obligation limitation under this heading in Public Law 103-331 is hereby reduced by \$54,550,000.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSIONS OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The obligation limitation under this heading in Public Law 103-331 is hereby reduced by \$132,190,000, of which \$27,640,000 shall be deducted from amounts made available for the Applied Research and Technology Program authorized under section 307(e) of title 23, United States Code, and \$50,000,000 shall be deducted from the amounts available for the Congestion Pricing Pilot Program authorized under section 1002(b) of Public Law 102-240, and \$54,550,000 shall be deducted from the limitation on General Operating Expenses: *Provided*, That the amounts deducted from the aforementioned programs are rescinded.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)
(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 103-211, \$100,000,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Section 341 of Public Law 103-331 is amended by deleting "and received from the Delaware and Hudson Railroad," after "amended,".

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$9,707,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL MAGNETIC LEVITATION PROTOTYPE
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the available balances of contract authority under this heading, \$250,000,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$7,000,000 are rescinded.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSIONS OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Notwithstanding section 313 of Public Law 103-331, the obligation limitations under this heading in the following Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Acts are reduced by the following amounts:

Public Law 102-143, \$31,681,500, to be distributed as follows:

(a) \$1,281,500 is rescinded from amounts made available for replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities: *Provided*, That the foregoing reduction shall be distributed according to the reductions identified in Senate Report 104-17, for which the obligation limitation in Public Law 102-143 was applied; and

(b) \$30,400,000 is rescinded from amounts made available for new fixed guideway systems, to be distributed as follows:

- \$1,000,000, Cleveland Dual Hub Corridor Project;
- \$465,000, Kansas City-South LRT Project;
- \$950,000, San Diego Mid-Coast Extension Project;
- \$17,100,000, Hawthorne-Warwick Commuter Rail Project;
- \$375,000, New York Staten Island Midtown Ferry Project;
- \$4,000,000, San Jose-Gilroy Commuter Rail Project;
- \$1,620,000, Seattle-Tacoma Commuter Rail Project; and
- \$4,890,000, Detroit LRT Project.

Public Law 101-516, \$2,230,000, to be distributed as follows:

(a) \$2,230,000 is rescinded from amounts made available for new fixed guideway systems, for the Cleveland Dual Hub Corridor Project.

MASS TRANSIT CAPITAL FUND
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for liquidation of obligations incurred in carrying out section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, \$350,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS
(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 801. Of the funds provided in Public Law 103-331 for the Department of Transportation working capital fund (WCF), \$6,000,000 are rescinded, which limits fiscal year 1995 WCF obligational authority for elements of the Department of Transportation funded in Public Law 103-331 to no more than \$87,000,000.

SEC. 802. Of the total budgetary resources available to the Department of Transportation (excluding the Maritime Administration) during fiscal year 1995 for civilian and military compensation and benefits and other administrative expenses, \$15,000,000 are permanently canceled.

SEC. 803. Section 326 of Public Law 103-122 is hereby amended to delete the words "or previous Acts" each time they appear in that section.

CHAPTER IX

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND
GENERAL GOVERNMENT
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of the funds made available for the Federal Buildings Fund in Public Law 103-329, \$5,000,000 shall be made available by the General Services Administration to implement an agreement between the Food and Drug Administration and another entity for space, equipment and facilities related to seafood research.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS,
EMPLOYEE LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Government payment for annuitants, employee life insurance", \$9,000,000 to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-329, delete "of which not less than \$6,443,000 and 85 full-time equivalent positions shall be available for enforcement activities;".

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-329, \$100,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING
CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$11,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996.

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-329, delete "first-aid and emergency" and insert "short-term" before "medical services".

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS,
AND RELATED EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for construction at the Davis-Monthan Training Center under Public Law 103-123, \$5,000,000 are rescinded. Of the funds made available for construction at the Davis-Monthan Training Center under Public Law 103-329, \$6,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the remaining funds made available under Public Law 103-123 shall be used to initiate design and construction of a Burn Building at the Training Center in Glynco, Georgia.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-329, \$160,000 are rescinded.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT
ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-123, \$1,500,000 are rescinded.

UNITED STATES MINT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-329, insert "not to exceed" after "of which".

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
INFORMATION SYSTEMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-329, \$1,490,000 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—INTERNAL
REVENUE SERVICE

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103-329, in section 3, after "\$119,000,000", insert "annually".

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE
PRESIDENTTHE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-329, \$171,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS
SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND
(INCLUDING RESCISSION AND TRANSFER OF
FUNDS)

For activities authorized by Public Law 100-690, an additional amount of \$13,200,000, to remain available until expended for transfer to the United States Customs Service, "Salaries and expenses" for carrying out border enforcement activities: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-329, \$13,200,000 are rescinded.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUNDLIMITATIONS ON THE AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Laws 101-136, 101-509, 102-27, 102-141, 102-393, 103-123, 103-329, \$631,412,000 are rescinded from the following projects in the following amounts:

Arizona:

Bullhead City, a grant to the Federal Aviation Administration for a runway protection zone, \$2,200,000.

Lukeville, commercial lot expansion, \$1,219,000.

Nogales, U.S. Border Patrol Sector, headquarters, \$2,000,000.

Phoenix, U.S. Courthouse, \$12,137,000.

San Luis, primary lane expansion and administrative office space, \$3,496,000.

Sierra Vista, U.S. Magistrates office, \$1,000,000.

California:

Menlo Park, United States Geological Survey, Office laboratory building, \$790,000.

San Francisco, Federal Office Building, \$9,701,000.

District of Columbia:

Central and West heating plants, \$5,000,000.

Corps of Engineers, headquarters, \$37,618,000.

General Services Administration, Southeast Federal Center, headquarters, \$25,000,000.

U.S. Secret Service, headquarters, \$9,316,000.

Florida:

Tampa, U.S. Courthouse, \$5,994,000.

Georgia:

Albany, U.S. Courthouse, \$87,000.

Atlanta, Centers for Disease Control, site acquisition and improvement, \$25,890,000.

Atlanta, Centers for Disease Control, \$14,110,000.

Hawaii:

University of Hawaii-Hilo, Consolidation, \$12,000,000.

Illinois:

Chicago, Social Security Administration District Office, \$2,130,000.

Chicago, Federal Center, \$29,753,000.

Chicago, John C. Kluczynski, Jr., Federal building, \$13,414,000.

Maryland:

Avondale, De LaSalle building, \$16,671,000.

Montgomery County, FDA consolidation, \$228,000,000.

Woodlawn, SSA East High-Low building, \$17,292,000.

Massachusetts:
Boston, Federal building-U.S. Courthouse, \$4,076,000.

Nevada:
Reno, Federal building-U.S. Courthouse, \$1,465,000.

New Hampshire:
Concord, Federal building-U.S. Courthouse, \$3,519,000.

New Jersey:
Newark, parking facility, \$8,500,000.

New Mexico:
Santa Teresa, Border Station, \$4,004,000.

North Dakota:
Fargo, Federal building-U.S. Courthouse, \$1,371,000.

Ohio:
Steubenville, U.S. Courthouse, \$2,820,000.

Oregon:
Portland, U.S. Courthouse, \$5,000,000.

Pennsylvania:
Philadelphia, Veterans Administration, \$1,276,000.

Texas:
Ysleta, site acquisition and construction, \$1,727,000.

United States Virgin Islands:
Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, U.S. Courthouse Annex, \$2,184,000.

Washington:
Seattle, U.S. Courthouse, \$10,949,000.
Walla Walla, Corps of Engineers building, \$2,800,000.

West Virginia:
Wheeling, Federal building and U.S. Courthouse, \$28,303,000.

Nationwide:
Chlorofluorocarbons program, \$33,300,000.
Energy program, \$45,300,000.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-329, \$1,396,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-329, \$3,140,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. Section 5545a of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A) by striking "is required to" and inserting in lieu thereof "who is required to"; and

(B) by inserting "and" immediately after subparagraph (E)(v); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any Office of Inspector General which employs fewer than 5 criminal investigators may elect not to cover such criminal investigators under this section."

SEC. 902. (a) Section 5545a of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the appropriate place the following new subsection:

"(i) The provisions of subsections (a)-(h) providing for availability pay shall apply to a pilot employed by the United States Customs Service who is a law enforcement officer as defined under section 5541(3). For the purpose of this section, section 5542(d) of this title, and section 13(a)(16) and (b)(30) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(a)(16) and (b)(30)), such pilot shall be deemed to be a criminal investigator as defined in this section. The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period which begins on or after the 30th day following the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 903. Section 528 of Public Law 103-329 is amended by adding at the end a new proviso: "Provided further, That the amount set forth therefor in the budget estimates may be exceeded by no more than 5 percent in the event of emergency requirements."

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief" for necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$3,275,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DISASTER RELIEF EMERGENCY CONTINGENCY FUND

For necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$3,275,000,000, to become available on October 1, 1995, and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to Congress: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of the funds available from the National Flood Insurance Fund for activities under the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994, an additional amount not to exceed \$331,000 shall be transferred as needed to the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for flood mitigation and flood insurance operations, and an additional amount not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be transferred as needed to the "Emergency management planning and assistance" appropriation for flood mitigation expenses pursuant to the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$50,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That section 509 of the general provisions carried in title V of Public Law 103-327 regarding personnel compensation and benefits expenditures shall not apply to the funds provided under this heading in such Act.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327 and prior years, \$31,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP TRUST DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$50,000,000 are rescinded.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$5,131,400,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That of the total rescinded under this heading, \$700,600,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for development or acquisition costs of public housing (including \$80,000,000 of funds for public housing for Indian families), except that such rescission shall not apply to funds for priority replacement housing for units demolished or disposed of (including units to be disposed of pursuant to a homeownership program under section 5(h) or title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (hereinafter referred to as "the Act")) from the existing public housing inventory, as determined by the Secretary, or to funds related to litigation settlements or court orders, and the Secretary shall not be required to make any remaining funds available pursuant to section 213(d)(1)(A) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may recapture unobligated funds for development or acquisition costs of public housing (including public housing for Indians) irrespective of the length of time funds have been reserved or of any time extension previously granted by the Secretary; \$1,956,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for new incremental rental subsidy contracts under the section 8 existing housing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f) and the housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), excluding \$300,000,000 previously made available for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI), and the remaining authority for such purposes shall be only for units necessary to provide housing assistance for residents to be relocated from existing federally subsidized or assisted housing, for replacement housing for units demolished or disposed of (including units to be disposed of pursuant to a homeownership program under section 5(h) or title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937) from the public housing inventory, for funds related to litigation settlements or court orders, for amendments to contracts to permit continued assistance to participating families, or to enable public housing authorities to implement "mixed population" plans for developments housing primarily elderly residents; \$815,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for the modernization of existing public housing projects pursuant to section 14 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, and the Secretary shall take actions necessary to assure that such rescission is distributed among public housing authorities, as if such rescission occurred prior to the commencement of the fiscal year; \$22,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for special purpose grants; \$148,300,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for loan management set-asides; \$15,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for the family unification program; \$15,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for the housing opportunities for persons with AIDS program; \$34,200,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for lease adjustments; \$39,000,000 shall be from amounts previously made available under this head in

Public Law 103-327, and previous Acts, which are recaptured (in addition to other sums which are, or may be recaptured); \$70,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for section 8 counseling; \$50,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for service coordinators; \$66,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for family investment centers; \$85,300,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for the lead-based paint hazard reduction program; and \$1,115,000,000 shall be from funds available for all new incremental units (including funds previously reserved or obligated and recaptured for the development or acquisition costs of public housing (including public housing for Indian families), incremental rental subsidy contracts under the section 8 existing housing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f), and the housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o))) and non-incremental, unobligated balances: *Provided further*, That in allocating this \$1,115,000,000 rescission, the Secretary may reduce the appropriations needs of the Department by (1) waiving any provision of section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 811 of the National Affordable Housing Act (including the provisions governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance) that the Secretary determines is not necessary to achieve the objectives of these programs, or that otherwise impedes the ability to develop, operate or administer projects assisted under these programs, and may make provision for alternative conditions or terms where appropriate and (2) managing and disposing of HUD-owned and HUD-held multifamily properties without regard to any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a detailed operating plan of proposed funding levels for activities under this account within 30 days of enactment of this Act, and such funding levels shall not be subject to pre-existing earmarks or set-asides, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$405,900,000 of amounts earmarked for the preservation of low-income housing programs (excluding \$17,000,000 previously earmarked, plus an additional \$5,000,000, for preservation technical assistance grant funds pursuant to section 253 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended) shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, pending the availability of such funds, the Department of Housing and Urban Development may suspend further processing of applications.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, and in prior years, \$1,177,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That renewals of expiring section 8 contracts with funds provided under this heading in Public Law 103-327, and in prior years, may be for a term of two years. In renewing an annual contributions contract with a public housing agency administering the tenant-based existing housing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f) or the housing voucher program under section 8(o) (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Secretary shall take into account the amount in the project reserve under the contract being renewed in determining the amount of budget authority to obligate under the renewed contract (the

total amount available in all such project reserves is estimated to be \$427,000,000) and the Secretary may determine not to apply section 8(o)(6)(B) of the Act to renewals of housing vouchers during the remainder of fiscal year 1995.

CONGREGATE SERVICES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$37,000,000 are rescinded.

YOUTHBUILD PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$38,000,000 are rescinded.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, and excess rental changes, collections and other amounts in the fund, \$8,000,000 are rescinded.

NEHEMIAH HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds transferred to this revolving fund in prior years, \$10,500,000 are rescinded.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE
HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS
(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$297,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1995.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1001. (a) Section 14 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(q)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a public housing agency may use modernization assistance provided under section 14 for any eligible activity related to public housing which is currently authorized by this Act or applicable appropriations Acts for a public housing agency, including the demolition of existing units, for replacement housing, modernization activities related to the public housing portion of housing developments held in partnership, or cooperation with non-public housing entities, and for temporary relocation assistance, provided that the assistance provided to the public housing agency under section 14 is principally used for the physical improvement or replacement of public housing and for associated management improvements, except as otherwise approved by the Secretary, and provided the public housing agency consults with the appropriate local government officials (or Indian tribal officials) and with tenants of the public housing developments. The public housing agency shall establish procedures for consultation with local government officials and tenants, and shall follow applicable regulatory procedures as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) The authorization provided under this subsection shall not extend to the use of public housing modernization assistance for public housing operating assistance.”

(b) Subsection (a) shall be effective for assistance appropriated on or before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 1002. (a) Section 18 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by—

(1) inserting “and” at the end of subsection (b)(1);

(2) striking all that follows after “Act” in subsection (b)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: “, and the public housing agency provides for the payment of the relocation expenses of each tenant to be displaced, ensures that the rent paid by the tenant following relocation will not exceed the amount permitted under this Act and shall not commence demolition or disposition of any unit until the tenant of the unit is relocated.”;

(3) striking subsection (b)(3);

(4) striking “(1)” in subsection (c);

(5) striking subsection (c)(2);

(6) inserting before the period at the end of subsection (d) the following: “: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent a public housing agency from consolidating occupancy within or among buildings of a public housing project, or among projects, or with other housing for the purpose of improving the living conditions of or providing more efficient services to its tenants”;

(7) striking “under section (b)(3)(A)” in each place it occurs in subsection (e);

(8) redesignating existing subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(9) inserting a new subsection (f) as follows:

“(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, replacement housing units for public housing units demolished may be built on the original public housing site or in the same neighborhood if the number of such replacement units is significantly fewer than the number of units demolished.”

(b) Section 304(g) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 5(h) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking the last sentence.

(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall be effective for plans for the demolition, disposition or conversion to homeownership of public housing approved by the Secretary on or before September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That no application for replacement housing submitted by a public housing agency to implement a final order of a court issued, or a settlement approved by a court, before enactment of this Act, shall be affected by such amendments.

SEC. 1003. Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

“(z) TERMINATION OF SECTION 8 CONTRACTS AND REUSE OF RECAPTURED BUDGET AUTHORITY.—

“(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may reuse any budget authority, in whole or part, that is recaptured on account of termination of a housing assistance payments contract (other than a contract for tenant-based assistance) only for one or more of the following:

“(A) TENANT-BASED ASSISTANCE.—Pursuant to a contract with a public housing agency, to provide tenant-based assistance under this section to families occupying units formerly assisted under the terminated contract.

“(B) PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE.—Pursuant to a contract with an owner, to attach assistance to one or more structures under this section, for relocation of families occupying units formerly assisted under the terminated contract.

“(2) FAMILIES OCCUPYING UNITS FORMERLY ASSISTED UNDER TERMINATED CONTRACT.—Pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall first make available tenant- or project-based assistance to families occupying units formerly assisted under the terminated contract. The Secretary shall provide project-based assistance in instances only where the

use of tenant-based assistance is determined to be infeasible by the Secretary.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall be effective for actions initiated by the Secretary on or before September 30, 1995.”

ELIGIBILITY OF STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS FOR COMPREHENSIVE GRANTS

SEC. 1003A. The first sentence of section 14(k)(2)(D)(i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking “shall” and inserting the following: “shall, except as otherwise agreed by the Secretary and the agency.”

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For grants, loans, and technical assistance to qualifying community development financial institutions, and administrative expenses of the Fund, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading not to exceed \$4,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and not to exceed \$400,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided further*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be defined as in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$31,600,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to supplement existing resources provided to the Department for activities such as external affairs, general counsel, administration, finance, or office of inspector general: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available for expenses of an Administrator as defined in section 104 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (CDBFI Act): *Provided further*, That the number of staff funded under this heading shall not exceed 10 full-time equivalents: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of administering the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall have all powers and rights of the Administrator of the CDBFI Act and the Fund shall be within the Department of the Treasury.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$500,000 are rescinded.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND

PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$124,000,000 are rescinded and any unobligated funds as of June 30, 1995 are also rescinded.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$105,000,000 are rescinded.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$14,635,000 are rescinded.

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$9,806,805 are rescinded: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Environmental Protection Agency shall not be required to site a computer to support the regional acid deposition monitoring program in the Bay City, Michigan, vicinity.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-389 and Public Law 102-139 for the Center for Ecology Research and Training, \$83,000,000 are rescinded.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$100,000,000 are rescinded.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE/STATE REVOLVING FUNDS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327 and Public Law 103-124, \$1,077,200,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That \$1,074,000,000 of this amount is to be derived from amounts appropriated for State revolving funds and \$3,200,000 is to be derived from amounts appropriated for making grants for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities specified in House Report 103-715.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1004. None of the funds made available in any appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to require any State to comply with the requirement of section 182 of the Clean Air Act by adopting or implementing a test-only or IM240 enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance program, except that EPA may approve such a program if a State chooses to submit one to meet that requirement.

SEC. 1005. None of the funds made available in any appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to impose or enforce any requirement that a State implement trip reduction measures to reduce vehicular emissions. Section 304 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7604) shall not apply with respect to any such requirement during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending September 30, 1995.

SEC. 1006. None of the funds made available in any appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency for listing or to list any additional facilities on the National Priorities List established by section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 9605), unless the Administrator receives a written request to propose for listing or to list a facility from the Governor of the State in which the facility is located, or unless legislation to reauthorize CERCLA is enacted.

SEC. 1007. None of the funds made available in any appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 shall be spent by the Environmental Protection Agency to disapprove a State implementation plan (SIP) revision solely on the basis

of the Agency's regulatory 50 percent discount for alternative test-and-repair inspection and maintenance programs. Notwithstanding any other provision of EPA's regulatory requirements, the EPA shall assign up to 100 percent credit when such State has provided data for the proposed inspection and maintenance system that demonstrates evidence that such credits are appropriate. The Environmental Protection Agency shall complete and present a technical assessment of the State's demonstration within 45 days after submittal by the State.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION
SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327 and any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under "Research and Development" in prior years, \$95,000,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-389, for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network, \$27,000,000 are rescinded; and of any unobligated balances from funds appropriated under this heading in prior years, \$7,000,000 are rescinded.

MISSION SUPPORT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$32,000,000 are rescinded.

SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS
(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading in previous fiscal years, \$43,000,000 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1008. The Administrator shall acquire, for no more than \$35,000,000, a certain parcel of land, together with existing facilities, located on the site of the property referred to as the Clear Lake Development Facility, Clear Lake, Texas. The land and facilities in question comprise approximately 13 acres and include a Light Manufacturing Facility, an Avionics Development Facility, and an Assembly and Test Building which shall be modified for use as a Neutral Buoyancy Laboratory in support of human space flight activities.

SEC. 1009. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) shall convey, without reimbursement, to the State of Mississippi, all rights, title and interest of the United States in the property known as the Yellow Creek Facility and consisting of approximately 1,200 acres near the city of Iuka, Mississippi, including all improvements thereon and also including any personal property owned by NASA that is currently located on-site and which the State of Mississippi requires to facilitate the transfer: *Provided*, That appropriated funds shall be used to effect this conveyance: *Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 in appropriated funds otherwise available to NASA shall be transferred to the State of Mississippi to be used in the transition of the facility: *Provided further*, That each Federal agency with prior contact to the site shall remain responsible for any and all environmental remediation made necessary as a result of its activities on the site: *Provided further*, That in consideration of this conveyance, NASA may require such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems appropriate to pro-

tect the interests of the United States: *Provided further*, That the conveyance of the site and the transfer of the funds to the State of Mississippi shall occur not later than thirty days from the date of enactment of this Act.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
ACADEMIC RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$131,867,000 are rescinded.

CORPORATIONS
FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION
FDIC AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-327, \$11,281,034 are rescinded.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

EMERGENCY SALVAGE TIMBER SALE PROGRAM

SEC. 2001. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) The term "emergency period" means the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 1997.

(3) The term "salvage timber sale" means a timber sale for which an important reason for entry includes the removal of disease- or insect-infested trees, dead, damaged, or down trees, or trees affected by fire or imminently susceptible to fire or insect attack. Such term also includes the removal of associated trees or trees lacking the characteristics of a healthy and viable ecosystem for the purpose of ecosystem improvement or rehabilitation, except that any such sale must include an identifiable salvage component of trees described in the first sentence.

(4) The term "Secretary concerned" means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to lands within the National Forest System; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) COMPLETION OF SALVAGE TIMBER SALES.—

(1) SALVAGE TIMBER SALES.—Using the expedited procedures provided in subsection (c), the Secretary concerned shall prepare, advertise, offer, and award contracts during the emergency period for salvage timber sales from Federal lands described in subsection (a)(4). During the emergency period, the Secretary concerned is to achieve, to the maximum extent feasible, a salvage timber sale volume level above the programmed level to reduce the backlog volume of salvage timber. The preparation, advertisement, offering, and awarding of such contracts shall be performed utilizing subsection (c) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, including a law under the authority of which any judicial order may be outstanding on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) USE OF SALVAGE SALE FUNDS.—To conduct salvage timber sales under this subsection, the Secretary concerned may use salvage sale funds otherwise available to the Secretary concerned.

(3) SALES IN PREPARATION.—Any salvage timber sale in preparation on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be subject to the provisions of this section.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY SALVAGE TIMBER SALES.—

(1) SALE DOCUMENTATION.—

(A) PREPARATION.—For each salvage timber sale conducted under subsection (b), the Secretary concerned shall prepare a document that combines an environmental assessment under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(E)) (including regulations implementing such section) and a biological evaluation under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2)) and other applicable Federal law and implementing regulations. A document embodying decisions relating to salvage timber sales proposed under authority of this section shall, at the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned and to the extent the Secretary concerned considers appropriate and feasible, consider the environmental effects of the salvage timber sale and the effect, if any, on threatened or endangered species, and to the extent the Secretary concerned, at his sole discretion, considers appropriate and feasible, be consistent with any standards and guidelines from the management plans applicable to the National Forest or Bureau of Land Management District on which the salvage timber sale occurs.

(B) USE OF EXISTING MATERIALS.—In lieu of preparing a new document under this paragraph, the Secretary concerned may use a document prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) before the date of the enactment of this Act, a biological evaluation written before such date, or information collected for such a document or evaluation if the document, evaluation, or information applies to the Federal lands covered by the proposed sale.

(C) SCOPE AND CONTENT.—The scope and content of the documentation and information prepared, considered, and relied on under this paragraph is at the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than August 30, 1995, the Secretary concerned shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the implementation of this section. The report shall be updated and resubmitted to the appropriate committees of Congress every six months thereafter until the completion of all salvage timber sales conducted under subsection (b). Each report shall contain the following:

(A) The volume of salvage timber sales sold and harvested, as of the date of the report, for each National Forest and each district of the Bureau of Land Management.

(B) The available salvage volume contained in each National Forest and each district of the Bureau of Land Management.

(C) A plan and schedule for an enhanced salvage timber sale program for fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997 using the authority provided by this section for salvage timber sales.

(D) A description of any needed resources and personnel, including personnel reassignments, required to conduct an enhanced salvage timber sale program through fiscal year 1997.

(E) A statement of the intentions of the Secretary concerned with respect to the salvage timber sale volume levels specified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1158, House Report 104-124.

(3) ADVANCEMENT OF SALES AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may begin salvage timber sales under subsection (b) intended for a subsequent fiscal year before the start of such fiscal year if the Secretary concerned determines that performance of such salvage timber sales will not interfere with salvage

timber sales intended for a preceding fiscal year.

(4) DECISIONS.—The Secretary concerned shall design and select the specific salvage timber sales to be offered under subsection (b) on the basis of the analysis contained in the document or documents prepared pursuant to paragraph (1) to achieve, to the maximum extent feasible, a salvage timber sale volume level above the program level.

(5) SALE PREPARATION.—

(A) USE OF AVAILABLE AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary concerned shall make use of all available authority, including the employment of private contractors and the use of expedited fire contracting procedures, to prepare and advertise salvage timber sales under subsection (b).

(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The preparation, solicitation, and award of salvage timber sales under subsection (b) shall be exempt from—

(i) the requirements of the Competition in Contracting Act (41 U.S.C. 253 et seq.) and the implementing regulations in the Federal Acquisition Regulation issued pursuant to section 25(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c)) and any departmental acquisition regulations; and

(ii) the notice and publication requirements in section 18 of such Act (41 U.S.C. 416) and 8(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)) and the implementing regulations in the Federal Acquisition Regulations and any departmental acquisition regulations.

(C) INCENTIVE PAYMENT RECIPIENTS; REPORT.—The provisions of section 3(d)(1) of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-226; 5 U.S.C. 5597 note) shall not apply to any former employee of the Secretary concerned who received a voluntary separation incentive payment authorized by such Act and accepts employment pursuant to this paragraph. The Director of the Office of Personnel Management and the Secretary concerned shall provide a summary report to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate regarding the number of incentive payment recipients who were rehired, their terms of reemployment, their job classifications, and an explanation, in the judgment of the agencies involved of how such reemployment without repayment of the incentive payments received is consistent with the original waiver provisions of such Act. This report shall not be conducted in a manner that would delay the rehiring of any former employees under this paragraph, or affect the normal confidentiality of Federal employees.

(6) COST CONSIDERATIONS.—Salvage timber sales undertaken pursuant to this section shall not be precluded because the costs of such activities are likely to exceed the revenues derived from such activities.

(7) EFFECT OF SALVAGE SALES.—The Secretary concerned shall not substitute salvage timber sales conducted under subsection (b) for planned non-salvage timber sales.

(8) REFORESTATION OF SALVAGE TIMBER SALE PARCELS.—The Secretary concerned shall plan and implement reforestation of each parcel of land harvested under a salvage timber sale conducted under subsection (b) as expeditiously as possible after completion of the harvest on the parcel, but in no case later than any applicable restocking period required by law or regulation.

(9) EFFECT ON JUDICIAL DECISIONS.—The Secretary concerned may conduct salvage timber sales under subsection (b) notwithstanding any decision, restraining order, or injunction issued by a United States court before the date of the enactment of this section.

(d) DIRECTION TO COMPLETE TIMBER SALES ON LANDS COVERED BY OPTION 9.—Notwithstanding any other law (including a law under the authority of which any judicial order may be outstanding on or after the date of enactment of this Act), the Secretary concerned shall expeditiously prepare, offer, and award timber sale contracts on Federal lands described in the "Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl", signed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture on April 13, 1994. The Secretary concerned may conduct timber sales under this subsection notwithstanding any decision, restraining order, or injunction issued by a United States court before the date of the enactment of this section. The issuance of any regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(d)) to ease or reduce restrictions on non-Federal lands within the range of the northern spotted owl shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of section 102(2C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2C)), given the analysis included in the Final Supplemental Impact Statement on the Management of the Habitat for Late Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl, prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior in 1994, which is, or may be, incorporated by reference in the administrative record of any such regulation. The issuance of any such regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(d)) shall not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement under section 102(2C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2C)).

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—Salvage timber sales conducted under subsection (b), timber sales conducted under subsection (d), and any decision of the Secretary concerned in connection with such sales, shall not be subject to administrative review.

(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) PLACE AND TIME OF FILING.—A salvage timber sale to be conducted under subsection (b), and a timber sale to be conducted under subsection (d), shall be subject to judicial review only in the United States district court for the district in which the affected Federal lands are located. Any challenge to such sale must be filed in such district court within 15 days after the date of initial advertisement of the challenged sale. The Secretary concerned may not agree to, and a court may not grant, a waiver of the requirements of this paragraph.

(2) EFFECT OF FILING ON AGENCY ACTION.—For 45 days after the date of the filing of a challenge to a salvage timber sale to be conducted under subsection (b) or a timber sale to be conducted under subsection (d), the Secretary concerned shall take no action to award the challenged sale.

(3) PROHIBITION ON RESTRAINING ORDERS, PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS, AND RELIEF PENDING REVIEW.—No restraining order, preliminary injunction, or injunction pending appeal shall be issued by any court of the United States with respect to any decision to prepare, advertise, offer, award, or operate a salvage timber sale pursuant to subsection (b) or any decision to prepare, advertise, offer, award, or operate a timber sale pursuant to subsection (d). Section 705 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any challenge to such a sale.

(4) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The courts shall have authority to enjoin permanently, order

modification of, or void an individual salvage timber sale if it is determined by a review of the record that the decision to prepare, advertise, offer, award, or operate such sale was arbitrary and capricious or otherwise not in accordance with applicable law (other than those laws specified in subsection (i)).

(5) TIME FOR DECISION.—Civil actions filed under this subsection shall be assigned for hearing at the earliest possible date. The court shall render its final decision relative to any challenge within 45 days from the date such challenge is brought, unless the court determines that a longer period of time is required to satisfy the requirement of the United States Constitution. In order to reach a decision within 45 days, the district court may assign all or part of any such case or cases to one or more Special Masters, for prompt review and recommendations to the court.

(6) PROCEDURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court may set rules governing the procedures of any proceeding brought under this subsection which set page limits on briefs and time limits on filing briefs and motions and other actions which are shorter than the limits specified in the Federal rules of civil or appellate procedure.

(7) APPEAL.—Any appeal from the final decision of a district court in an action brought pursuant to this subsection shall be filed not later than 30 days after the date of decision.

(g) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS.—

(1) EXCLUSION.—The Secretary concerned may not select, authorize, or undertake any salvage timber sale under subsection (b) with respect to lands described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF EXCLUDED LANDS.—The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) Any area on Federal lands included in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(B) Any roadless area on Federal lands designated by Congress for wilderness study in Colorado or Montana.

(C) Any roadless area on Federal lands recommended by the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management for wilderness designation in its most recent land management plan in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) Any area on Federal lands on which timber harvesting for any purpose is prohibited by statute.

(h) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary concerned is not required to issue formal rules under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to implement this section or carry out the authorities provided by this section.

(i) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—The documents and procedures required by this section for the preparation, advertisement, offering, awarding, and operation of any salvage timber sale subject to subsection (b) and any timber sale under subsection (d) shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of the following applicable Federal laws (and regulations implementing such laws):

(1) The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(2) The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(3) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(4) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(5) The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a et seq.);

(6) The Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960 (16 U.S.C. 528 et seq.);

(7) Any compact, executive agreement, convention, treaty, and international agreement, and implementing legislation related thereto; and

(8) All other applicable Federal environmental and natural resource laws.

(j) EXPIRATION DATE.—The authority provided by subsections (b) and (d) shall expire on September 30, 1997. The terms and conditions of this section shall continue in effect with respect to salvage timber sale contracts offered under subsection (b) and timber sale contracts offered under subsection (d) until the completion of performance of the contracts.

(k) AWARD AND RELEASE OF PREVIOUSLY OFFERED AND UNAWARDED TIMBER SALE CONTRACTS.—

(1) AWARD AND RELEASE REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall act to award, release, and permit to be completed in fiscal years 1995 and 1996, with no change in originally advertised terms, volumes, and bid prices, all timber sale contracts offered or awarded before that date in any unit of the National Forest System or district of the Bureau of Land Management subject to section 318 of Public Law 101-121 (103 Stat. 745). The return of the bid bond of the high bidder shall not alter the responsibility of the Secretary concerned to comply with this paragraph.

(2) THREATENED OR ENDANGERED BIRD SPECIES.—No sale unit shall be released or completed under this subsection if any threatened or endangered bird species is known to be nesting within the acreage that is the subject of the sale unit.

(3) ALTERNATIVE OFFER IN CASE OF DELAY.—If for any reason a sale cannot be released and completed under the terms of this subsection within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall provide the purchaser an equal volume of timber, of like kind and value, which shall be subject to the terms of the original contract and shall not count against current allowable sale quantities.

(l) EFFECT ON PLANS, POLICIES, AND ACTIVITIES.—Compliance with this section shall not require or permit any administrative action, including revisions, amendment, consultation, supplementation, or other action, in or for any land management plan, standard, guideline, policy, regional guide, or multiforest plan because of implementation or impacts, site-specific or cumulative, of activities authorized or required by this section, except that any such administrative action with respect to salvage timber sales is permitted to the extent necessary, at the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, to meet the salvage timber sale goal specified in subsection (b)(1) of this section or to reflect the effects of the salvage program. The Secretary concerned shall not rely on salvage timber sales as the basis for administrative action limiting other multiple use activities nor be required to offer a particular salvage timber sale. No project decision shall be required to be halted or delayed by such documents or guidance, implementation, or impacts.

SEC. 2002. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

SEC. 2003. Upon the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make downward adjustments in the discretionary spending limits (new budget authority and outlays) specified in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974 for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998 by the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays for discretionary programs resulting from the provisions of this Act (other than emergency appropriations) for such fiscal year, as calculated by the Director.

PROHIBITION ON USE OF SAVINGS TO OFFSET DEFICIT INCREASES RESULTING FROM DIRECT SPENDING OR RECEIPTS LEGISLATION

SEC. 2004. Reductions in outlays, and reductions in the discretionary spending limits specified in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, resulting from the enactment of this Act shall not be taken into account for purposes of section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 2005. July 27 of each year until the year 2003 is designated as "National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and to urge the departments and agencies of the United States and interested organizations, groups, and individuals to fly the American flag at half staff on July 27 of each year until the year 2003 in honor of the Americans who died as a result of their service in Korea.

DENIAL OF USE OF FUNDS FOR INDIVIDUALS NOT LAWFULLY WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 2006. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide any direct benefit or assistance to any individual in the United States when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that—

(1) the individual is not lawfully within the United States; and

(2) the benefit or assistance to be provided is other than search and rescue; emergency medical care; emergency mass care; emergency shelter; clearance of roads and construction of temporary bridges necessary to the performance of emergency tasks and essential community services; warning of further risk or hazards; dissemination of public information and assistance regarding health and safety measures; provision of food, water, medicine, and other essential needs, including movement of supplies or persons; or reduction of immediate threats to life, property, and public health and safety.

(b) ACTIONS TO DETERMINE LAWFUL STATUS.—Each Federal entity or official receiving funds under this Act shall take reasonable actions to determine whether any individual who is seeking any benefit or assistance subject to the limitation established in subsection (a) is lawfully within the United States.

(c) NONDISCRIMINATION.—In the case of any filing, inquiry, or adjudication of an application for any benefit or assistance subject to the limitation established in subsection (a), no Federal entity or official (or their agent) may discriminate against any individual on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age, or disability.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 2007. (a) Of the funds available to the agencies of the Federal Government, other than the Department of Defense—Military, \$325,000,000 are hereby rescinded: *Provided*, That rescissions pursuant to this paragraph shall be taken only from administrative and travel accounts: *Provided further*, That rescissions shall be taken on a pro rata basis from funds available to every Federal agency, department, and office in the Executive

Branch, including the Office of the President.

(b) Of the funds available to the Department of Defense—Military, \$50,000,000 are hereby rescinded: *Provided*, That rescissions pursuant to this paragraph shall be taken only from administrative and travel accounts: *Provided further*, That rescissions shall be taken on a pro rata basis from funds available to every agency, department, and office.

(c) Within 30 days of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate a listing of the amounts by account of the reductions made pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

TITLE III

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES

OKLAHOMA CITY RECOVERY

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

There is hereby established the Counterterrorism Fund which shall remain available without fiscal year limitation. For necessary expenses, as determined by the Attorney General, \$34,220,000, to remain available until expended, is appropriated to the Counterterrorism Fund to reimburse any Department of Justice organization for the costs incurred in reestablishing the operational capability of an office or facility which has been damaged or destroyed as the result of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City or any domestic or international terrorism event: *Provided*, That funds from this appropriation also may be used to reimburse the appropriation account of any Department of Justice agency engaged in, or providing support to, countering, investigating or prosecuting domestic or international terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities, and to conduct a terrorism threat assessment of Federal agencies and their facilities: *Provided further*, That any amount obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under the authorities available to the organization reimbursed from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That amounts in excess of the \$10,555,000 made available for extraordinary expenses incurred in the Oklahoma City bombing for fiscal year 1995, shall be available only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of Public Law 103-317: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount not previously designated by the President as an emergency requirement shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted to Congress.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For an additional amount for expenses resulting from the bombing of the Alfred P.

Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City and other anti-terrorism efforts, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount not previously designated by the President as an emergency requirement shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted to Congress.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for expenses resulting from the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City and other anti-terrorism efforts, including the establishment of a Domestic Counterterrorism Center, \$77,140,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount not previously designated by the President as an emergency requirement shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted to Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3001. Any funds made available to the Attorney General heretofore or hereafter in any Act shall not be subject to the spending limitations contained in sections 3059 and 3072 of title 18, United States Code: *Provided*, That any reward of \$100,000 or more, up to a maximum of \$2,000,000, may not be made without the personal approval of the President or the Attorney General, and such approval may not be delegated.

SEC. 3002. Funds made available under this Act for this title for the Department of Justice are subject to the standard notification procedures contained in section 605 of Public Law 103-317.

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

COURT SECURITY

For an additional amount for "Court Security" to enhance security of judges and support personnel, \$16,640,000, to remain available until expended, to be expended directly or transferred to the United States Marshals Service: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount not previously designated by the President as an emergency requirement shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted to Congress.

CHAPTER II

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for emergency expenses of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, and anti-terrorism efforts, including the President's anti-terrorism initiative, \$34,823,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for the Federal response to the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, \$1,100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for emergency expenses of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, and other anti-terrorism efforts, including the President's anti-terrorism initiative, \$6,675,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

UNITED STATES CUSTOM SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for emergency expenses resulting from the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE

The aggregate limitation on Federal Buildings Fund obligations established under this heading in Public Law 103-329 (as otherwise reduced pursuant to this Act) is hereby increased by \$66,800,000, of which \$40,400,000 shall remain available until expended for necessary expenses of real property management and related activities (including planning, design, construction, demolition, restoration, repairs, alterations, acquisition, installment acquisition payments, rental of space, building operations, maintenance, protection, moving of governmental agencies, and other activities) in response to the April 19, 1995, terrorist bombing attack at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

In carrying out such activities, the Administrator of General Services may (among other actions) exchange, sell, lease, donate, or otherwise dispose of the site of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building (or a portion thereof) to the State of Oklahoma, to the city of Oklahoma City, or to any Oklahoma

public trust that has the city of Oklahoma City as its beneficiary and is designated by the city to receive such property. Any such disposal shall not be subject to—

(1) the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.); or

(3) any other Federal law establishing requirements or procedures for the disposal of Federal property;

Provided, That these funds shall not be available for expenses in connection with the construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus, if required by the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for required expenses in connection with the development of a proposed prospectus: *Provided further*, That for additional amounts, to remain available until expended and to be deposited into the Federal Buildings Fund, for emergency expenses resulting from the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City: for "Construction", Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, demolition, \$2,300,000; for "Minor Repairs and Alterations", \$3,300,000; for "Rental of Space", \$8,300,000, to be used to lease, furnish, and equip replacement space; and for "Buildings Operations", \$12,500,000: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for emergency expenses resulting from the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, \$3,200,000, to remain available through September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Community Development Grants", as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, \$39,000,000, to remain available until expended to assist property and victims damaged and economic revitalization due to the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995, primarily in the area bounded on the south by Robert S. Kerr Avenue, on the north by North 13th Street, on the east by Oklahoma Avenue, and on the west by Shartel Avenue, and for reimbursement to the City of Oklahoma City, or any public trust thereof, for the expenditure of other Federal funds used to achieve these same purposes: *Provided*, That in administering these funds, and any Economic Development Grants and loan guarantees under section 108 of such Act used for economic revitalization activities in Oklahoma City, the Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds or guarantees, except for require-

ments related to fair housing and non-discrimination, the environment, and labor standards, upon a finding that such waiver is required to facilitate the use of such funds or guarantees, and would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of the statute or regulation: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not adversely affect the amount of any formula assistance received by Oklahoma City or any other entity, or any categorical application for other Federal assistance: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be used for the repair and reconstruction of religious institution facilities damaged by the explosion in the same manner as private nonprofit facilities providing public services: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$3,523,000, to increase Federal, State and local preparedness for mitigating and responding to the consequences of terrorism: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Emergency Management Planning and Assistance", \$3,477,000, to increase Federal, State and local preparedness for mitigating and responding to the consequences of terrorism: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Additional Disaster Assistance, for Anti-terrorism Initiatives, for Assistance in the Recovery from the Tragedy that Occurred at Oklahoma City, and Rescissions Act, 1995".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 176, 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].

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, I am pleased to bring to the House the emergency supplemental and rescissions bill, H.R. 1944.

As all Members know, the President vetoed H.R. 1158. This bill is a replacement version of H.R. 1158, and makes some changes to H.R. 1158 that will cause this new bill to be signed once congressional action is complete. This bill gives the President the opportunity again to take a first small step toward balancing the budget.

Since the veto, negotiations have been occurring to determine what

changes might be made to gain the President's approval and yet be acceptable to the Congress. Finding common ground in these negotiations has proven extraordinarily difficult. But I am pleased to tell you that with the changes I will propose in an amendment following my statement, the President will sign this bill.

After 3 weeks, we reached a stage in the negotiations where I felt we had to move if we were to have any chance of enacting an emergency supplemental and rescissions bill. We have gone a long way to meeting the President's concerns to the extent we have been able to identify them.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes important supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance, \$6.55 billion, mostly for the Los Angeles earthquake, but also for some more recent flood and fire disasters; \$144.4 million for the Oklahoma City recovery; \$145.1 million for antiterrorism initiatives and enhanced security; and \$275 million as requested by the President for debt relief for Jordan.

These appropriations are more than fully offset so that the bill nets out to over \$9.126 billion in savings because of rescissions of over \$16.3 billion. That is, we cut \$16.3 billion, we spend about \$7.2 billion, and we have over \$9.1 billion in savings.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes decreased rescissions, or lowered cuts, from H.R. 1158 for Adult Job Training, School-to-Work, Goals 2000, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Drug Courts, the FACES program or the Community School program of HHS, the TRIO program, the Child Care block Grant program, Housing for People with AIDS, National and Community Service, Safe Drinking Water, and Community Development Financial Institutions. It also provides a new appropriation for additional urban redevelopment in Oklahoma City needed as a result of the terrorist attack.

Mr. Speaker, all of these additions, or lowered rescissions, have been requested by the administration and are being placed in the bill as a result of the administration's requests.

Mr. Speaker, the bill includes increased rescissions from H.R. 1158 levels for GSA's energy program, for GSA's Chlorofluorocarbon program, for the Assisted Housing (section 202) program, for NASA Challenger funds, and for NASA research and development. It also includes new rescissions for the Congregate Services, for travel and administration expenses from all Federal agencies, and makes some minor changes to the salvage timber language. The cuts in Federal travel and administration expenses and the reduction in the FEMA disaster supplemental appropriation were proposed by the President, who supports the other changes as well.

Overall, the changes to this bill compared to H.R. 1158 are \$772 million in increases and \$794 million in decreases. That is, \$772 million in increased

spending, and \$794 million in decreased spending. This nets out to a further reduction of \$22 million in savings over and above the \$9.1 billion that was saved in the earlier bill.

In implementing the provisions of this bill, we expect the administration to use the guidance included in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference on the Conference Report on H.R. 1158, House Report 104-124.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass the bill quickly. The enactment of this bill is crucial, and I repeat, crucial to the orderly development of the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills. Without the savings included in this bill, next year's bills will have to be cut over \$3 billion more in order to meet the allocations in the budget resolution that we have just adopted.

The \$3 billion would have to come in large measure from the programs that

the President was trying to protect when he vetoed H.R. 1158. When you are trying to balance the budget, as the President is now on board saying he wishes to do, you have to make difficult choices. You cannot have it both ways. If you protect programs this year, then you have to increase the level of cuts that you have to make in those same programs or in other programs the next year.

This bill compared to H.R. 1158 represents a balance of differing viewpoints. It restores funding for some programs this year that the President cares about, yet it provides enough savings so that we will not have to drastically cut similar programs next year. If we reduce the savings in this bill further by restoring more funding or if the bill is vetoed, then we have to increase the cuts that we have to make in these same programs next year. It is just that simple.

Mr. Speaker, if you are for deficit reduction, there is no reason not to support this bill. It is the last train leaving the station for fiscal year 1995. Important emergency supplemental appropriations are in this bill. Important rescissions are in this bill. It saves over \$9.1 billion. It is not my idea of a perfect bill because it is a compromise bill, but it is a good bill, and we need its enactment as the first step in balancing the budget.

This is the very first real step that we can take in achieving a balanced budget. There will not be another change in fiscal year 1995. This is it, so let's adopt this bill and take the first step on the long road of getting our fiscal house in order.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table showing the details of this bill including the affect of the amendment I will be offering:

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944)

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
TITLE I - SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS			
CHAPTER I			
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Agricultural Research Service (by transfer).....	(2,218,000)	(2,218,000)	
Food Safety and Inspection Service			
Salaries and expenses.....	9,082,000	9,082,000	
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service			
Salaries and expenses.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	
Commodity Credit Corporation			
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund: Food for progress.....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	
GENERAL PROVISIONS			
Section 715 (increase in limitation).....	(24,500,000)	(24,500,000)	
Total, Department of Agriculture.....	14,082,000	14,082,000	
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Office of the Secretary.....	-31,000	-31,000	
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization.....	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	
Agricultural Research Service: Buildings and facilities.....	-1,400,000	-1,400,000	
Cooperative State Research Service.....	-1,051,000	-1,051,000	
Buildings and facilities.....	-2,184,000	-2,184,000	
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service: Buildings and facilities.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	
Farmers Home Administration			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:			
Rental housing (sec. 515) (loan subsidy).....	-15,500,000	-15,500,000	
Local technical assistance and planning grants.....	-1,750,000	-1,750,000	
Alcohol Fuels Credit Guarantee Program Account (FY83).....	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	
Total, Farmers Home Administration.....	-26,250,000	-26,250,000	
Rural Electrification Administration			
Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account:			
Loan subsidies: Telephone 5%.....	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	
Food and Nutrition Service:			
Special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	
Public Law 480 Program Account:			
Title III - Commodity grants:			
Program level.....	(-40,000,000)	(-40,000,000)	
Appropriation.....	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	
Total, Chapter I:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	-81,834,000	-81,834,000	
Appropriations.....	(14,082,000)	(14,082,000)	
Rescissions.....	(-95,918,000)	(-95,918,000)	
(By transfer).....	(2,218,000)	(2,218,000)	
CHAPTER II			
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
RELATED AGENCY			
National Bankruptcy Review Commission (by transfer).....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
RELATED AGENCY			
United States Information Agency			
International broadcasting operations.....	7,290,000	7,290,000	
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
Office of Justice Programs			
Drug courts (crime trust fund).....	-22,100,000	-17,100,000	+5,000,000
General Administration			
Working capital fund.....	-5,500,000	-5,500,000	
Legal Activities			
Assets forfeiture fund.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Immigration and Naturalization Service			
Salaries and expenses: General fund appropriation.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
Federal Prison System			
Salaries and expenses.....	-28,037,000	-28,037,000	
Total, Department of Justice.....	-81,837,000	-56,637,000	+5,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
National Institute of Standards and Technology			
Scientific and technical research and services.....	-17,000,000	-17,000,000	
Industrial technology services.....	-16,300,000	-16,300,000	
Construction of research facilities.....	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology.....	-63,300,000	-63,300,000	
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration			
Operations, research, and facilities.....	-24,200,000	-24,200,000	
Construction.....	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
GOES satellite contingency fund.....	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	-41,700,000	-41,700,000	
Technology Administration			
Salaries and expenses.....	-1,750,000	-1,750,000	
National Technical Information Service			
NTIS revolving fund.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
National Telecommunications and Information Administration			
Information infrastructure grants.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	
Economic Development Administration			
Economic development assistance programs.....	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	
Emergency appropriations.....	-5,250,000	-5,250,000	
Total, Department of Commerce.....	-142,000,000	-142,000,000	
THE JUDICIARY			
United States Court of International Trade			
Salaries and expenses.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services			
Defender services.....	-9,500,000	-9,500,000	
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Total, The Judiciary.....	-15,500,000	-15,500,000	
RELATED AGENCIES			
Small Business Administration			
Business loans program account.....	-8,000,000	-8,000,000	
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Administration of Foreign Affairs			
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	-2,250,000	-2,250,000	
Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad.....	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	-32,250,000	-32,250,000	
International Organizations and Conferences			
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities.....	-14,617,000	-14,617,000	
Total, Department of State.....	-46,867,000	-46,867,000	
RELATED AGENCIES			
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency			
Arms control and disarmament activities.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	
Board for International Broadcasting			
Israel relay station.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
United States Information Agency			
Educational and cultural exchange programs	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Radio construction	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	
Radio Free Asia	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Total, United States Information Agency	-26,000,000	-26,000,000	
Total, Chapter II:			
New budget (obligational) authority	-298,714,000	-291,714,000	+5,000,000
Emergency rescissions	(-5,250,000)	(-5,250,000)	
Appropriations	(7,290,000)	(7,290,000)	
Rescissions	(-298,754,000)	(-293,754,000)	(+5,000,000)
(By transfer)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	
CHAPTER III			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL			
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY			
Corps of Engineers - Civil			
General investigations	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	
Construction, general	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	
Total, Department of Defense - Civil	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Bureau of Reclamation			
Operation and maintenance	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities	-74,000,000	-74,000,000	
Atomic Energy Defense Activities: Materials Support and other Defense programs	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
Departmental Administration	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	
Power Marketing Administrations			
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
Total, Department of Energy	-139,000,000	-139,000,000	
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Appalachian Regional Commission	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Total, Chapter III: Rescissions	-234,000,000	-234,000,000	
CHAPTER IV			
FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS			
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Debt restructuring: Debt relief for Jordan	275,000,000	275,000,000	
MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
International organizations and programs	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Agency for International Development			
Development assistance fund	-41,300,000	-41,300,000	
Population, development assistance	-19,000,000	-19,000,000	
Development fund for Africa	-21,000,000	-21,000,000	
Debt restructuring under the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	
Economic Support Fund	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	
Assistance for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	
Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	-135,700,000	-135,700,000	
MILITARY ASSISTANCE			
Peacekeeping operations	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
EXPORT ASSISTANCE			
Trade and Development Agency			
Trade and development.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	
Total, Chapter IV:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	117,300,000	117,300,000	
Appropriations.....	(275,000,000)	(275,000,000)	
Rescissions.....	(-157,700,000)	(-157,700,000)	
CHAPTER V			
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Bureau of Land Management			
Management of lands and resources.....	-70,000	-70,000	
Construction and access.....	-900,000	-900,000	
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	
Land acquisition.....	-1,487,000	-1,487,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	-4,987,000	-4,987,000	
United States Fish and Wildlife Service			
Construction.....	-12,415,000	-12,415,000	
Land acquisition.....	-1,078,000	-1,078,000	
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service.....	-13,491,000	-13,491,000	
National Biological Survey			
Research, inventories, and surveys.....	-14,549,000	-14,549,000	
National Park Service			
Construction.....	-20,890,000	-20,890,000	
Urban park and recreation fund.....	-7,480,000	-7,480,000	
Land acquisition and State assistance.....	-13,634,000	-13,634,000	
Total, National Park Service.....	-42,004,000	-42,004,000	
Minerals Management Service			
Royalty and offshore minerals management.....	-514,000	-514,000	
Bureau of Indian Affairs			
Operation of Indian programs.....	-4,850,000	-4,850,000	
Construction.....	-9,571,000	-9,571,000	
Indian direct loan program account.....	-1,700,000	-1,700,000	
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	-16,121,000	-16,121,000	
Territorial and International Affairs			
Administration of territories.....	-1,938,000	-1,938,000	
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	-32,139,000	-32,139,000	
Compact of Free Association.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
Total, Territorial and International Affairs.....	-35,077,000	-35,077,000	
Total, Department of the Interior.....	-128,723,000	-128,723,000	
RELATED AGENCIES			
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Forest Service			
Forest research.....	-8,000,000	-8,000,000	
State and private forestry.....	-7,800,000	-7,800,000	
International forestry.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	
National forest system.....	-1,650,000	-1,650,000	
Construction.....	-6,072,000	-6,072,000	
Land acquisition.....	-1,429,000	-1,429,000	
Total, Forest Service.....	-24,951,000	-24,951,000	
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
Fossil energy research and development.....	-18,100,000	-18,100,000	
Energy conservation.....	-49,628,000	-49,628,000	
Total, Department of Energy.....	-67,728,000	-67,728,000	
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION			
Indian education.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES			
Smithsonian Institution			
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
Construction.....	-11,512,000	-11,512,000	
Total, Smithsonian Institution	-12,512,000	-12,512,000	
National Gallery of Art			
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	-407,000	-407,000	
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts			
Construction.....	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars			
Salaries and expenses.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities			
National Endowment for the Arts			
Grants and administration	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
National Endowment for the Humanities			
Grants and administration	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Total, Chapter V:			
Rescissions	-248,321,000	-248,321,000	
CHAPTER VI			
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Employment and Training Administration			
Training and employment services.....	-1,399,115,000	-1,349,115,000	+50,000,000
Community service employment for older Americans	-14,440,000	-14,440,000	
State unemployment insurance and employment service operations	-80,000,000	-80,000,000	
Limitation on trust fund transfer.....	-87,700,000	-87,700,000	
Total, Employment and Training Administration.....	-1,561,255,000	-1,481,255,000	+80,000,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics			
Salaries and expenses.....	-700,000	-700,000	
Total, Department of Labor	-1,561,955,000	-1,481,955,000	+80,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
Health Resources and Services Administration			
Program operations	-41,350,000	-41,350,000	
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention			
Disease control, research, and training.....	-2,300,000	-2,300,000	
National Institutes of Health			
National Center for Research Resources	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	
Buildings and facilities.....	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	
Total, National Institutes of Health.....	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	
Assistant Secretary for Health			
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health	-1,400,000	-1,400,000	
Agency for Health Care Policy and Research			
Health care policy and research.....	-3,132,000	-3,132,000	
Health Care Financing Administration			
Program management.....	-19,700,000	-19,700,000	
Administration for Children and Families			
Job opportunities and basic skills	-330,000,000	-330,000,000	
Low income home energy assistance (advance appropriation, 1996)	-319,204,000	-319,204,000	
State legalization impact assistance grants.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	
Child care and development block grant	-8,400,000		+8,400,000
Community services block grant.....	-15,287,000	-15,287,000	
Children and families services programs (crime trust fund).....	-25,900,000	-15,900,000	+10,000,000
Total, Administration for Children and Families	-700,791,000	-682,391,000	+18,400,000
Administration on aging.....	-898,000	-898,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
Office of the Secretary			
Policy research.....	-4,018,000	-4,018,000	
Total, Department of Health and Human Services.....	-843,580,000	-825,180,000	+18,400,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION			
Education reform.....	-104,030,000	-34,030,000	+70,000,000
Education for the disadvantaged.....	-4,808,000	-4,808,000	
School improvement programs.....	-391,840,000	-171,840,000	+220,000,000
Crime trust fund.....	-11,100,000	-11,100,000	
Bilingual and immigrant education.....	-38,500,000	-38,500,000	
Vocational and adult education.....	-90,807,000	-90,807,000	
Student financial assistance.....	-85,000,000	-85,000,000	
Howard University.....	-1,800,000	-1,800,000	
Higher education.....	-54,872,000	-43,472,000	+11,200,000
College housing and academic facilities loans program.....	-432,000	-432,000	
Education research, statistics, and improvement.....	-30,925,000	-30,925,000	
Total, Department of Education.....	-813,512,000	-512,312,000	+301,200,000
RELATED AGENCIES			
Corporation for Public Broadcasting:			
Advance appropriation, 1996.....	-37,000,000	-37,000,000	
Advance appropriation, 1997.....	-55,000,000	-55,000,000	
Railroad Retirement Board: Dual benefits payments account.....	-7,000,000	-7,000,000	
GENERAL PROVISIONS			
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION			
Federal direct student loans.....	-61,000,000	-61,000,000	
Total, Chapter VI:			
Rescissions.....	-3,319,057,000	-2,949,457,000	+369,600,000
CHAPTER VII			
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress			
Gratuities, deceased Members.....	133,800	133,800	
JOINT ITEMS			
Joint Economic Committee.....	-480,000	-480,000	
Joint Committee on Printing.....	-236,137	-236,137	
Total, Joint Items.....	-666,137	-666,137	
OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT			
Salaries and expenses.....	-650,000	-650,000	
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE			
Salaries and expenses.....	-187,000	-187,000	
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
Capitol Buildings and Grounds			
Capitol buildings.....			
Senate office buildings.....	-850,000	-850,000	
Capitol Power Plant.....	-1,850,000	-1,850,000	
Capitol complex security enhancements (transfer from Botanic Garden).....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	
Total, Capitol Buildings and Grounds.....	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE			
Congressional printing and binding.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
Office of Superintendent of Documents			
Salaries and expenses.....	-600,000	-600,000	
Total, Government Printing Office.....	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	
BOTANIC GARDEN			
Salaries and expenses.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS			
Salaries and expenses.....	-150,000	-150,000	
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses.....	-100,000	-100,000	
Total, Library of Congress.....	-250,000	-250,000	
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE			
Salaries and expenses.....	-2,617,000	-2,617,000	
Total, Chapter VII:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	-16,368,537	-16,368,537	
Appropriations.....	(133,600)	(133,600)	
Rescissions.....	(-16,502,137)	(-16,502,137)	
(By transfer).....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	
CHAPTER VIII			
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Federal Railroad Administration			
Office of the administrator (by transfer).....	(811,950)	(811,950)	
Federal Transit Administration			
Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization).....	(360,000,000)	(360,000,000)	
Office of the Secretary			
Working capital fund.....	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	
Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	-5,300,000	-5,300,000	
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	-11,300,000	-11,300,000	
Coast Guard			
Operating expenses.....	-4,300,000	-4,300,000	
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:			
Hurricane Andrew/Iniki supplemental (emergency).....	-4,400,000	-4,400,000	
Vessels.....	-12,133,000	-12,133,000	
Other equipment.....	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	
Shore facilities and aids to navigation.....	-16,261,000	-16,261,000	
Subtotal.....	-35,514,000	-35,514,000	
Environmental compliance and restoration.....	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	
Total, Coast Guard.....	-42,114,000	-42,114,000	
Federal Aviation Administration			
Operations.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	-24,850,000	-24,850,000	
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	-2,094,000,000	-2,094,000,000	
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	-2,127,350,000	-2,127,350,000	
Federal Highway Administration			
Limitation on general operating expenses.....	(-54,550,000)	(-54,550,000)	
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):			
(Limitation on obligations).....	(-132,190,000)	(-132,190,000)	
Rescission.....	-132,190,000	-132,190,000	
Emergency relief program.....	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	-232,190,000	-232,190,000	
Federal Railroad Administration			
Northeast corridor improvement program.....	-6,707,000	-6,707,000	
National MAGLEV prototype development (Highway Trust Fund).....	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	-256,707,000	-256,707,000	
Federal Transit Administration			
Transit planning and research.....	-7,000,000	-7,000,000	
Discretionary grants:			
(Limitation on obligations) (Highway Trust Fund).....	(-33,911,500)	(-33,911,500)	
Rescission.....	-33,911,500	-33,911,500	
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	-40,911,500	-40,911,500	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
GENERAL PROVISIONS			
Salaries and expenses.....	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
Total, Chapter VIII:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	-2,728,572,500	-2,728,572,500	
Emergency rescissions.....	(-104,400,000)	(-104,400,000)	
Rescissions.....	(-2,824,172,500)	(-2,824,172,500)	
(Limitations on obligations).....	(-186,101,500)	(-186,101,500)	
(By transfer).....	(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)	
INDEPENDENT AGENCY			
Office of Personnel Management:			
Government payment for annuitants, employee life insurance benefits.....	9,000,000	9,000,000	
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY			
Departmental offices.....	-100,000	-100,000	
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:			
Salaries and expenses.....	11,000,000	11,000,000	
Acquisition, construction, improvements, and related expenses.....	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	
Financial Management Service.....	-180,000	-180,000	
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	
Internal Revenue Service: Information systems.....	-1,480,000	-1,480,000	
Total, Department of the Treasury.....	-3,250,000	-3,250,000	
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
The White House Office.....	-171,000	-171,000	
Federal Drug Control Programs:			
Special Forfeiture Fund.....	13,200,000	13,200,000	
Rescission.....	-13,200,000	-13,200,000	
Total, Executive Office of the President.....	-171,000	-171,000	
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
General Services Administration:			
Federal Buildings Fund: Rescissions.....	-580,412,000	-631,412,000	-51,000,000
Federal Election Commission.....	-1,388,000	-1,388,000	
Office of Personnel Management: Salaries and expenses.....	-3,140,000	-3,140,000	
Total, Chapter IX:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	-579,388,000	-630,388,000	-51,000,000
Appropriations.....	(33,200,000)	(33,200,000)	
Rescissions.....	(-612,588,000)	(-663,588,000)	(-51,000,000)
(By transfer).....	(13,200,000)	(13,200,000)	
CHAPTER X			
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY			
Disaster relief (emergency).....	3,350,000,000	3,275,000,000	-75,000,000
Advance appropriation, FY 1996 (emergency).....	3,350,000,000	3,275,000,000	-75,000,000
National flood insurance fund (by transfer).....	(5,331,000)	(5,331,000)	
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	6,700,000,000	6,550,000,000	-150,000,000
CORPORATIONS			
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: Bank Enterprise Act.....	36,000,000		-36,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY			
Community Development Financial Institutions			
Community development financial institutions fund program account.....		50,000,000	+ 50,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS			
Veterans Health Administration			
Medical care.....	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	
Departmental Administration			
Construction, major projects.....	-31,000,000	-31,000,000	
Total, Department of Veterans Affairs.....	-81,000,000	-81,000,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
Housing Programs			
National homeownership trust demonstration program	-50,000,000	-50,000,000
Annual contributions for assisted housing	-5,031,400,000	-5,131,400,000	-100,000,000
(Deferral)	(405,900,000)	(405,900,000)
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts	-1,177,000,000	-1,177,000,000
Congregate services	-37,000,000	-37,000,000
Youthbuild program	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Housing counseling assistance	-38,000,000	-38,000,000
Flexible subsidy fund	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
Nehemiah housing opportunities fund	-10,500,000	-10,500,000
Total, Housing Programs	-6,324,900,000	-6,461,900,000	-137,000,000
Homeless Assistance			
Homeless Assistance grants (deferral)	(297,000,000)	(297,000,000)
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	-6,324,900,000	-6,461,900,000	-137,000,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board			
Salaries and expenses	-500,000	-500,000
Community Development Financial Institutions			
Community development financial institutions fund program account	-124,000,000	-124,000,000
Corporation for National and Community Service			
National and community service programs	-210,000,000	-105,000,000	+105,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency			
Research and development	-14,835,000	-14,835,000
Absenteeism, control, and compliance	-8,808,805	-8,808,805
Buildings and facilities	-83,000,000	-83,000,000
Hazardous substance superfund	-100,000,000	-100,000,000
Water infrastructure / State revolving fund	-1,302,200,000	-1,077,200,000	+225,000,000
Total, Environmental Protection Agency	-1,509,841,805	-1,284,841,805	+225,000,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration			
Science, aeronautics and technology	-62,000,000	-85,000,000	-43,000,000
Construction of facilities	-34,000,000	-34,000,000
Mission support	-32,000,000	-32,000,000
Space flight, control and data communications	-20,000,000	-43,000,000	-23,000,000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	-138,000,000	-204,000,000	-66,000,000
National Science Foundation			
Academic research infrastructure	-131,887,000	-131,887,000
CORPORATIONS			
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: FDIC affordable housing program	-11,281,034	-11,281,034
Total, Chapter X:			
New budget (obligational) authority	-1,795,189,839	-1,804,189,839	-9,000,000
Emergency appropriations	(6,700,000,000)	(6,550,000,000)	(-150,000,000)
Appropriations	(38,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+14,000,000)
Rescissions	(-8,531,189,839)	(-8,404,189,839)	(+127,000,000)
(By transfer)	(5,331,000)	(5,331,000)
(Deferrals)	(702,900,000)	(702,900,000)
Total, Title I:			
New budget (obligational) authority	-9,182,125,878	-8,867,525,878	+314,600,000
Emergency appropriations	(6,700,000,000)	(6,550,000,000)	(-150,000,000)
Emergency rescissions	(-109,850,000)	(-109,850,000)
Appropriations	(365,705,800)	(378,705,800)	(+14,000,000)
Rescissions	(-18,138,181,478)	(-15,887,581,478)	(+450,600,000)
(Increases in limitations on obligations)	(24,500,000)	(24,500,000)
(Reductions in limitations on obligations)	(-188,101,500)	(-188,101,500)
(By transfer)	(25,360,950)	(25,360,950)
(Deferrals)	(702,900,000)	(702,900,000)

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
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	
Receipts.....	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	
Federal administration and travel expenses.....		-375,000,000	-375,000,000
Total, Title II:			
New budget (obligational) authority	-31,168,000	-406,168,000	-375,000,000
TITLE III			
EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS			
ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES			
OKLAHOMA CITY RECOVERY			
CHAPTER I			
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
General Administration			
Salaries and expenses.....	34,220,000	34,220,000	
Legal Activities			
Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Federal Bureau of Investigation			
Salaries and expenses.....	77,140,000	77,140,000	
Total, Department of Justice.....	113,360,000	113,360,000	
THE JUDICIARY			
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services			
Court security.....	16,640,000	16,640,000	
Total, Chapter I:			
New budget (obligational) authority	130,000,000	130,000,000	
CHAPTER II			
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY			
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....	1,100,000	1,100,000	
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.....	34,823,000	34,823,000	
United States Customs Service: Salaries and expenses.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	
United States Secret Service.....	8,675,000	8,675,000	
Total, Department of the Treasury.....	43,598,000	43,598,000	
INDEPENDENT AGENCY			
General Services Administration:			
Federal Buildings Fund:			
Limitations on availability of revenue:			
Construction and acquisition of facilities.....	(2,300,000)	(2,300,000)	
Alfred P. Murrah Federal Office Building.....	(40,400,000)	(40,400,000)	
Repairs and alterations.....	(3,300,000)	(3,300,000)	
Rental of space.....	(8,300,000)	(8,300,000)	
Real property operations.....	(12,500,000)	(12,500,000)	
Total, limitations.....	(66,800,000)	(66,800,000)	
Total, Chapter II:			
Budgetary resources available.....	110,398,000	110,398,000	
Emergency appropriations.....	(43,598,000)	(43,598,000)	
(Limitations on availability of revenue).....	(66,800,000)	(66,800,000)	
CHAPTER III			
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
Management and Administration			
Community development grants.....		39,000,000	+ 39,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....	3,200,000	3,200,000	

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL (H.R. 1944) — continued

	H.R. 1158	H.R. 1944	H.R. 1944 compared with H.R. 1158
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY			
Salaries and expenses.....	3,523,000	3,523,000
Emergency management planning and assistance.....	3,477,000	3,477,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
Total, Chapter III:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	10,200,000	49,200,000	+ 39,000,000
Total, Title III:			
Budgetary resources available.....	250,566,000	299,566,000	+ 39,000,000
Emergency appropriations.....	(183,798,000)	(222,798,000)	(+ 39,000,000)
(Limitations on availability of revenue).....	(86,800,000)	(86,800,000)
Grand Total:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	-9,029,498,876	-9,050,896,876	-21,400,000
Emergency appropriations.....	(8,883,798,000)	(8,772,798,000)	(+ 111,000,000)
Emergency rescissions.....	(-109,650,000)	(-109,650,000)
Appropriations.....	(334,536,800)	(348,536,800)	(+ 14,000,000)
Rescissions.....	(-16,136,181,476)	(-16,082,581,476)	(+ 75,600,000)
(FY 1995).....	(-15,728,977,476)	(-15,861,377,476)	(+ 75,600,000)
(FY 1996).....	(-386,204,000)	(-386,204,000)
(FY 1997).....	(-66,000,000)	(-66,000,000)
(increases in limitations on obligations).....	(91,300,000)	(91,300,000)
(Reductions in limitations on obligations).....	(-186,101,500)	(-186,101,500)
(Total, appropriations and increases in limitations on obligations).....	(7,309,634,800)	(7,212,634,800)	(+ 97,000,000)
(Total, rescissions and reductions in limitations on obligations).....	(-16,413,932,976)	(-16,346,332,976)	(+ 67,600,000)
(By transfer).....	(25,300,000)	(25,300,000)
(Deferrals).....	(702,800,000)	(702,800,000)

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I understand full well why the President feels he has to sign this bill. As President, he feels a deep obligation to try to assure that funds are available for the California and other disasters. He is deeply concerned about obtaining Jordan debt relief. We all understand why. There are a number of other high-priority items which the President feels that he needs.

But we have a different role. As I look at this bill, I see it quite differently than does my good friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. I see a bill which has total rescissions of over \$16 billion, total additional spending of some \$7.2 billion, a net change of \$9.2 billion in budget authority. But that results in only about \$5 billion in actual outlay savings. In the first year those outlay savings are used to reduce the deficit, but over the life of this bill, the 7-year life of this bill, the rest of these savings are used to pay for the tax cut which our friends on this side of the aisle are pushing.

As we have discussed many times, the lion's share of that tax cut is going to people who make more than \$100,000 a year. To put it in perspective, the first year savings which result, which are used for deficit reduction, are about \$5 billion, but over the life of the bill, the amount of money available to be used to help finance that tax package is between \$130 and \$140 billion.

That is why, when this bill was before the House the first time, the Democratic Members of this House tried to assure that those savings would be used to reduce the deficit, not to provide somebody who makes \$200,000 a year a tax cut. We tried to pass the Brewster amendment, and we did pass the Brewster amendment. I believe only 9 Members of this House voted against it. I may have to correct that number, but I think that is the number.

But then, as I said earlier in debate, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget told the press that, well, passage of that Brewster amendment was all just a game in order to get the votes to pass this rescission bill. The problem is that what this winds up being is a great transfer of resources from middle-income families, from low-income seniors, to people who I think in the name of the national interest because of their high income could very well afford to forgo a tax cut if they are in the \$200,000 bracket.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any reason why to finance that kind of a tax cut we ought to cut housing for people who desperately need it by \$5 billion, HUD-assisted housing; why we ought to cut HUD housing renewals by \$1.2 billion; why we ought to cut 1996 summer jobs by \$872 million; why we ought to cut other youth training programs by \$272 million; why we ought to cut low-in-

come heating assistance by \$319 million.

That low-income heating assistance program may not be important to somebody in a warm weather state or in a moderate weather state, but in my district it gets to be 42 below zero in February, and I am not talking chill factor.

Eighty percent of the people who use that program make less than \$10,000 a year. I started that program with Senator Muskie years ago because I just got awfully tired of seeing, in my own communities, seniors who had to make a choice between paying for prescription drugs and buying their own food and keeping their house warm.

□ 2030

As I said before on this floor, I will never forget meeting a woman who I met in a city called Stevens Point in my district, who lived in a house which was built for her as a wedding gift by her husband many years ago. She was in her 80's, very poor.

That house meant more to her than anything else in her life and the only thing kept her in that house was that low income heating assistance program. She had closed up every other room in the house except the living room, the kitchen and the bathroom and she slept on an old beat up couch in the living room and was desperately grateful that she was getting a little bit of help so she could stay in the home that she loved.

Now, I know that some people think that sentiment is passe and that emotions should not count, but I hope that Members of Congress are not just numbers machines. I hope we remember that behind each and every number we deal with are human beings: working families, very often, people who count on us to make the right decisions on behalf of their welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I take a back seat to no one in my desire for a balanced budget and I have indicated many times that I would support most of the cuts in this bill, certainly not all of them, but I would support most of these cuts even though some of them, no question, will hurt, if they were going to actually reduce the deficit.

But this is the leading wedge that is pushing the way open to provide for that rich man's tax cut which is going through this place and I just think it is wrong.

And while the President has to expect the bill because he has other responsibilities, I am simply casting a protest vote against what I consider to be the misguided priorities and the insufficient attention to deficit reduction as opposed to tax cuts for high-income folks.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], our distinguished friend and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said today that when they passed the budget resolution, they were delivering on their promise on the Republican side of the

aisle. But I would simply note that you cannot deliver on a promise by making another promise and as we all know, all a budget resolution is, is a promise. It has no force of law until we do something else.

But this, my friends, is real. When we pass this legislation, this appropriations and rescission legislation, it is real.

And the problem is that when it became real on the Republican side of the aisle, they refused to accept our language for more than 1 day when we tried to attach, when we did attach that amendment that tried to assure that all of the cuts be used for deficit reduction rather than for the kind of tax package working its way through this House.

So Mr. Speaker, since the huge majority of the dollars in this bill will really go for that purpose, and not for deficit reduction, I feel required to lodge a protest vote, because I really do think we can do better. I really do think we can be more fair and I really do think we can be more disciplined on the tax side.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues frankly, I have talked to a number of constituents in my district who do very well under this tax cut who tell me, "Dave, forget it. Until we do better on balancing the budget, in my income level, I do not need a tax cut."

I really think we underestimate the sense of patriotism and the sense of reality and the willingness of the American people to sacrifice. I think we underestimate the willingness of the people in this society to sacrifice, if they truly believe it is shared sacrifice, balanced sacrifice, and really is for the purpose of significant, long-term deficit reduction.

This package is a smoke screen for tax reduction and, again, I say I understand why the President feels he must sign it, because he has other responsibilities. But I think we have responsibilities in our own roles to try to insist that these packages be as fair as possible, even while we go about the business on both sides of the aisle of trying to find responsible ways to reduce the deficit.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], my friend, a question. I agree with everything that he said. The cuts here are devastating. LIHEAP means a great deal to people in the State of Vermont. Education cuts, Public Broadcasting cuts, and so forth and so on.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Wisconsin note that given the fact that this government and Congress provide \$100 billion a year in corporate welfare, that is tax breaks and subsidies for the largest corporations and

the wealthiest people, does the gentleman happen to note any cuts in corporate welfare as part of this rescission package?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have not been able to find any. I would like to think that I have missed one or two.

Mr. SANDERS. Nor can I. Now that the Cold War has finally ended and many of us think that we do not need billions for star wars or B-2 bombers, has the gentleman from Wisconsin noted any cuts in military spending for B-2 bombers or star wars? Maybe the gentleman could educate us on that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] no. I am dismayed that when I tried to offer an amendment in the Committee on Rules that would have enabled me to reduce the funding for the F-22, that I was denied the right to offer that amendment.

I would point out, we are very willing, I guess, to cut \$574 million out of education programs. I am not willing to do that when I look at some of the things that are not being cut that should be. But I find it dismaying that that kind of cut is easily acceptable.

But yet we face a situation with the B-22, for instance, where the plane is supposed to replace the F-15. The F-15 is the finest fighter in the world. We have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of them. The Pentagon tells us that the useful military shelf life of that plane will extend out at least to the year 2014, and yet we are asked to replace that with the F-22 at a cost of \$70 billion, \$160 million a plane. So I do find our priorities a bit warped.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 176 I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Livingston: On page 3, line 18, strike "1736(g)" and insert in lieu thereof: "1736o(g)", and

On page 8, line 7, strike "title II", and insert in lieu thereof: "title III", and

On page 9, strike all on line 9 down to and including "scinded." on page 9, line 12, and insert in lieu thereof:

"Under this heading in Public Law 103-317, after the word "grants", insert the following: "and administrative expenses". After the word "expended", insert the following: "Provided. That the Council is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and use gifts, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Council".", and

On page 11, line 6 strike "\$31,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$24,200,000", and

On page 11, line 6, strike all beginning with ", of which" down through and including "program" on page 11, line 9, and on page 39, line 22 strike all after "Provided," down to and including "grams" on page 39, line 25, and insert in lieu thereof: "That the funds remaining available for obligation after this rescission for carrying out this Act may only be used for entrepreneurship, academic, or tutorial programs or for work force preparation", and

On page 86, line 14, strike "shall" and insert in lieu thereof: "is authorized to", and

On page 86, strike all beginning on line 24 down through and including "Act" on page 87, line 22, and

On page 91, line 3, strike "4332(2)(E)" and insert in lieu thereof: "4332(2)", and

On page 98, line 4, strike "102(2C)" and insert in lieu thereof: "102(2)(C)", and

On page 98, line 6, strike "4332(2C)" and insert in lieu thereof: "4332(2)(C)", and

On page 98, line 17, strike "102(2C)" and insert in lieu thereof: "102(2)(C)", and

On page 98, line 18, strike "4332(2C)" and insert in lieu thereof: "4332(2)(C)", and

On page 103, line 11 strike all beginning with "September" down to and including "1997" on page 103, line 12, and insert in lieu thereof: "December 31, 1996".

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to explain the amendment.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment I have offered makes technical changes to the Food for Progress rescission, the Public Law 480 program account rescission, and the Children and Family Services program rescission because they were incorrectly drafted.

It eliminates two rescissions for the Ounce of Prevention and the GLOBE Programs. It changes the requirement that NASA acquire land in Texas to only authorizing this acquisition.

It also eliminates the language authorizing the transfer of the Yellow Creek NASA facility which was included in H.R. 1158. Finally, it makes several citation corrections to the salvage timber provision and changes the termination of the timber salvage sale provision from September 30, 1997, to December 1996.

These changes are necessary for the bill to reflect the original introduced intent, to eliminate an authorization problem, and to gain the President's signature. So I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] to complete his statement.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Let us talk economics for a moment and what is really going on in America. Let us recognize that in America today the wealthiest 1 percent of the population owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent.

The gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider. The middle-class is shrinking. Workers are earning lower wages. That is the economic reality in America. But what does that have to do with the rescission package that we are looking at tonight?

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we are going to be honest, we would say let us move forward in a way that is fair that does not hurt those people who are seeing a decline in their stand-

ard of living, those people who are experiencing increased poverty.

Interestingly enough, however, when we look at this rescission package, do we notice any cuts, any cuts in the \$100 billion a year that the largest corporations in America and that the wealthiest people in America are receiving through corporate welfare? Amazingly, no, we do not.

We see cuts in affordable housing. We see cuts in environmental protection; cuts in the summer job program for low-income kids; cuts in LIHEAP. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] talked about LIHEAP. In the State of Vermont, it gets mighty cold in the wintertime. We have elderly people trying to survive on \$8,000 or \$9,000 a year Social Security, but they are cutting that program some \$300 million.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how low-income elderly people will survive with those types of cuts. But when it comes to corporate welfare, my goodness, we just cannot find a nickel.

What about military spending?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the other members of the committee, the Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS], the other members of the Oklahoma delegation, our mayor of Oklahoma City, Ron Norick, the Governor, Frank Keating, and all others who have worked together to try to fashion some relief for our city, which was so unfortunately damaged by the bombing on April 19.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is extremely important to Oklahoma City. It has \$39 million of relief to assist people, businesses, property, in the damaged area and in the downtown area of Oklahoma City, including an unusual provision, unique for this special purpose, to assist downtown churches, one of which was immediately across the street from the blast, so that they too, to the same extent as any other nonprofit group, might receive the assistance to rebuild at least what we can rebuild since the lives that were shattered cannot be put back together.

The churches, for example, rendered emergency assistance and even provided the facilities for the morgue that was necessary when 168 people died in that catastrophic explosion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is also important because it has funds to rebuild or repurchase a new Federal building; for the demolition of the building which has occurred; the ability to turn the site over to the city of Oklahoma City for a permanent memorial, which is to be constructed; to provide emergency funding for housing of Federal agencies; and of course money for

antiterrorist activities, including \$2 million as necessary for the prosecution of the despicable individuals that committed that atrocious act of terrorism.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, this is important, and I ask every Member to join me in expressing appreciation and in asking support of this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to say one thing.

Apparently, I misspoke a second ago when I said or when I talked about how I understand if the President felt a need to sign this bill. I had been informed erroneously, it turns out, that the Administration had agreed to sign this bill, and hearing that, I had also erroneously assumed that certainly our Republican friends would never be rash enough to bring this bill to the floor while negotiations were still going on with the President, because I thought that things would be handled more gracefully than that. But apparently they have not been, and I am informed that there is still a negotiating process going on.

So I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman, if that is the case, that if they are interested, if you are sincerely interested in getting an agreement with the White House, and I know the White House is interested in getting an agreement with you, I would suggest that the responsible thing would be to suspend the rest of this debate until, in fact, we do have something to present to the House which does represent the genuine agreement.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would only respond to the gentleman by saying it was my understanding at the outset of this debate that we had an agreement with the White House, and if the gentleman has better information than I do, then I would have to express my shock and dismay in the event that no agreement exists. I can tell the gentleman that there have been some ongoing negotiations with respect to language in collateral documents that deal with the timber sales.

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

I tell the gentleman, to the best of my knowledge, that those negotiations on collateral documents which have no reflection on this, no direct reflection on this bill, and really do not, in my mind, indicate that the President has not agreed to go forward.

As I say, if the gentleman has additional information or new information that says that the Administration is not prepared to go forward, then I think he should bring that to the attention of the House, and I would say that I would be very, very displeased.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would be kind enough to yield, I would simply say that I was just informed by a key

White House person in the meeting, or my staff was, that they are still trying to work out language, and it just seems to me particularly graceless for us to be proceeding if, in fact, both parties are working in good faith. I really do believe that it does no one any good, the Congress or the White House, for us to be proceeding if there is, in fact, uncertainty about this, and I think Members are entitled to know what the facts are before they cast a vote.

So I would respectfully urge, and I see the majority leader on the floor, I would respectfully urge that he suspend further consideration of this bill until we can honestly tell Members what, in fact, is going on.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that whatever negotiations are going on, to the best of my knowledge, affect or are involving a letter of clarification of intent on the timber issue and have nothing whatsoever to do with the substance of this bill, and, frankly, I do not anticipate that the lack of finality with respect to that letter of clarification should have any impact on the results of these deliberations on the floor.

Now, I am also of the understanding that the rule that we are working under, provides for no extension, no termination, no recess, and that we are obligated to go forward and complete the debate, and for that reason I, in fact, will pose that as a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, am I right, am I correct in my interpretation of the rule, are we compelled to go forward until the conclusion of this debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The understanding of the Chair is that he could withdraw the bill by unanimous consent but that that would be the only way that the House could proceed differently than the manner in which we are proceeding at the present time, since the previous question is ordered by the rule.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, unless someone gives me notification that the White House is not prepared to go forward, under the circumstances, I would not be inclined to offer such a request by unanimous consent. Therefore, I would suggest the gentleman to go ahead and debate on his own time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, simply to say that I think it is a distinct disservice to Members to ask them to participate in this debate before they know whether an agreement has been reached. I do not think it serves the country well either.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary for me to inform my colleagues, because of events that may happen in the near future, about the specifics of the timber situation, as it has become known, which is parochial to the States of Montana and Idaho.

Montana and Idaho are the only two States in the Nation that have not resolved the RARE-II dilemma, roadless area review and evaluation dilemma. Neither Montana nor Idaho have passed the necessary legislation to either designate the RARE-II wildlands in those two States nor, critically important, have we passed necessary legislation to release those lands.

What the House of Representatives has done in the past, in fact, less than a year ago, is to pass through this body a bill which was not accepted on the other side which would have protected against usual timber harvest 1,100,000 acres of Montana.

Under the bill before us, despite that vote a year ago, that land could be open to timbering. Now, here is my point: If that happens, in fact, if any of the two RARE-II lands are opened to timbering in Idaho or Montana, the people of those States will instantly go to court, and, by the way, if any of those 1,100,000 acres that this House has voted to put in wilderness or protect otherwise are threatened with timbering by the Forest Service, I will go to court to stop it.

So I want to put the House of Representatives on notice that if timbering in these lands which the Congress, the House of Representatives, is on record as protecting goes forward, there will be lawsuits against it.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, over 2 months have passed since the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Building in downtown Oklahoma City. As you can well imagine, representing this area during this time has been quite a challenge. There is truly no clear formula on how a Member of Congress should deal with such a disaster.

Since the bombing, I have expressed my belief that while private relief has poured in from throughout the nation, the Federal Government has a distinct responsibility to Oklahoma City above and beyond building a new federal building, or bolstering law enforcement in Oklahoma City and throughout the country. With the rubble removed and the rebuilding and healing of a damaged city in full swing, the magnitude of the loss is coming into perspective.

The President's veto of the earlier version of the emergency supplemental and rescissions bill gave us in Congress the ability to listen and react to Governor Keating and Mayor Norick's pleas for Federal assistance in response to the economic losses pertaining to the bombing. The Federal response to the bombing contained in H.R. 1944 is a major step toward meeting the city's

economic needs this tragic event has created.

I would like to commend the Speaker, Chairman LIVINGSTON, Chairman LEWIS, and Mr. ISTOOK for their efforts as we have worked to develop the right course for this aid to take. I look forward to working with them and state and local leaders in Oklahoma as we continue to facilitate the healing and rebuilding process.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to simply say it is a miracle. We are now told that within the last minute there actually has been an agreement reached on this letter.

I still find it phenomenal that this House is being asked to vote on this agreement without even having seen it. The timber issue is important to a lot of people in this House, including me, and just for the heck of it, I would like to know what the agreement is and see it in black and white before we debate it. It might be kind of quaint, but it might also be kind of useful.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

I certainly am very sympathetic to the gentleman from Oklahoma who was in the well just before me. I think all of us realize that the President has, and we have, a serious responsibility dealing with some disasters.

But let us talk about this bill, which I think this rescission bill in a way is a disaster, because while it cuts over \$16 billion, the disasters, whether you agree with them or not, are only \$7-plus billion, and so that means there is \$9 billion left.

What happens to that money? It does not go to the deficit. It goes for tax cuts for the rich.

Now, I even questioned some of the disasters that are out there in parts of the country where people do not buy insurance, where they are back here all the time with their little tin cup; meanwhile they are returning State dollars and State taxes to their own people, and meanwhile what are we cutting in here to make them whole? While they are getting tax rebates at the State and local level, my people in Colorado are being asked by this rescission bill to zero out summer jobs, to cut AmeriCorps in half, which is one of the great hopes for young people who are not lucky enough to be born into a family that can get them through college, it cuts significantly the Goals 2000 programs dealing with education, it zeros out the math and science training, it zeros out the public broadcasting, and for those of us who are parents and find Big Bird the only decent thing we want our kids to watch on TV, these are very serious cuts.

Part of this money, and I do not begrudge the part that is going to Oklahoma, but I begrudge the part that is going to tax cuts for the rich, and I begrudge the part that is going to other

parts where they are rescinding their State taxes at the same time they come at us with their golden cup.

□ 2100

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] to take the well, and I would ask him, the author of the portion of the amendment relating to timber, to clarify the intent of the changes negotiated with the administration. The timber provision, of course, was originally conceived, I think, by the gentleman, as well as the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources. But the gentleman from North Carolina is the only forester who is a Member of the House, and he was directly involved in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] so that he might describe the content of his negotiations.

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, "I appreciate your including me and the other members of the authorizing committees and their representatives in this discussion with the administration. It has been a long, arduous task, but I think we made progress."

We have been losing the forestry infrastructure in this country, along with it tens of thousands of jobs and our forest health in the long run. If we lose that forest infrastructure, then the decisions that are made in the future are moot because we will not be able to carry out those silviculture practices that our best universities, that a hundred years of forestry and a hundred years of experimentation with private, State, and Federal experiment sites have given us. We need harvest to carry out and save that infrastructure. We need it in an environmental way, and we have tried to craft a bill that will protect the environment, that will give us forest health at the same time it saves that infrastructure and provides jobs.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Will the gentleman yield on that point? Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. We have tried to work out because there has been little movement—although for nearly 3 years we have had promises, there has been little movement in getting that harvest. We have worked out with the administration a program that will define and move us forward both in forest health and in job creation. It will give a specific track that we can follow in a managed way using the best silviculture methods we have, taking into consideration the environment, and taking into consideration our economic needs. If we follow the outline that has been agreed to by the

President, then we can make substantial progress.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be monitoring this action periodically to see that we are making progress. We can provide the tools to the Forest Service, we can provide any other tools that are necessary for the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] an additional minute.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. We can be successful in all our areas in providing jobs and protecting forest health and protecting the environment, and I think this agreement that we reach tonight will give us that end product, and that is why I am willing to support that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized, he controls the time—

Mr. DEFAZIO. I am asking him to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I will not yield at this time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has declined to yield, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] does control the time.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. We can be successful in all our areas, in providing jobs, and protecting forest health, and protecting the environment, and I think this agreement that we reach tonight will give us that end product, and that is why I am willing to support that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Representing the most public timber-dependent district in the Nation and far exceeding the needs of the gentleman's district, could the gentleman provide something in writing to decide before we vote, or are we going to be required to vote on the good-faith assurances of the Republican Party, having dealt with a Democratic President, and telling us that there is nothing available in writing? What is available in writing to the Members of this House, 435 members, now?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I say to the gentleman, "Mr. DICKS has been involved from your side of the aisle, been involved in these negotiations. What we have tried to do is what I just said. We all recognize the need. We have tried to come up with a realistic plan, not unlike what was passed in the original—

Mr. DEFAZIO. Is it in writing?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. By 277 members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the modifications agreed to by the administration and the committees embody clarifications of several parts of the package.

First, subsection (l) concerning the effect of the provision on other laws was revised by creation of a limited exception to language that prohibited modifying land plans and other

administrative actions a consequence of implementing this section. The new exception allows modifications under limited circumstances when needed to meet salvage levels agreed to by the conferees or to reflect the particular effect of the salvage sale program.

However, the salvage timber sales cannot form the basis for an administrative action that limits other multiple use activities. Project decisions, such as salvage sales, cannot be stopped or delayed by modifications either. The term "delayed" was substituted to ensure that salvage sales and other project decisions go forward. A clarification was added to make sure that a particular salvage timber sale cannot be required to be offered.

Second, subsection (b)(1) was clarified in its linkage to subsection (c), which is part of the salvage sale portion of the section. The authority and process for emergency salvage timber sales is contained in these and other subsections and the clarification embodies the concept that the two subsections are to work in concert, but that once a sale is prepared and advertised the sale is deemed sufficient to meet all applicable laws and then go forward. A 45-day stay can delay the sale while the U.S. District Court considers an appeal. Otherwise the sale will proceed. This expedited procedure will ensure that dead and dying timber on federal land can be harvested before it rots.

Third, the managers and Administration agreed to two important changes in subsection (i). We made it explicit that any salvage sale subject to subsection (b) and any timber sale subject to subsection (d) should be deemed to satisfy the requirements of any compact, executive agreement, convention, treaty, and international agreement, and implementing legislation related thereto. This change was made in response to allegations that passage and implementation of Section 2001 would result in violations of the North American Free Trade Agreement. No such violations would occur.

Fourth, subsection (i) and paragraph (i)(8) were modified slightly to clarify that salvage timber sales subject to subsection (b) and any timber sale subject to subsection (d) shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of all applicable federal environmental and natural resource laws. This clarification is to ensure that purchasers of timber under this section must still comply with applicable contract law.

I stress that this provision was developed in concert with the authorizing Committee and included only after close consultation with the authorizing committees. The legislative committees have ensured us that long-term timber salvage legislation is forthcoming.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources, to discuss his understanding of these negotiations.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest, as the chairman of the authorizing committee, the Committee on Resources can agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR]. The man has done yeoman's work on this situation of salvageable timber.

One of the things that concerns me the most, Mr. Speaker: We worked long and hard to force and forge several modifications and address the concerns

of the administration. We have worked with the administration. It is language that is coming from the administration and not legislative language in this bill. What we are trying to do, why anybody would oppose it, is salvage dead trees, not RARE II, 16 billion board feet of timber is rotting today, standing because it was burned last year. And yet I have people say, "Oh, we can't harvest it because it might destroy the ecosystem."

What we have destroyed are the jobs of the American people. The mills have been shut down, those that provide the paper for this gobbled gook that we work on here every night, for that which we use here ourselves personally, have been shut down, and the American people have been put out of work, and I have people on that side that say, "We can't harvest a dead tree."

We have negotiated long and hard with the chairman and the administration, trying to reach a solution by putting the people of America back to work, and we have done that, and we will continue to do it with this legislation. But beyond that is a matter of principle. Is, in fact, man part of this system?

This man is a forester and understands that the renewable growth of trees—trees are a renewable resource. And to have someone to say we cannot cut down 16 billion board feet of trees, which we have not asked to do so; we asked to cut down 3 billion board feet. That is all, and yet we are looked upon by the media and by those in this body, saying we must not harvest RARE II.

Nonsense. We are talking about a tree that has been burnt because the forests were not managed to begin with. We are talking about American lives and American working forests. It is time we got on. This is good legislation. I urge the passage of the legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. We need a thoughtful forest health program. We have a forest health crisis in the Western United States caused by mismanagement, and that would include some salvage, but we are being asked to accept a pig in a poke. We are being told that the Democrat administration has entered into a secret agreement not available in writing with the Republican majority which we are going to be asked to vote on within 15 minutes here in the House of Representatives. I am being asked to accept on good faith that this is something that will both protect the environment and do what we need for forest health and salvage in the Western United States, but it is not available in writing.

This is an outrage, this is an extraordinary outrage. I do not know how many times I heard from the minority on that side last year, "You can't make us vote on something we haven't read." We have not read this. This is not available to us. It is not available

to us either through the Democratic administration, nor the Republican majority. That is absurd. No one in America thinks we should vote on something we have not read.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. SPEAKER, if the gentleman has not read the timber provisions in H.R. —

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have read that, if the gentleman will yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. As a matter of fact, I will not yield.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, of course not. They will not let us read it, and they will not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman owes the House the respect of the rules.

Mr. DEFAZIO. He owes the courtesy of reading it before I vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. SOLOMON. Get the Sergeant at Arms to get him out of here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does owe the House the respect for the rules, and the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of ranting and raving from the gentleman without a sense of humor about the fact that he has not had a chance to read this. No the fact of the matter is H.R. 1158 was filed 3 months ago. The President of the United States vetoed that bill. It contained a lot of timber language. He has had 3 months to read that language—

Mr. DEFAZIO. And I have read it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I did not know that I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The gentleman will not yield. He is shutting me down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon should obey the rules of the House. The rules of the House require him to be yielded to while he is proceeding on the time of the gentleman from Louisiana. If the gentleman wants time, he seeks time from a Member who will yield it to him. Otherwise, he has no right to interrupt people who are proceeding under the proper order. The gentleman has the obligation to himself to proceed under the proper order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And I was simply going to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has had 3 months to read the timber language in H.R. 1158, he has had a couple of days to read the timber language in H.R. 1944, and he has got the opportunity to speak with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] as well as the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG]—

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] and the other folks who were working with the administration. He has got the opportunity to speak with the President of the United States. He has got the opportunity to speak with Leon Panetta. He has got the opportunity to speak with all of these people in his own administration, and he is pleading surprise. He is pleading that he does not have an opportunity to know what the agreement is.

The agreement centers over about five words in addition to the words that are in this document, H.R. 1944—

Ms. FURSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And I am absolutely astounded that he should beat his breast and express to the Chamber that he has not had an opportunity to see what is going on. If he has not had an opportunity to see what is going on, I would suggest to him that he is not doing his homework. He did not pick up the telephone and call the President of the United States to ask him what is going on.

Ms. FURSE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask, "Why don't we all get 10 minutes' sleep, and then I will yield to somebody."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY from Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that there is an enormous amount of controversy over the number of board feet, and when those board feet are going to be cut, and who they are going to be sold to, and when they are going to be turned into homes and other kinds of products. I am more concerned with the \$17 billion that is going to be cut out of this Nation's economy by this bill and the complicity that our administration is showing with the Republicans to gut most specifically the housing programs of this country. We are talking about wood, but that wood ultimately gets turned into homes, and, as a result of the actions being taken in this bill, we are going to see thousands and thousands of Americans thrown into homelessness.

I say to my colleagues, make no mistake about it. When you cut a quarter of the Nation's housing budget in 1 year without even a weekend's thought as to how these programs are going to be affected, homelessness is going to be created. People don't like seeing homeless people on the street. It makes them feel awkward. It makes them feel badly. You look around and remember where this country was.

Mr. Speaker, in 1980 we spent \$30 billion building affordable housing, built over—300,000 units of affordable housing got built in that year. This year we built about 10,000 units of affordable housing, and we wonder why we created homelessness. The fact of the matter is

that, if we are truly concerned about where we are headed in this country, then we ought not to be going after programs that provide for fuel assistance in the wintertime, that go after housing assistance throughout the year, or safe drinking water, or women, infants, and children, or the national service program, or education grants. What we ought to be doing is going after where the money is in America. We ought not to be providing these huge tax cuts. We ought to be looking at whether or not we need to be spending \$2 million more on star wars, whether or not we want to be underwriting the nuclear power industry of America through new breeder reactors, whether we ought to be going after the oil and gas industry. That is where the money is in this country.

If we want to make cuts, go where the money is. Do not go where the poor people are. That is what this budget does. The Clinton administration, the Clinton Republicans, ought to be ashamed.

□ 2115

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Those who are in the gallery are informed they are the guests of the House, and shall not participate by demonstrating their pleasure for one speaker or another.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to basically explain to my colleagues that I think the changes that were made in the timber legislation were those sought by the administration. The gentleman from Louisiana's Mr. Chairman will change the date until December 31, 1996, which is a date that the administration requested.

Basically the program will be a 1995-1996 program on timber salvage, and the administration has signed a letter, Secretary Glickman, saying they will do the very best they can to try. The base program is 3 billion board feet. They will do the best they can over the 2-year period to do an additional 1.5 billion board feet, but that requires them to have the resources necessary, the personnel, in order to lay out those sales. And this is laid out in a letter to Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fair compromise. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], and others were involved with the staff of the administration. We tried to do the best we could. There were some on the other side of the aisle that wanted a much higher number. The administration told them basically this is the best they could do under the circumstances.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] must understand is we have plans in place in Oregon and Washington to restore salmon habitat, and we have not seen the agreement. We have an obligation to the fishermen and fisherwomen in our communities who have worked hard and given up an enormous amount.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have got the money in the interior appropriations bill to continue the jobs in the woods program, and the assistance for helping fish. I agree. We wanted to make sure this program is environmentally sensitive, the administration has said. This is not a Forest Service run by anyone other than Jack Ward Thomas from the gentlewoman's great State of Oregon. They are going to do the sales properly and in a way that will not hurt the fish.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As the gentleman knows, the original rescissions bill allowed the harvest under this section of both dead, dying, diseased timber and green timber. Is the green timber still in this?

Mr. DICKS. As the gentleman well knows, any time you do a salvage sale, there is going to be some green sales at the periphery of the sale. But they will do that and try to minimize the taking.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman would yield further, under the gentleman's understanding then there would only be green timber harvested in an ancillary way, with the main purpose to be to get salvage.

Mr. DICKS. That is correct. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Throughout the Pacific Northwest, we are trying to restore the great salmon runs on which our people depend, the tribal people, and the fishermen who are fishing commercially and for the sports fishery. We are not here to say that whatever Mr. Clinton and the administration says is right in this sale is necessarily what we believe is right for our constituents. We need to see the paper. We need to know that in fact our watersheds are protected.

Yes, we are very willing to work together, but we need to see the paper, because we are representing fishermen and fisherwomen, both tribal and nontribal, who depend on clean watersheds, depend on clear running water. It is impossible for us to know whether this is going to be good for our watershed plans or bad for them, because we do not know the language.

We are the most trusting people in the world, but we have a duty and an

obligation to our fishermen and the people who have sacrificed time and again to try and bring these great salmon runs back. The people of the Northwest have spent millions of dollars on this. We need to see the paper before we can vote on this most important agreement. That is our duty.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard to get a commitment and a track laid down that would bring about a realistic harvest, a harvest that would impact forest health, that would get timber available to save the infrastructure and create jobs. And there are some 88,000 jobs that can be created out of the original package. It will be slightly less than this, but it will be a substantial job creation.

The commitment we received from the Secretary was to bring us approximately \$4.5 billion in the period between now and December 31, 1996. That commitment was made to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and myself, and we will monitor in the coming months to see that that commitment is followed. We have given the administration the tools. They have given us the assurance, and they have given the people across this country, the assurance that they want to see the harvest coming with the tools and with their word we will move ahead.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to be able to address myself to the question of the Emergency Salvage Timber Sale Program in H.R. 1944. I want to make it clear that my Administration will carry out this program with its full resources and a strong commitment to achieving the goals of the program.

I do appreciate the changes that the Congress has made to provide the Administration with the flexibility and authority to carry this program out in a manner that conforms to our existing environmental laws and standards. These changes are also important to preserve our ability to implement the current forest plans and their standards and to protect other natural resources.

The agencies responsible for this program will, under my direction, carry the program out to achieve the timber sales volume goals in the legislation to the fullest possible extent. The financial resources to do that are already available through the timber salvage sale fund.

I would hope that by working together we could achieve a full array of forest health, timber salvage and environmental objectives appropriate for such a program.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I think it behooves us as legislators, knowing there are many subtleties and words, to have before us the actual language, the laws that are being waived, the laws that are being superseded, the new

standards that will be imposed, and the objectives before we vote. The gentleman derided me, the gentleman from Louisiana, for I have read the bill, and I voted against the original rescissions bill. I have read the language that was available an hour ago. I have talked to the chief of the Forest Service as recently as an hour ago. But there is language now that has come since that time that is not available in print.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that still confuses me on this is I understand this provision still explicitly authorizes below cost sales so that in this bill in which we are trying to save money we well lose money on these sales. Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is one of the many waivers in this bill. It authorizes below cost sales, waives about 10 major environmental and procedural laws and waives all court and administrative and judicial appeals.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pointing out that the amendment is on record and the gentleman can read the amendment as well as the bill, I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the time is late, but it always amazes me where we can have people talk about they have not had an opportunity. The only real change in this whole legislative process is a change of the date at the bequest of the administration. That is all it is. The rest of it has been voted overwhelmingly by this committee.

But the thing that bothers me most, I hear people say we have not had an opportunity. We have not been able to read it. That is nonsense. They have had all these months to read it. One date changed, from 1997 to 1996, and that is it, which I did not like. Because I think we have to harvest those trees that are rotting today on their stumps because they burned, again because the forests were not managed.

To have someone say they are going to affect the fisheries, have you ever seen where the area has been burned and the soil has been eroded because the structure has been diluted because of fire? That is going to affect the fisheries? Nonsense, and you know that.

This is an attempt to destroy by opposition to this bill the infrastructure of the logging industry, which is important to this community. This bill needs to be passed because we are salvaging something in fact that is a waste today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I have been told by tribal leaders that where there has been logging and secondary logging, you find that salmon restoration is diminished by sometimes up to 80

percent. We need to know, are there buffer strips? We need to know, is there clear protection for salmon spawning ground?

Mr. YOUNG, there is no one in this room who knows more about salmon. There is no one who cares more than the gentleman does about salmon. I care, too. I have salmon fishermen who are concerned that the great plans they have put in place and the sacrifices they have made may be, may be, diminished by this legislation.

All they ask of me is that I know what is in the bill. And this bill has changed hourly. I represent fishermen who fish as the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] does on the great salmon of the Northwest. We must do everything we can to preserve their habitat.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 2¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have now been going 2 days without sleep. We have not been able to review the timber issue on paper or to talk to people who have actually done the negotiating, except for the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], evidently. We are relying on the word of people who are in the room. We are debating the work product even as the work product is being put together.

I think that is a ludicrous way to do business, absolutely ludicrous. We should be debating this issue after we know what the full agreement is, not before.

As I said earlier, I understand the pressures on the President to sign this legislation and get on to other things. His veto has made this bill almost \$800 million less pernicious. For that, I am happy. But this bill has always been basically a hit on kids and a hit on old folks for two purposes: One, to pay for disaster relief for California, and, second, to provide tax breaks, the lion's share of which are going to the wealthiest people in this country.

This bill is paraded as a deficit reduction package. In fact, because of the denial of the Brewster language, this bill is in fact providing only \$5 billion in deficit reduction in the first year numbers, and then the out year numbers are devoted and fully available for use to finance that tax package that I am talking about. I do not believe it is fair, I do not believe it is right.

So Members are certainly entitled to vote any way they wish. They all have their own views and their own consciences, but I would suggest that if this Congress cannot do better, it is a pretty sad day.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes to close debate.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, here we are at the end of June. I look back on this past six months, and I think it has been a monumental 6 months, a revolutionary 6 months. The American people said at the polls 9 months ago they wanted change, and they are getting it. The Congress, both in the House and Senate, is delivering on the promises that were made in the last elections, and we are cutting the budget for the first time. For the first time we are saying no longer will we continue to spend more money on new programs, new ideas, new agencies, new departments. We are going to start downsizing Government.

There are many people in this Chamber who say they are for a balanced budget, they are for trimming. Folks, here is your first opportunity. It does not matter what you did on H.R. 1158. You could have voted for or against it. The President vetoed it and that is history. But this is H.R. 1944, and it provides a net of nearly \$9.2 billion in net savings for the American taxpayer in fiscal year 1995.

□ 2130

It is the very first significant step towards a balanced budget. In addition, it pays for the Oklahoma disaster. It pays for the California disaster. It pays for disasters in 39 other States, for flood and fire and earthquake. It pays for the Jordanian debt relief that the President of the United States asked for, and it puts people back to work in the northwest where their timber has burned.

This your opportunity to make the first step, the first meaningful step toward budget reduction. And if you vote against it, you have no excuse in going back to your constituents and saying, I am for budget reduction, but I voted against the one, the first bill that mattered.

My colleagues, this is your opportunity. Vote for this bill. Send it to the Senate. Send it to the President, and have him sign it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1944, the "new" fiscal year 1995 rescission bill. This is the third rescission measure we have taken up this year. What does it take for my Republican colleagues to realize that the rescission bill is just wrong and repeating the same wrong action again, and again, does not make it right. Politics should not be allowed to outweigh the needs of the American people.

We should be applauding the President's veto and his attempt to save this Republican Congress from itself, and to respond to the needs of the American people. Instead, my Republican colleagues have now introduced for consideration another rescission bill.

It is just not right—to launch an assault on children, the elderly, and working families. The cuts contained in the Republican "new" rescission bill continue to devastate the lives of our most vulnerable citizens.

Funding for housing assistance is cut over \$6 billion. This cut will deny the elderly, chil-

dren, and low-income families the housing assistance they need.

Funding for low-income home energy assistance is cut \$319 million. This cut will force our elderly to choose between heat and food.

Funding for safe and drug free schools is cut \$16 million. This cut will deny children a safe, drug free, and crime free learning environment.

Funding for summer jobs is cut \$872 million. This cut will deny teenagers who need to work, a summer job.

Funding for veterans medical care is cut \$50 million. This cut denies the men and women who have served our country the medical care they need.

Funding for adult and youth employment training is cut \$330 million. This cut denies working families the employment training opportunities they so desperately need to provide for their families.

Families must not be forced to choose between paying tuition and the mortgage, or child care and food, or health care and heat. We must not ignore the drain this rescission measure would create on hard working families. And, we must not allow our seniors and the poor to be used as pawns in a tax giveaway scheme for the rich. This assault on the nation's most vulnerable populations is unconscionable and inhumane.

As Members of Congress, we must take a strong stance in defense of our nation's seniors, children, elderly, and veterans. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this bad rescission bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I realize we've all had a long week of business here in this Chamber and we're all a little tired, but if my eyes don't deceive me I see very little changed in H.R. 1944 from the bill the President rightly vetoed earlier this month. The legislation we have before us today still slashes \$16.4 billion in vital assistance to children, working families, and senior citizens in order to fatten the pockets of corporations and wealthy individuals, still steals hope and opportunity away from middle America through draconian cuts to education and job training initiatives, still blocks rescissions savings from being used for deficit reduction, still guts programs which give a much needed injection of resources to local communities. In short, H.R. 1944 still makes no common sense!

In fact, 91 percent of the cuts in this "new" rescissions bill are the same as those in the "old" rescissions bill. Talk about *deja vu*!

The Speaker and his henchmen like to spout on and on about how they care so much about helping people to help themselves. Well, you sure wouldn't know it by looking at H.R. 1944. All this legislation does is help thousands of people on their way out on to the streets.

I have heard a vocal outcry from my constituents about reductions in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which helps two 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 uncaringly hacks LIHEAP by 25 percent with this bill. 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.

In my city of Chicago the temperature on an average winter day hovers around 10 degrees,

with the wind chill in the negative double digits. In January, 60-year-old Earline Hooker froze to death because she wasn't able to get LIHEAP assistance. Tell her family that the LIHEAP program doesn't make a difference.

But this majority party doesn't just focus their attack on seniors with H.R. 1944. They also mount an assault on 600,000 of our most underprivileged children with 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, thousands of 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!

The GOP then turns its efforts toward the absolute destruction of the quality of life for public housing residents in this nation and the abandonment of 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 \$5 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. At a time when the Chicago Housing Authority [CHA] and its tenants are in dire need of increased attention and resources to help improve the problems that beset CHA, the Republicans just laugh in the face of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1944. This Congress still has responsibilities to the American people to invest in our children, our families, and our communities—despite what the Republican majority would have us believe.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, although this version of the rescissions bill was just introduced last night, it shouldn't take anyone too long to figure out that, as written, it still would seriously harm America's national forests. For this reason alone, I cannot support this poorly written piece of legislation.

Rather than work toward a balanced and environmentally sustainable means to salvage timber, the Republicans have tacked on odious environmental language which will encroach on the health of the environment.

Why are the Republicans clouding the rescissions bill with a costly environmental disaster such as this timber salvage plan?

To some, the words "timber salvage" may be rhetorically pleasing—evoking images of saving rotting trees from their imminent demise—yet this timber salvage plan is a thinly disguised excuse for unregulated timber harvest in our treasured national forests.

H.R. 1944's timber salvage plan would mandate more than 6 billion board feet be cut from our national forests over the next 2 years. Worse still, a majority of this astounding sum will come from our northwest national forests most pristine roadless areas and old-growth remnants.

While proponents of this bill claim that loggers only will cut down trees that are diseased, the actual rescissions language states that loggers may go in and cut whatever they see fit as long as there are any trees in the forest that are damaged. Definition of timber salvage in subsection (a)(3).

I am appalled that in order to let the timber industry into the Nation's forests, the Republicans will literally suspend all environmental, health, and safety laws. As written, this bill will even overturn any judicial order, fought for by some of our own constituents, aimed at preventing such poorly planned taxpayer-subsidized logging as this bill will mandate.

Clearly, emergency appropriations legislation is not an effective way to manage forests, nor is it good public policy.

Mr. Speaker, allowing passage of this so called timber salvage plan will threaten the health of our national forests. Unfortunately, the Republicans have got the votes to do whatever they please and they want to pass this bill. I am dismayed that they repeatedly use their new-found power to continue an irresponsible assault on our Nation's environment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker. The President vetoed this rescissions bill the first time for many reasons: it cut funding for the National Service Plan and heating oil assistance for the elderly, zeroed out funding for the Housing for People With AIDS Program and sliced deep into education funds.

But Rescissions II still contains a devastating provision from the original bill vetoed by the President: it allows for the raiding of our Treasury and the pillaging of the environment just to hand a bonus check to the timber industry.

This timber salvage provision is a lobbyist's dream and a taxpayer nightmare. It would allow the chainsaw destruction of our national forests and permit logging without laws in vast stretches of the American West.

Even with all of the rhetoric we have heard about cutting our deficit, no funds from this fire sale of the American West will be returned to the Treasury. The losses to the U.S. Treasury will require subsequent supplemental appropriations and new funding to cover the costs.

The bill ignores our current fiscal problems and encourages timber to be cut at any cost, even allowing salvage sales to continue if the costs of the sales exceed the revenues they generate.

This means that even if salvage sales don't make money, they will continue, because Congress will have said that protecting the timber industry is more important than protecting the environment or safeguarding the U.S. Treasury.

As I stated earlier, this provision Waives all Federal laws. Passage of this bill again literally suspends criminal law, conflict of interest limitations, Federal contacting requirements and anti-fraud provisions, not to mention the rule against obligating Federal funds without authority to do so.

This rescissions bill replaces the rule of law with lawlessness. It says to the American people that Congress cares more about creating a few temporary jobs now than it does about deficit reduction and environmental protection for the future.

During the debate on this bill, we have heard a lot of rhetoric that this salvage authority is desperately necessary to save our forests and ensure forest health.

What we have not heard is that the Forest Service is already conducting an aggressive salvage program.

In fact, since 1978, the chief's annual reports show that 15 percent of the cut was salvage—a figure representing more than 22 billion board feet!

The Forest Service currently has all the legal authority it needs to carry out an aggressive salvage program within existing law and clearly intends to do just that.

But perhaps my biggest concern with this ill-gotten gains legislation is that the level of logging required by this provision would require massive new road-building in roadless areas and massive clear-cutting.

Both of these practices seriously degrade the environment, including eroding the soil; harming the watersheds downstream; destroying salmon and trout spawning and rearing habitat; threatening watersheds and drinking water supplies and reducing the ability of forest soils to nourish health forests.

Mr. Chairman, in all the rhetoric on this issue, we've heard repeatedly about how the Clinton administration's land use policies have constituted some kind of war on the west.

I would submit that this timber salvage provision is the real war on the west.

If we pass this rescissions bill again, we will deliver a one-two punch to our country: we'll be pillaging the Treasury and destroying our environment and the precious natural resources we all cherish.

To those in this body who would say that this rescissions bill is necessary and appropriate, I would remind you of a simple truth from the Great Law of the Iroquois Confederacy: "in our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations.

Mr. Chairman, I did not come to Washington to preside over the destruction of our natural heritage. My constituents sent me here to ensure that every American will have natural resources to enjoy that will still be here in seven generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to House Resolution 176, the previous question is ordered on the amendment and on the bill.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1944) to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that the Committee report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 66, line 14, strike "\$3,275,000,000" and insert "\$3,250,000,000";

On page 66, line 23, strike "\$3,275,000,000" and insert "\$3,250,000,000"; and

On page 68, strike line 4 through "That" on line 7 and capitalize the "s" in "section" on line 7.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this recommittal motion is very straightforward. I would urge its support. It simply restores \$50 million which has been cut from veterans' medical care.

The account it has been cut from has traditionally run small surpluses, but it has almost always been used to take care of the backlog of needs for medical equipment at the VA which total over \$800 million.

We have, for instance, an MRI scanner at Salt Lake; x ray machine at Shreveport, which is needed; nuclear imaging system at Bay of Pines; a variety of other backlogged items which I will show anybody who has the slightest bit of interest.

We offset the funding for this by simply taking three quarters of 1 percent out of what are in effect unobligated balances from the disaster account in the bill. It will do no damage to anyone, but it will provide our veterans some very badly needed additional medical care. I would urge the adoption of the recommittal motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this motion is very simple and straightforward. By voting yes, you and I tonight can restore \$50 million in cuts to veterans' health care programs. It is that simple. And if you vote no, you are simply saying that you want to cut badly needed veterans hospital equipment by \$50 million.

Now, if you believe that veterans presently receive better health care than they deserve, then go ahead, vote no on this motion. But if you believe that veterans' health care has already been cut enough over the last several years, as I do, and if you believe it is unfair for veterans to make further cuts in their health care services, then you should vote yes on this motion.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, this House passed a constitutional amendment to prevent the burning or desecration of the American flag. I voted for that amendment. Many of our Democratic and Republican colleagues said we should vote for this flag amendment because we owed it to our veterans who were willing to fight and die for their country. I agree.

But Members, it is not good enough to wrap yourself in the flag yesterday for veterans and then turn your back on veterans tonight. It is time right now, right now to match our votes with our rhetoric. It is time right now to say to our Nation's veterans, you have already sacrificed enough for America.

In honoring our Nation's veterans over 130 years ago, President Lincoln said at Gettysburg that the world would little note or long remember what he said there, but the world would never forget what they did there.

Perhaps those eloquent ideas are appropriate this evening in this Congress. Our Nation's veterans should little note what Members of Congress say about supporting veterans, but they should long remember what Members of Congress do about supporting veterans.

I would suggest that cutting veterans' health care in this bill to help pay for a tax break for Donald Trump is simply not fair. We can do better. Our veterans deserve better from this Congress.

Veterans do not need our lip service. What they deserve is quality health service.

Less than 5 minutes, that is what it would take to make this amendment to this bill on this floor tonight.

Last night we spent hours debating esoteric issues on foreign aid and Burma and other nations. Having stayed up all night last night on those issues on foreign aid, do not America's veterans deserve five minutes of your and my time tonight to make a renewed commitment to see they receive the quality VA health care they deserve?

I think yes. I want to urge Republicans and Democrats in this House to say "yes" to veterans, say "yes" to their health care and say "yes" to this motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, very late.

I just want to express my thanks to the Members on both sides for sticking with us not only over these last couple of days but for these last several months in what has been a difficult period. But we have a real opportunity to give the American taxpayer some savings and do some good, I just say to the gentleman who offered this motion to recommit that his motion reminds me of the old criminal defense tactic of throwing up a smoke screen, talking about something that really does not have anything to do with the issue at hand.

He wants you to forget the facts are that we are giving nearly \$9.2 billion in savings to the American people in fiscal year 1955. And it does not matter that the funds which he apparently attempts to keep for the VA really are a loser. This money is not going to be used by the VA. It was money for equipment and salaries, costs that were not needed this year. You can talk about the veterans, but really, that is a nonissue.

We have already reduced FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency by \$150 million. The gentleman's motion to recommit would take money away from FEMA.

The fact is that the recommittal motion would cut disaster funds to provide for things that are not needed, and I would urge the rejection of the motion to recommit.

I would point out to all the Members on both sides of the aisle, folks, the ad-

ministration supports this bill. Here is the statement of administration policy.

The Executive Office of the President says:

The statement of administration policy provides the administration's views on H.R. 1944. The administration supports H.R. 1944 as amended by the Livingston amendment, which is made in order under the rule.

H.R. 1944 provides an important balance between deficit reduction and providing funds to meet emergency needs. This legislation provides essential funding for FEMA disaster relief.

Which the gentleman wishes to cut in this motion to recommit,

For the federal response to the bombing in Oklahoma City, for the increased anti-terrorism efforts, and for providing debt relief to Jordan in order to contribute to further progress toward a Middle East peace settlement. H.R. 1944 reduces federal spending by \$9 billion.

My colleagues, there you have it. That is not BOB LIVINGSTON talking. This is not the majority party talking. That is from the administration. They are saying, vote for the bill. We pay for the supplemental funding for the Oklahoma bombing. We pay for flood and fire and earthquake and disaster assistance. We enable the timber people to go back to work, and we pay for Jordanian debt relief, as requested by the administration, to secure a balanced peace in the Middle East. We do all of that, plus you get \$9.2 billion in additional savings for the American taxpayer in 1995.

My colleagues, it is a good bill. The administration likes this bill. The Senate is going to pass this bill. All we need is your votes, 218 plus. Give me your votes, and we will go home, and we can all sleep well tonight.

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

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—192

Abercrombie	Bishop	Clayton
Ackerman	Bonior	Clement
Andrews	Borski	Clyburn
Baessler	Boucher	Coleman
Baldacci	Brewster	Collins (IL)
Barcia	Browder	Collins (MI)
Barrett (WI)	Brown (CA)	Condit
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Conyers
Beilenson	Brown (OH)	Costello
Bentsen	Bryant (TX)	Coyne
Berman	Cardin	Cramer
Bevill	Chapman	Danner

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

NAYS—232

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

LoBiondo Portman Souder Gilcrest Linder Royce
 Longley Pryce Spence Gillmor Livingston Salmon
 Lucas Quillen Stearns Gilman LoBiondo Sanford Richardson
 Manzullo Quinn Stockman Goodlatte Longley Saxton Rivers
 Martini Radanovich Stump Gooding Lucas Scarborough Rusk
 McCollum Ramstad Talent Gordon Luther Schaefer Sabo
 McCrery Regula Tate Goss Manuzillo Schieff Thompson
 McDade Riggs Tauzin Graham Martini Seastrand Sanders
 McHugh Roberts Taylor (NC) Greenwood Mascara Sensenbrenner
 McInnis Rogers Thomas Gunderson McCollum Shadegg Sawyer
 McIntosh Rohrabacher Thornberry Gutknecht McCrery Shaw Schramer
 McKeon Ros-Lehtinen Tiahrt Hamilton McDade Shays Scott
 Metcalf Roth Tor-kildsen Hancock McHugh Shuster Serrano
 Meyers Roukema Upton Hansen McIntosh Siskey Skelton
 Mica Royce Vucanovich Harman McKeon Skelton
 Miller (FL) Salmon Waldholtz Meehan Smith (MI)
 Molinari Sanford Wal-dholtz Minge Smith (NJ)
 Moorhead Saxton Walker Hastings (WA) Metcalf Smith (TX)
 Morella Scarborough Walsh Hay-ers Smith (WA)
 Myers Schaefer Wamp Miller (FL) Solomon
 Myrick Schiff Watts (OK) Mica
 Nethercutt Seastrand Weldon (FL) Miller (FL)
 Neumann Sensenbrenner Weldon (PA) Minge
 Ney Shadegg Weller Heine-man Spratt
 Norwood Shaw White Hill-early Moorhead Stearns
 Nussle Shays Whitfield Hobson Morella Stenholm
 Oxley Shuster Wicker Hoekstra Murtha Stockman
 Packard Skeen Wolf Hoke Myers Stump
 Parker Smith (MI) Young (AK) Horn Myrick Talent
 Paxon Smith (NJ) Young (FL) Nethercutt Tanner
 Petri Smith (TX) Zeliff Neumann Tate
 Pombo Smith (WA) Zimmer Ney Tauzin
 Porter Solomon

Richardson Slaughter Vento
 Rivers Stark Volkmer
 Roybal-Allard Stokes Ward
 Rusk Stupak Waters
 Sabo Tejada Watt (NC)
 Sanders Thompson Waxman
 Sawyer Thornton Williams
 Schroe-der Thurman Wise
 Schumer Torricelli Woolsey
 Scott Towns Wyden
 Serrano Traficant Wynn
 Skaggs Tucker Velazquez

NOT VOTING—7
 Clay Moakley Yates
 Durbin Reynolds
 Engel Studts

NOT VOTING—7

Clay Moakley Yates
 Durbin Reynolds
 Engel Studts

□ 2218

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

Messrs. HALL of Texas, MASCARA, and DOYLE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002".

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 20, concurrent resolution providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate on Thursday, June 29, 1995, or Friday, June 30, 1995, until Monday, July 10, 1995, and a conditional adjournment of the House on the legislative day of Friday, June 30, 1995, until Monday, July 10, 1995.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT POLICIES

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-169) on the resolution (H. Res. 180) waiving points of order against the conference report accompanying the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOT VOTING—10

Foglietta Studts
 Durbin Moakley Yates
 Engel Reynolds
 English Stokes

□ 2200

Mr. HORN, Mr. EHLERS, and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The question is on passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 151, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

YEAS—276

Allard Buyer Dicks
 Archer Callahan Dooley
 Arney Calvert Doolittle
 Bachus Camp Dornan
 Baesler Canady Doyle
 Baker (CA) Castle Dreier
 Baker (LA) Chabot Duncan
 Baldacci Chambliss Dunn
 Ballenger Chapman Edwards
 Barr Chenoweth Ehlers
 Barrett (NE) Christensen Ehrlich
 Bartlett Chrysler Emerson
 Barton Clement English
 Bass Clinger Ensign
 Bateman Coble Everett
 Beilenson Coburn Ewing
 Bereuter Collins (GA) Fawell
 Berman Combest Fazio
 Bilbray Condit Fields (TX)
 Bilirakis Cooley Flanagan
 Bliley Cox Foley
 Blute Crane Forbes
 Boehlert Crapo Fowler
 Boehner Cremeans Fox
 Bonilla Cubin Franks (CT)
 Bono Cunningham Franks (NJ)
 Brewster Danner Frelinghuysen
 Brownback Davis Frisa
 Bryant (TN) de la Garza Funderburk
 Bunn Deal Gallegly
 Bunning DeLay Ganske
 Burr Diaz-Balart Gekas
 Burton Dickey Geren

Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Inglis
 Istook
 Jacobs
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Kasich
 Kelly
 Kim
 King
 Kingston
 Klug
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 LaHood
 Largent
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Laughlin
 Lazio
 Leach
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Lightfoot
 Lincoln

NAYS—151

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Andrews
 Barcia
 Barrett (WI)
 Becerra
 Bentsen
 Beville
 Bishop
 Bonior
 Borski
 Boucher
 Browder
 Brown (CA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brown (OH)
 Bryant (TX)
 Cardin
 Clayton
 Clyburn
 Coleman
 Collins (IL)
 Collins (MI)
 Conyers
 Costello
 Coyne
 Cramer
 DeFazio
 DeLauro
 Dellums
 Deutsch
 Dingell
 Dixon
 Doggett
 Eshoo
 Evans
 Farr
 Fattah

Fields (LA)
 Filner
 Flake
 Foglietta
 Ford
 Frank (MA)
 Frost
 Furse
 Gejdenson
 Gephardt
 Gibbons
 Gonzalez
 Green
 Gutierrez
 Hall (OH)
 Hastings (FL)
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Holden
 Hoyer
 Jackson-Lee
 Jefferson
 Johnson (SD)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnston
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy (MA)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kennelly
 Kildee
 Kleczka
 Klink
 LaFalce
 Lantos
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski

Lofgren
 Lowey
 Maloney
 Manton
 Markey
 Martinez
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McDermott
 McHale
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meek
 Menendez
 Mfume
 Miller (CA)
 Mineta
 Mink
 Mollohan
 Moran
 Nadler
 Neal
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pastor
 Payne (NJ)
 Pelosi
 Peterson (FL)
 Peterson (MN)
 Pickett
 Pomeroy
 Poshard
 Rahall
 Rangel

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1995 SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET AND RESCISSIONS OF AUTHORITY REQUEST ACT AND PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1996 BUDGET REQUEST ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-89)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's Proposed FY 1995 Second Supplemental Budget and Resciissions of Authority Request Act and the Proposed FY 1996 Budget Request Act.

The Proposed FY 1996 Budget has not been reviewed or approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, created by Public Law 104-8, the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 (the "Act"). It will be subject to such review and approval pursuant to section 208 of the Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 29, 1995.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 11, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 211(b)(f), Public Law 101-515 as amended by Section 260001, Public Law 103-322, I hereby appoint the following individual representing law enforcement officers to the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement: Mr. Darryl Jones of Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

EXTENDING AUTHORITIES UNDER THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill—S. 962—to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until August 15, 1995, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I do want to state some concerns I have about the process surrounding the consideration of the bill.

This is the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. It expires June 30, 1995, which is this Friday. The bill before us, S. 962, extends the law only for another 45 days, until August 15.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is critical to the Middle East peace process. If the act is allowed to expire, all funds for direct assistance to the Palestinian authority and the West Bank and Gaza will be cut off. The United States will not be able to contribute to international efforts to benefit the Palestinian authority, and representatives of the Palestinian authority or related entities will not be able to maintain an office in the United States. So, engaging in diplomatic activities here would be virtually impossible.

In short, allowing this law to expire could bring down the peace process at a time of intense Israeli-Palestinian peace talks.

Given the fragile, but nonetheless positive, nature of ongoing discussion between the Israelis and Palestinians, I have concern that we want to add to the instabilities of the region by extending this law only until August 15. By doing so, we are sending mixed signals to the parties, raising doubts about our resolve in the peace process. We create artificial tensions for a region that has plenty of real tensions. We do so for reasons that have nothing to do with Palestinians or Israelis.

We want the Palestinians to do more to control violence. We have concerns about some actions of the Palestinian authority. But we have an ongoing process to monitor Palestinian behavior without imposing unnecessary time pressures on both sides.

I think it is a mistake not to authorize a longer extension at this time.

I will not object to the bill, but I do hope that when we have to return to the floor later this summer to extend this law again, we do so for a longer period of time.

We should send a signal of strong support for the Middle East peace process, not the opposite. The Middle East peace process is hard enough. We in the Congress should not make it harder.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, S. 962 is a temporary extension of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, which is scheduled to expire at the end of this week unless congressional authority is extended.

Because we will conference with the Senate on a more substantive Middle East Peace Facilitation Act prior to

the summer recess, this legislation extends the Act until August 15, 1995. In essence, this is a 45-day extension.

I therefore urge positive consideration of this legislation under my unanimous consent request.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 962

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.

Section 583 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) is amended by striking "July 1, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 15, 1995".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING UPON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO RELEASE U.S. CITIZEN, HARRY WU

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the resolution—House Resolution 178—calling upon the People's Republic of China to release U.S. citizen Harry Wu unconditionally and to provide for an accounting of his arrest and detention, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object. I simply want to commend the authors of the resolution for their excellent work in bringing this measure before the House in a timely fashion.

House Resolution 178 condemns the arbitrary detention of Mr. Harry Wu by the Chinese.

Mr. Wu is a dedicated human rights activist. He is highly respected by Members, many Members of this House. I support the resolution, and I call upon the Chinese Government to release Mr. Wu.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to join my colleagues and commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and so many others, particularly the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], for the work they have done on this issue.

I know Harry Wu. He has testified before my committee. The courage of this individual, who spent 19 years in slave labor camps in China, to go back to fight for other people's freedom and to continue to raise the issues of the Chinese Government's abuse of its own citizens is courage that it is hard for most of us to fathom.

There is a double outrage here. One is that Harry Wu, who suffered so much at the hands of the Chinese, is suffering there again today. But it does beyond that. Harry Wu went to China as an American citizen with a valid American passport and a valid visa from the Chinese Government. This is someone who has had the courage to continue to work for his fellow man and for his fellow men and women of China who live under oppression.

This kind of action by the Chinese Government will only continue to isolate that Government. It is an outrage that we will not sit idly by. It will mobilize Members of the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle.

Harry Wu is a genuine hero today, and he will not be forgotten by this Congress. He must be released by the Chinese, and again I would like to commend the ranking Member, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], particularly on our side, the Gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], for the wonderful work she has done on this issue through the years.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, our committee on International Relations reported out House Resolution 177, a resolution that calls upon the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release Harry Wu. Harry Wu is well-known to many Members of Congress for his testimony before a number of our committees about human rights abuses in China. Because of this, he was arrested in China on June 19.

I want to commend the chairman of the Human Rights and International Organization Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for crafting the resolution before us and I want to thank the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. BE-REUTER, for coordinating his efforts with Mr. SMITH to bring it so rapidly before us.

It is an outrage that an American citizen is being held by the Government of the People's Republic of China and they have denied our Government representatives access to him and have not told our representatives where he is or what charges are being contemplated against him.

That kind of action indicates that the Government in Beijing will disregard conventions and agreements whenever it suits them. A government

that will sell restricted weapons technology to Iran will certainly not have a problem with breaking more mundane but no less important consular agreements.

Accordingly, I fully support this resolution and urge my colleagues to join us in voting for it.

□ 2230

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], one of the chief sponsors of House Resolution 177.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to commend Chairman GILMAN, Chairman SMITH, and perhaps Harry Wu's best friend in the Congress, FRANK WOLF. Harry Wu has friends on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the Atlantic, and on both sides of the Pacific. He is a truly internationally recognized champion of freedom and democracy.

Who else is Harry Wu? Harry Wu, when 19 or 20 years old, criticized the Soviet invasion of Hungary. He was overheard doing that and sent as a political prisoner to a slave labor camp, where he served for 19 years. Eventually he came out and came to the United States. He is a U.S. citizen, but has not forgotten those who were left behind in these prison labor camps. He has written books describing the plight of those people, and worked tirelessly to try to expose the prison labor system in China.

Those of us who know Harry and appreciate the valuable contribution he has already made always discouraged him from going back to China, because this is what we did fear. Because of the international acclaim that he had received and the international attention that he had brought to both the slave labor issue in China and also the organ transplant issue which is associated with the slave labor camps, that the Chinese were not happy, and that he might be in danger should he go there. So we have discouraged him in recent years from returning there, and our worst fears have not been realized.

So, with that, I want to say, because I know time is of the essence and we want to get on with the evening, but to Harry Wu's wife Ching Li, we commend her for her courage. She is a source of strength and inspiration to us. She knows that Harry did what he did because he believed in freedom and democracy, and risked his life many times over the years. He did these outstanding things with the support of his friends in the U.S. Congress and the European Parliament and other places, and among those are the people who are here before us tonight, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. WOLF. It is one of the joys of my service in Congress to have worked with them on this issue and to support such an exceptional person as Harry Wu. I am grateful to all of our colleagues for allowing us this unanimous consent request this evening.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a chief sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the abuse of human rights by the People's Republic of China includes the thousands of people who languish in the gulag system and logai system which Harry Wu has so faithfully, as well as so courageously, exposed throughout the years, but the human rights abuses, as we all know, are legion in the People's Republic of China. Now they include again a U.S. citizen.

On June 19 of this year, just a couple of days ago, Harry Wu was arrested as he entered China. Harry Wu is well known to many of us in Washington. He is a former political prisoner. He was a prisoner in the logai system for 19 years.

Harry has tirelessly worked to expose Chinese human rights abuses. The extensive prison labor system, the backbone of China's export industry, the trafficking of body parts of prisoners for transplant and research, and he has also uncovered the numerous products manufactured in the slave labor camps which are being sold in the United States.

Knowing that each time he returned to China to investigate human rights abuses that he put himself in danger, Harry Wu continued to go back, remembering those millions who like he suffered, or like his brother, who died at the hands of the Chinese Government and military.

Mr. Chairman, on April 3 we had the privilege in the International Operations and Human Rights Committee to hear testimony from six survivors of the logai system. They gave extensive testimony, a Buddhist monk, a priest, and others who had been held by the Chinese, and, of course, I think the most riveting testimony was given by Harry Wu.

When talking about this, he said, "I really want to forget the nightmares of that past period, but, you know, some things simply will not go away. So, like a bad dream, they refuse to disappear."

But he also said, "I am a survivor. I think I have a responsibility to those inmates who are still there. Finally, I have got a chance to tell the truth to the world."

Today again, sadly, Mr. Speaker, Harry Wu is not free. His whereabouts is not known. The U.S. Embassy for its part was informed of the arrest and tried, and tried very hard, to find out where he is, and has been stonewalled. Nine days have past since Harry Wu, a U.S. citizen, was arrested.

How much longer do we have to wait to find out where he is and exactly what kind of shape he is in? Harry Wu indeed has been a voice for those crying out for truth and for justice. I am

very glad in a bipartisan way, Mr. Speaker, that we today will go on record calling on the People's Republic of China, working with the administration on this one, to try to get the freedom of this United States citizen, who has been unjustly and cruelly taken by the People's Republic of China.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], one of the chief sponsors of the resolution.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, so much has been said, let me just cover a few other points. Harry is a scholar at the Hoover Institute. He is an author. His latest book is *Bitter Winds*, where he talks about his 19 years in the gulag.

With regard to these circumstances, as the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] said, Harry is an American citizen. Harry Wu is an American citizen with a valid passport who has been arrested and detained by the Chinese Government. They have not even allowed our government to interview him, to see him. He is a moral leader, not only in the United States, but in the world. He is almost like the Sharanski of China, if you will.

I want to thank the people who moved this out of the committee so fast, and thank the leadership of the Congress. I think the fact that Congress has acted so quickly, I have never seen the Congress act this quickly on anything, and the fact that in these busy days, staying in around the clock, that the Congress has brought this up is very, very important.

We are asking that he be released. Released. Unconditionally released, whereby he can return to his family. I do not know that Harry is listening at this moment, but I know his wife is, and we just remember Harry in our prayers and remember her.

I would just say to the Chinese Government, and I do not know if they are watching tonight, but if anything were to happen to Harry Wu, I just think that the Chinese Government would pay a price for the future that they do not even realize. We are not going to make any threats tonight, and I do not think it is appropriate to be combining this with MFN or all these other things. But if anything ever happened to Harry Wu, I pledge myself I would commit myself and dedicate myself to doing anything and everything I can to make sure that there had been a price paid.

So we call on the Chinese Government to release Harry Wu and let him return to his family.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for moving this resolution so fast.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am just asking the gentleman to yield in order for me to thank the ranking minority member for his cooperation and bringing the measure to the floor expeditiously. I want to commend the original sponsors, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for joining together in moving this measure quickly through the House so we can bring the greatest pressure possible to the People's Republic of China for the early release of Mr. Wu.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and his cooperation this evening. Just in closing I wanted to make it clear what we are asking for is for the Chinese Government to make us aware of Harry Wu's whereabouts, to allow him to have a visit as is appropriate in our relationship with China and the consular agreements, a visit from representatives of the American Embassy and consulate there, and also to free Harry Wu.

We will pursue this issue until he is free, and this evening's unanimous consent action is an important step for us in the direction. Once again, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for his cooperation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 178

Whereas Peter H. Wu, known as Harry Wu, is a citizen of the United States;

Whereas Harry Wu entered the People's Republic of China with an American passport and a valid visa but has been detained incommunicado by Chinese authorities since June 19, 1995;

Whereas on June 23, 1995, the Government of the People's Republic of China notified the United States Government of its detention of Harry Wu;

Whereas on June 26, 1995, the United States Government requested that Chinese Government authorities provide prompt access to Harry Wu;

Whereas Article 35 of the United States- People's Republic of China Consular Convention of February 19, 1982, requires that access to a detained or arrested American citizen be granted no later than 48 hours after a request for such access is made;

Whereas, as of Wednesday, June 28, 1995, the People's Republic of China had failed to act in accordance with the 48 hour consular access provision of the Consular Convention; and

Whereas the Department of State has not been informed of where Harry Wu is being held, nor what charges, if any, are being contemplated, and has not received any assurances that the obligations of the Government of the People's Republic of China under

the Consular Convention will be met: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) The House of Representatives expresses its condemnation of the arrest and detention of Harry Wu and its deep concern for his well-being and freedom;

(2) It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) The People's Republic of China must immediately comply with its commitments under the United States- People's Republic of China Consular Convention of February 19, 1982, by allowing consular access to Harry Wu;

(B) The People's Republic of China should provide a full accounting to the United States for Harry Wu's arrest and detention, and should immediately and unconditionally release him; and

(C) The President of the United States should use every diplomatic means available to ensure Harry Wu's safety and well-being, and to secure his immediate and unconditional release.

(3) The Clerk of the House shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the United States, and to President Jiang Zemin of the People's Republic of China.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE RESCISSIONS PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a very long discussion, now I guess almost some six months, attempting to bring this House to focus on what has been partly the claim of the American people, discussion about a balanced budget, the idea that a deficit does exist, and we as the United States Congress, being representative of all Americans, should begin to strategize, to respond to building a better America as we move into the 21st Century.

We have each struggled with this, and many would say there are many Democrat obstacles we have had to fight. And I thought that as we came into the 104th Congress, we could attempt to do this in a manner that would evidence our commitment to the best and the most fulfilling of what America has to offer, and that is of course, an opportunity to achieve and to be able to achieve the American dream.

But I think it is important as we concluded the vote on the rescissions today to express my disappointment, that I do not believe we had reached that point. First of all, I think it is important to note for many Americans who listen to sound bites or read headlines, that in actuality, the deficit in

this Nation probably falls around 52 percent of its assets, and in comparison to our world's neighbors we probably have the lowest deficit-asset ratio of any nation today.

So when we begin this issue of rescissions and as well the issue of deficit reduction and what we want this country to look like, I would have hoped we would have been more expansive in our viewpoint and focused possibly on the American dream. But in this rescissions package that passed today, we took \$1.1 billion out of the safe drinking water proposal and plan. We took \$16 million from the safe and drug free schools. We took \$105 million from the National and Community Service Commission. We reduced the Goals 2000 emphasis on education by \$31.5 million. When adults lose their jobs and they need to be retrained, we have taken now some \$58 million from adult job training. The school work program has lost \$5 million. Many judges came and testified before the Committee on the Judiciary and indicated the value of the drug courts, and that program was cut by \$17.1 million, courts to try drug offenders and move them away from drug addiction to rehabilitation.

□ 2245

When the number of AIDS cases are increasing in this country, we saw fit to cut housing for people with AIDS, some 15 million. And then something that is certainly not part of the Constitution but is really part of the American dream and certainly should be part of the privilege of those who do not have, we cut some \$1.3 billion out of section 8 housing. Finally, as we look toward the 21st century and we look toward technology, we proceeded to cut some \$204 million out of NASA.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying that we should be better than that. We owe it to the American people. We owe it to them to inform them truthfully what is our vision and our dream for America.

Do we say to them that they have no longer access to the American dream and to be better than they were yesterday and better than what their parents were and certainly to wish for their children a better life? We have many months to go and many bills to look at and many issues to fund, and certainly few dollars, but if we do not come at it with a better spirit and a spirit that reflects all of America, I am concerned and experience great apprehension that we are not prepared to enter the 21st century with the American dream intact for all Americans.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS TO
EXTEND REMARKS IN THE CON-
GRESSIONAL RECORD ON CER-
TAIN FUTURE DATES

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the legislative days of Wednesday, June 28; Thursday, June 29; and Friday, June 30, 1995 all Members be permitted to ex-

tend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TOWNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WISE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CHAMBLISS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FALOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SEASTRAND addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROGRESS OF THE 104TH
CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight I believe we showed very clearly how we can have cooperative government moving together. The administration, the White House, President Clinton, working together with Congress, were able to have a revised rescissions bill which, in fact, restored funds for drug free schools in the amount of 26 million; drug courts, 17 million; adult job training, 58 million; AmeriCorps, 105 million, safe drinking water programs, federal TRIO program and the school to work programs. But with all of those programs that were partially restored, which were agreed to in a bipartisan way, almost 270 votes here in the House, we were able to have a net savings in spending of 9.2 billion. This is a much-needed down payment on a balanced budget that we are trying to reach by the year 2002. Without this, the task of balancing the budget in seven years becomes much more difficult to achieve.

You see, Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, what we are trying to do is

keep the services that we need for people to improve the quality of their life and the opportunities to get a job and to raise their families and to have the pride of work, but we are trying to eliminate the bureaucracies that we have in Washington, and we are doing that successfully every day.

This bill that we just passed tonight cuts a total of 16.5 billion from funding levels by eliminating unauthorized programs, duplicative programs and eliminates bureaucracies that are wasteful.

Other reforms I think this Congress can be proud of here at the 6-month point for the 104th Congress include legislation that calls for a gift ban from lobbyists, a reduction of the pensions, which has been adopted, for Members, a reduction by one-third of our committee staffs, eliminating 3 committees and 25 subcommittees, legislation calling for a sunset of Federal regulations and of Federal agencies that have become wasteful and are duplicating what has been done in the states.

All of this has created \$165 million of savings just from the House of Representatives alone. Overall in our government, 190 billion in spending reductions and 90 billion in deficit reduction.

One more area of reform which I think is important to announce today, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, of which I am a Member, under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman BILL CLINGER, and the Regulatory Subcommittee under the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman DAVE MCINTOSH, we began hearings today in another important area of new reform; that is, to investigate the issue of nonprofit organizations which receive federal funds from taxpayers and make use of those funds to support political activity or to support a political point of view. People in the United States should not have their taxes used for that purpose. That is for private purposes, not for the public. President Thomas Jefferson long ago criticized such activities as not in keeping with the will of the people.

The U.S. court cases reinforce this position. Just this week, Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal outlined in an article that there may be as many as 40,000 nonprofit organizations that receive partial funding from the Federal Government that may be involved in activities which are inappropriate in the sense that they are doing political activity for one point of view, and this is inappropriate.

We received excellent testimony from the United Seniors Association, through its spokesperson Jim Martin. He explained that not \$1 of his organization goes to help represent seniors or the people that are involved with the group.

We also received excellent testimony from ALAN SIMPSON, the U.S. Senator, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], and Mrs. Spare from the Asso-

ciation for Retarded Citizens in Pennsylvania.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to continuing those hearings and to be able to come back to this House with meaningful legislation that will make sure that the people's business is being taken care of, less waste, more services for the people, and more for what the American people want and that is an accountable government.

EFFECT OF BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words tonight about the budget passed today and also the rescission package and to suggest that it is terribly important that the American people have an understanding of what is going on, because to a very significant degree, the budget proposal passed by the Republican leadership today is going to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable people in our country and give tax breaks and subsidies to precisely those people who need it the least.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of Vermont, we have thousands and thousands of senior citizens who tonight are finding it difficult to pay for their prescription drugs. Today they cannot afford the high cost of health care. It is grossly unfair to make those senior citizens and senior citizens all over this country pay more for Medicare because of the devastating cuts that are contained within the Republican budget passed today.

Second of all, in Vermont and all over this country, middle-class parents are wondering how they are going to afford to send their kids to college, given the escalating cost of higher education. Everybody knows that in the competitive world economy, our young people need the best education that they can get. Within that context, it is absolutely insane to be cutting back on student loans and student grants. We need more help for middle-class and working-class families to help them send their kids to college, not less help.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard so often on the floor of this House, this is the 50th anniversary of World War II. And over and over again we hear people talking about the heroism, the bravery, the courage of the men and women in this country who defeated Hitler and saved human civilization in their terrible struggle against Nazism and Fascism 50 years ago. And we thank those veterans.

In my State of Vermont, many of them, many of them have been wounded in various wars in body and in spirit. This country owes a great deal to those men and women.

I wonder how many of them know that after all of the praise that is heaped upon them that in reality and real life, after all of the talk and all of

the rhetoric, that the Republican budget makes tens of billions of dollars in cuts in veterans' programs. So thank you very much, those veterans who tonight are in the VA hospitals. Thank you for the work and the courage that you gave this country 50 years ago and our thank you is that we cut the benefits and the programs that were promised to you.

A couple of weeks ago I received a letter from a veteran from Rutland, VT, and he said, let us talk about the Contract With America. And he talked about how his arm was wounded fighting against the Japanese during World War II. And he said, I know what the Contract With America is about, because he and millions of other Americans made a real Contract With America when they spilt their blood defending this country. And today it is no way to say thank you to those men and women by cutting programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think almost everybody in this House, the Republicans, the Democrats and me, the only Independent in this Congress, understand that the deficit and the \$4.7 trillion national debt is a very serious problem that must be dealt with. Almost everybody wants to move us toward ending our deficit, balancing the budget.

The question is, how do you do it? do you cut back on Head Start? Do you cut back on WIC? do you cut back on environmental programs on library programs? Or do you finally have the courage to say, let us move forward in a fair way.

Mr. Speaker, a recent economic study came out printed on the front page of the New York Times. The richest 1 percent of the population owns 40 percent of the wealth of America; richest 1 percent owns more than the bottom 90 percent. Yet this proposal, budget proposal of the Republicans does what? Half of the tax breaks, individual tax breaks go to people earning \$100,000 a year. Rich get richer; poor get poorer. We give tax breaks to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, we must move forward toward a balanced budget. But let us not do it on the backs of the weakest and the most vulnerable people. Let us ask those people who have the money, among many other things, to pay their fair share of taxes. Let us deal with the scandal of corporate welfare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to cosponsor a resolution introduced by Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa, opposing the resumption of French nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

On June 13, 1995, French President Jacques Chirac announced that he would end his nation's moratorium on nuclear tests and conduct eight underground nuclear tests on Moruroa Atoll in French Polynesia between September 1995 and May 1996. According to President Chirac, the tests are to ensure the reliability and security of France's nuclear arsenal and perfect laboratory simulation so that

further tests will be unnecessary. I respectfully suggest to President Chirac that the eight underground nuclear tests to be conducted between September and May are themselves unnecessary.

The threat of nuclear war that once cast a large shadow over national and international affairs has been considerably diminished since the end of the cold war. One hundred and seventy nations agreed recently to extend the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the expectation that the nuclear powers, including France, would ratify a comprehensive nuclear test ban by 1996 and refrain from conducting any nuclear test. France's planned nuclear tests conflict with the designation of the South Pacific as a nuclear-free zone. In spite of these developments and designations, President Chirac has decided that France will become one of only two nations—the other being China—still conducting nuclear tests.

In announcing the resumption of French nuclear tests, President Chirac waved away the criticism of ecologists by stating that the eight planned underground tests on Moruroa Atoll would have "no ecological consequences." President Chirac also indicated his decision was "in the higher interest of [the French] nation" and also "irrevocable." While President Chirac's decision appears intended to reinforce France's stature as the world's third nuclear power, it also revives the dismissive attitude of past French Governments toward the concerns of scientists and South Pacific Islanders.

As our colleague Congressman FALCONE has noted, South Pacific Islanders are acutely aware of the lingering effects of nuclear testing. Certainly, the Marshall Islanders who were exposed to radiation when the United States Government conducted nuclear weapons tests over Bikini Atoll in the 1940's and 1950's could tell President Chirac a thing or two about the consequences, ecological and otherwise, of nuclear tests.

Nuclear tests release two types of radioactive isotopes. The first type, radioactive iodine, is relatively short-lived and decays rapidly within several months. The second type, including cesium-137, strontium-90, and plutonium-239, is very long-lived, and if present in the food chain, even in low-levels, could be responsible for producing increased risks of cancers of all types. The fact that an excessive number of thyroid nodules and birth defects have been observed among residents of the northern Marshall Islands suggests strongly that long-lived radioactive isotopes are present in the environment of the northern Marshall Islands.

Of course, President Chirac could—and probably would—dismiss these observations about the lingering effects of nuclear tests on Marshall Islanders on the grounds that the 66 nuclear tests conducted by America during the 1940's to 1950's took place in the atmosphere whereas the eight nuclear tests that France plans to conduct will take place deep under Moruroa Atoll.

President Chirac has made it abundantly clear that he is both determined to resume French nuclear tests and confident that the planned series of underground nuclear tests pose absolutely no risk to the ocean, the marine life, and surrounding environment.

I must respectfully point out to President Chirac that his decision to resume nuclear tests under Moruroa Atoll is appalling to envi-

ronmentalists, scientists, nuclear disarmament supporters, and the people who live in or around the South Pacific. I strongly and earnestly appeal to President Chirac to rescind his decision to resume these French nuclear tests. They constitute a needless assault on our ocean habitat as well as an open violation of the test ban treaty.

The world should not have to tolerate any more tests. The Just-One-More-Test-Before-We-Sign-the-Treaty stance taken by President Chirac is sheer hypocrisy.

□ 2300

A REPORT FROM INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a report on what I learn when Ruthie and I go home to Indiana each weekend—a Report from Indiana if you will.

This weekend I had the privilege of attending the "promise keeper men's conference." We have talked a great deal about how this new Republican Congress is keeping our promises made to the American people to change Washington by reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government cutting taxes and balancing the budget.

This conference was about keeping promises at a much more fundamental level.

And the results are phenomenal 62,000 men came from throughout the midwest to the Hoosierdome in downtown Indianapolis to reaffirm their faith and their commitment to their families.

There is nothing quite like joining in with 62,000 men singing church campfire songs at the top of their lungs.

Tony Evans—who was chaplain to the Dallas Cowboys—spoke about how committed individuals are the building blocks of our society.

When we keep our promise to live the standards of our faith, we become leaders. As strong individuals we can lead our family—and pass on these values to our children. Strong families make up healthy communities—where we live out the commandment to love our neighbors and ourselves. And, Tony Evans pointed out healthy communities are the building blocks of good States and good States build strong Nation. A United States, committed to the moral principles that have always made our country strong, will lead the world and establish freedom for all mankind.

I was profoundly struck by Tony Evans' message—as I realized that each of us, by keeping faith with promises we make are an integral part to restoring, strengthening, and building the American dream.

And I was even more profoundly struck on Sunday morning when I attended a 25th wedding celebration of

two friends who have and are living out this principle.

Anne and Max Smith invited their friends to join them at a service at Westfield Friends Meeting, a quaint little county church just outside Hagerstown, IN.

Max is a full time farmer; Anne works at the local welfare office helping children. They both have a strong faith that has been the touchstone of their busy lives. On that faith they built a strong family—raising two children, Brent and Shellie, of their own.

Their strong family let them reach out to help others in their community. At a testimonial lunch after the service, three different young people spoke about how Max and Anne had "adopted them" into their family and given them a chance in life.

Max serves the community as county commissioner, spending countless hours worrying about county services, from fixing back roads in rural Wayne County to administering relief to the poor.

Anne and Max have both been promise keepers. Their commitment has made their church, their community, their county, the State of Indiana, and America a better place to live. And I was honored to be a small part of their celebration of 25 years of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, that's the report from Indiana for this week.

THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON REDISTRICTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12th, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for a period of time not to extend beyond midnight, as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to talk about a decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court today. I find it very ironic that the Supreme Court would rule in a case that affects the District, the 11th District of Georgia, to be unconstitutional, and it is ironic that we stand at a time in our history that we are trying to bring about a color blind society. We are trying to bring about a democracy to represent all of the people, and the Supreme Court ruled today that the 11th District of Georgia is unconstitutional, and ruled that the Fourth Congressional District, the district which I represent, did not rule on that district at all, simply because the plaintiffs in that case did not have standing.

Tonight I wanted to take just a moment to talk about some of the districts that are majority districts across this country that look just as irregular as the majority minority districts in this country, and try to give some sense of understanding as to why would courts and why would people across America, even entertain the thought that districts, simply because of their shape and simply because of their appearance, are unconstitutional.

I wanted to start by talking about the Fourth Congressional District in Louisiana, the district which I represent. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that is a very diverse district. The district that I represent is in fact the district of the future. It is a district that is comprised of about 55 percent African-Americans and about 45 percent are white citizens. Therefore, this district in my opinion is a very diverse district, and it really bothers me tonight that the Supreme Court would even consider striking down a district that is as diverse as the district that I represent.

If you look at the shape of the Fourth Congressional District in Louisiana, one may say on its face it is irregular. One may say that it looks somewhat different from the form, because it does move from the northern part of the State of Louisiana, to those who are not familiar with the Fourth Congressional District. This district moves from the northern part of Louisiana, which is the Shreveport-Bossier area, and then it goes down to the more southern part of the State, which goes a little bit past Baton Rouge and goes into St. James Parish.

This district in my opinion is a pretty nice looking district. Most people when they look at this district on a map, they say, that is an irregular-shaped district. It looks bad, it looks bizarre and it ought to be unconstitutional, and it ought to be unconstitutional because it is a majority black district, and why would anybody in their right mind draw a district like that? However, when you really look at the facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker, you see that many districts all across this country look the same and look just like the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana.

For example, if you take the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee, which was created in 1990, this district, Mr. Speaker, is 96 percent majority, 96 percent white. This district is not under attack tonight, it probably will not be under attack tomorrow, and probably will not be under attack in the future of this country.

I often wonder, why would one allege that the Fourth Congressional District and the 11th Congressional District of the State of Georgia are unconstitutional because they look irregular and the majority of the voters in those particular districts are black.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If one had a pejorative perspective about this kind of district, one could say it looks like Batman spreading his wings.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Without question. If you look at the Fourth Congressional District from Tennessee and the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana—as a matter of fact, I am going to try to see if I can put the two

districts side by side. I mean these two districts, if you look at the two districts side by side, you see that these two districts do not look too much different from each other. I mean, this is the Fourth Congressional District. The only difference is this district is much more diverse than the 11th Congressional District in Tennessee. This district in Tennessee is 96 percent white; this district is 45 percent white, 55 percent black. The only difference is, if you want to look at it from an appearance perspective, is this district is more diverse than the Fourth Congressional District in Tennessee, and it amazes me tonight that this district would be in question as an unconstitutional district simply because it is majority minority.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, during the reapportionment process, as you know, you were part of the Louisiana Legislature, I was a part of the Georgia Legislature, and people would go and look at these maps on the wall and they would try and affix the names and shapes and all kinds of pejorative terms to these districts that were majority minority.

However, I am astounded to see, and this is my first time seeing this, the Fourth District in Tennessee that looks—I mean if I wanted to be pejorative, I would call it all kinds of names, too. However, that is not what we are about. Was this an effective district in electing someone to represent the people of Tennessee?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Without question, and I am glad the gentlewoman makes that distinction. I mean, I am certainly not being critical of the Fourth District of Tennessee. I feel it is a beautiful district, because first of all, it is not a beauty contest we are in today in terms of determining how districts look, because none of them look like perfect squares and perfect circles, they all look like animal cookies, if you really want to know the truth.

The fact of the matter is this district encompasses urban and rural Tennessee, I mean it moves to Kentucky, so when people talk about the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana and other majority minority districts in this country, they ought to look at some of the majority districts in this country and see that those districts are no better than the majority minority.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, they call them monstrosities, they call them sprawling, they call them all kinds of names, and here we see that we have white districts that can also be termed as sprawling and huge and monstrosities of districts as well. Districts are districts. The bottom line is do they elect competent people to represent the people of the area of these districts, just as the Fourth District of Louisiana works.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. That is right. This in my opinion is very much constitutional, it should stand in any court of law. No one should challenge

this district, because this district was the district that was drawn by the State legislature in the State of Tennessee, and it ought to be upheld and not challenged.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to applaud the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] for their hard work in this matter, and simply cite to both of you the dissenting opinion of Stevens that really said what you have just said.

Justice Ginsberg, according to Stevens, has explained why the district court's opinion on the merits was erroneous, and why this court's law-changing decision will breed unproductive litigation. He joined in the opinion without reservation.

This decision will result in unproductive litigation, because there are districts all over the Nation that have varying shapes. Why should anyone want to open up a Pandora's box of challenging all of those districts, of which people are pleased with their representation and comfortable with their representation. He added and said that he believes that the respondents of these cases, like the respondents in the United States versus Hayes, have not suffered any legally cognizable injury, that these people have not been hurt.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield.

Are you suggesting then that a Pandora's box has been opened, and so now we see that districts that are a majority black and majority minority across this country have been subjected to lawsuits, so we could also now find the majority white districts that look like this, drawn on the basis of race, also subjected to lawsuits?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Well if the gentleman would continue to yield as well, let me say that I can only read the plain black and white language here of the court. Justice Ginsberg, who answers that question yes, by saying that this law-changing decision that was offered today will breed unproductive litigation. If these are examples of districts across the Nation, which by the way, we have not heard a rising up of constituents in these different districts who happen to be, I believe, satisfied with their representative, which is what this Congress is about, a representative body. It appears to me that even the court believes that now we have opened to the world that if one person in the corner of that district or in the corner of a district in Montana or South Dakota or Michigan feels that they have a funny shape, but have not been denied representation, it appears that we have the Supreme Court, at least in the dissent by a very able Justice Ginsberg saying, yes, we have opened up this legal system to unproductive litigation with this decision today.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentlewoman a

few questions. I am going to place on the top of district No. 4 district No. 11, which is the district that the court ruled as being an unconstitutional district, the 11th District of Georgia. From an appearance perspective, would the gentlewoman agree with me that both of these districts pretty much look irregular, if you want to use the term irregular?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, someone would say in the eyes of beholder. I think that there would be the reception by many who looked at that and said yes, on both of those districts.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in my eyes that is the most beautiful district in the State of Georgia.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Let me ask the gentlewoman another question.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I understand.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Let me present another scenario to the gentlewoman. If I would suggest to the gentlewoman that this district is 60 percent black and 40 percent white, and this district is 96 percent white and 4 percent black, which of the two districts would the gentlewoman suggest would be the most diverse district?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Obviously, the top district that you have, the 11th District of Georgia, and as well, I would imagine that you might be able to point out several communities of interest in that district.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I would ask the gentlewoman, which would be the most segregated districts of the two?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, it would certainly seem to be the last one, which is, I believe, the fourth district.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. So if this district would be declared unconstitutional and segregate voters, then one would have to just make the fair assumption that this district would have to follow under the same rules and regulations; would you not agree to that?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I think what that does is absolutely affirms the comments made by Justice Ginsberg which say, you have now then opened a door to lawsuits all over this country, for districts all over this country.

□ 2315

And I frankly think this is not what the American people want. They want to be able to elect a Representative of their choosing. They want to be assured that that Representative will represent them and their interests. I do not think they want to find themselves in courthouses across this Nation challenging districts on the basis of shape.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would also suggest that the American people do not want a second occurrence of the situation that occurred after reconstruction. And that is that the American people

do not want the elected Representatives of the people of choice, of color, expelled because of their color.

But it appears to me that if we are not careful that is where we could end up. Tens, hundreds, thousands, of city council people, school board members, county commissioners, legislators, Members of Congress expelled for no other reason than the color of their skin. Is that the future that we want for this country? And is that the kind of democracy that we are supposed to be marching toward?

I think this Supreme Court decision has done a tremendous disservice to the people of this country, because instead of moving forward together, now we have the real chance of moving backwards.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I think the gentlewoman makes a very good point. One of the problems that we have in this country is how we integrate the institutions of power, the institutions that make decisions. How do we integrate this institution that we call the U.S. Congress, the House of Representatives?

You know, in one State, when one uses the term House of Representatives it connotes representatives of the people. I just have the view that when one puts a mirror in front of the U.S. House of Representatives it ought to represent to some degree the citizens of the United States of America. And if the court continues to go on the trend it is going on today, it is going to eliminate many of the majority-minority districts in this Congress, which means that you would not be able to see the kind of representation in this Congress that you see outside of this Congress, and that is among the American people.

I think it is encouraging to see Hispanics in the U.S. Congress and African-Americans and women in the U.S. Congress. I think that is what representation is all about. But we are clearly going to have a problem in obtaining a good representation of this country right here in the Halls of Congress if we continue to eliminate districts like the district from Georgia and other districts that are majority-minority districts.

I want the gentlewoman to bear with me a moment. I have a few more maps I want to show here, because this is, in my opinion, very important.

I am now placing on the easel the Third Congressional District from the State of Tennessee, which was created in 1990. This district is 87 percent majority.

Now, if the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, which is 60 percent minority, is unconstitutional, I can't see much difference between the 11th Congressional in Tennessee, other than this district is much more diverse than the Third Congressional District in Tennessee.

So I just think the Court is about to open up the floodgates of litigation as the gentlewoman knows, if they con-

tinue to go on the this trend of judging districts based on their appearance and not judging districts based on any real constitutional standard. Because none of these districts can win a beauty contest, and I do not think that is the purpose of the Voting Rights Act, and I do not think there is anything in the Constitution of the United States of America that says that a district must look a certain way.

I just find it ironic that the United States Supreme Court will take the amendment that was used to protect minority voters, the 14th amendment of the Constitution and the equal protection clause, and instead of using that as a shield to continue to protect minority voters, they use it as a award to insure the. I just find that to be hard to believe today, that the court would make that kind of ruling.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. You know, we are talking about beauty contests, but the beauty of these districts is that they provide effective representation for the people who reside in them. And I know that we perhaps would not have even had to have an 11th Congressional District of Georgia as a majority-minority district had the residents of the district been properly taken care of when they had other representation.

But you can immediately ride into the 11th District and know that you have crossed some kind of threshold, where you have people who live in homes without running water, you have people who are suffering from environmental contamination and dying, you have people who still have their voting rights violated in 1994 and 1995.

We cross some kind of time threshold, we cross some kind of socioeconomic threshold, we cross a neglect threshold. And now, for the first time, particularly in Georgia, outside of the city of Atlanta, people have a strong voice fighting for them, providing some relief from their suffering.

And the Supreme Court now says that that is unconstitutional. The question, I guess, is not what about CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, but what about those people? Because CYNTHIA MCKINNEY may be gone, but the problems that those people have to endure day after day as they mete out a meager existence will endure. What is going to happen to those people? Who will serve those people? I do not have lobbyists coming into my office asking me to please provide running water for the people who do not have running water in their homes in your district, CYNTHIA.

The lobbyists come by and they have their hands out and they are asking for government largess, but it is not on behalf of the people who are in need. I was sent here by the people who are in need, and I do my darnedest to represent them, as I know you do, and

that is the appropriate balance in this place; that is the appropriate balance for government, that we have all of the people who are in need and all of the various needs represented. And their in the marketplace of political ideas they clash and their values assume a certain kind of value, and some win and some lose, some come out on top, but everybody should not always have to come out on the bottom all the time.

That is what these districts were designed to prevent. That is why I believe all of these districts are beautiful districts.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for that analogy. I mean the gentlewoman has done such a great job here in this Congress for the people that she represents back in Georgia and it would be just, in my opinion, a big calamity for the many people in Georgia to lose a Representative like you.

That is why the point of shape should be such a nonfactor, to even opine a thought that a gentlewoman like you might not be able to serve in this body simply because the district looks a certain way. In my opinion, I agree with you, I think the district is absolutely beautiful. First of all, there is no constitutional standard for beauty. I have read through and through the Constitution and I have not seen any beauty contest requirement for the shape of a district. One of the reasons for that is because the districts, I mean the States are not perfect squares and perfect circles.

You take the State of Louisiana, for example, it is shaped like a boot. So you cannot get a perfect district out of the State of Louisiana when the State itself does not, is not a perfect square or a perfect circle, but I think the State of Louisiana is a beautiful State.

I take issue with anybody who would say the State of Louisiana is not a beautiful-looking State. I am proud of that boot shape of the State of Louisiana, because it is not how the shape of the State looks, it is what is within the State. We have great people within the State of Louisiana.

Let me, if the gentlewoman would bear with me just for a moment, I know the gentlewoman has been up all night representing her constituents.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Two nights.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Two nights in a row on the floor of this House not being able to go to sleep, not one ounce.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Not 10 minutes of sleep.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Not 10 minutes and still on the floor tonight fighting for the damned, the doomed, the disenfranchised, the have-nots, and I just want to commend the gentlewoman from Georgia for just being here, because she has often said the issue is not whether or not CYNTHIA MCKINNEY will serve another day in Congress, but the issue is whether or not a person like CYNTHIA MCKINNEY will have the opportunity to serve in

Congress. These are not guaranteed districts, these are opportunity districts.

I want the gentlewoman to look at the Sixth District of Chicago. This district is in existence today. This district is represented by a very able Member of this body. I would dare not say that this Member of Congress has not represented his constituents. This district is separated.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Discontinuity.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. This is not even contiguous. This district is separated not by water, not by some island, this district is separated by another district. If you look, another district, a congressional district actually runs in between this district and this little island here, which is a part of this district.

Now, if this district, which is all contiguous, not one part of this district is noncontiguous, and this district, which is—let me give you the numbers of this district, 95.2 percent white.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Looks like that district could be subject to a lawsuit.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. If this district here is unconstitutional according to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, then what do you think this district here is? You are talking about a district that is not even contiguous. There are three different islands on this district here, and this district here is certainly all intact and all contiguous.

Ms. MCKINNEY. What kind of mischief has the Supreme Court now made? Can you imagine the 50 States of the United States engaged in redistricting in the middle of the 10-year period? What kind of political chaos could result in something like that?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. It would be absolute disruption. It would open up the floodgates of litigation. It would be unmanageable. If every one citizen in America who feels that their district does not look a certain way and will not pass any beauty contest runs to the courthouse and files a lawsuit, we are going to be dealing with this issue of reapportionment for a long period of time.

That is why I think the courts must be very careful when they come down on these districts simply because they are majority-minority, one; and, two, they do not look a certain way and do not pass the course of beauty contests and fail to look at all these districts that are majority-majority districts, that do not look a certain way and do not fit into a perfect square, in a perfect box scenario or syndrome. Those districts which are overwhelmingly one race and not diverse, like these districts that the courts are making, calling unconstitutional, have to be subject to the same kind of scrutiny that these districts are subject to.

I only have three more districts I would like to share with the gentlewoman because I know it is getting late in the hour.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But you know, Congressman, I would also like to say

something about this notion about districts are supposed to look a certain way, people are supposed to look a certain way. I have had a particular problem since I have been elected because I do not quite look the way most Members of Congress are supposed to look. Security guards stop me, elevator operators stop me, you name it, I have problems. I was stopped even last week because I do not look the way some folks think a Member of Congress is supposed to look.

When we start judging by how we think folks are supposed to look or things are supposed to look, and then discriminating against them based on the fact that that does not quite look like what we think it ought to look like, the stereotype we have in our minds, then we really are engaging in something else that is very harmful, and that is what we want to avoid as well.

So there is some preconceived idea, I guess, that a good district is a circular district, or maybe it is a square district, but it certainly cannot look like that district and be a good district. It can look like that district if it produces somebody who looks like the way a Member of Congress is supposed to look, but if that district produces somebody who looks like me and says I do not look like the kind of person who ought to be walking the Halls of Congress as a Member of Congress, then something is wrong with the district. Highly suspect reasoning.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I would like to share with the gentlewoman just three more maps. I want to thank her for her patience. While we talk about appearance, I would like to share with the gentlewoman the 14th Congressional District of Texas.

This was a 1920's. You can see that that district was not contiguous. It had an island, and that was not because of water, it was because another district actually ran between that district, and this district was actually created to disenfranchise minority groups. It was gerrymandered for the purpose of excluding minority groups, Hispanics and blacks, so that they would not be empowered and so that they would not be the majority, so that they could not elect a candidate of their choice.

The courts saw absolutely nothing wrong with this district. Citizens did not file complaints, of course. But it just goes to show you how districts that look just like districts that are being declared unconstitutional are suspect, and the Supreme Court was very much constitutional in the past and in fact in the present.

Now this next district I am about to show the gentlewoman is probably the one that I have the most fun with, to be quite honest with you, because if the 11th District of Georgia is irregular, according to the courts, then I would like to know what you call this district. Now, this is the Sixth District of Texas, Dallas, TX. This is one district and no one has filed a lawsuit in

this district. Why? Because this district is not a majority-minority district. It is not Hispanic, it is not black. So I guess it is constitutional. But this district runs all over the place. I mean, they criticize a district in Louisiana saying it is only so wide. They criticize a district, the 12th Congressional District in North Carolina, represented by a very able Member of Congress, Mr. WATT. They said his district is as wide as an interstate. How wide is this district at certain points?

Now, let us do a comparison test. Let us do a little beauty contest. This is the district that was declared by the Supreme Court in its infinite wisdom as being unconstitutional, the 11th District of Georgia, which is at the top, and there is the Sixth District of Texas at the bottom. Now, you tell me which district in your opinion, if you want to talk beauty. There is a portion of this district that is not even contiguous. As a matter of fact, there are three or four portions of this district that are not contiguous. Take this portion here which is not contiguous. This little island over here to the left is not contiguous.

It just goes to show you you cannot develop an appearance standard to determine the constitutionality of a district.

The last district, which is probably the district that started this whole term gerrymandering, is a district of Massachusetts. A very able member of this body, a person who works very hard, represents the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts. This district is the real district because it comes from the State that brought about the term gerrymander as a result of their great Governor at that time. This district is not under challenge. It is not a majority-minority district; it is a majority-majority district. A very able member of this body represents this district, represents his constituents well, and no one asks questions about the constitutionality of this district. It is just suspect to me that only districts that appear to be unconstitutional are districts that are majority-minority.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Based on shape.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Just the other day in New York, I forgot what congressional district, but it is represented by a very able female member of this Congress.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Absolutely.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. A Hispanic district.

Ms. MCKINNEY. The Nation's first Puerto Rican American Congresswoman.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. First Puerto Rican American Congresswoman walking into the halls of Congress, now being challenged because her district looks a certain way, and it is majority Hispanic.

I just thought we would take a few minutes tonight to talk about this. And I also wanted to tell you how much your leadership has meant to

this body and will continue to mean to this body. Because I certainly have no plans of the gentlewoman leaving this body. But it really hurts me to my heart to know that the Supreme Court would rule that this beautiful district, this beautiful district, and to show you just how beautiful this district is, this absolute perfect beautiful district would be declared as an unconstitutional gerrymander, and this district here goes untouched. I want you to know that the people of Savannah and the people of all parts of Georgia who are under your great leadership, you know, have nothing to be ashamed of, and they ought to stick their chests out and be proud of the fact that they are members of this beautiful district.

I do not know what will happen in the future, but people like you are the kind of people that this country needs to make this country really project what it talks about on a day-to-day basis and even tries to get other countries to talk about, and that is democracy. Because now when we put a mirror in front of this Congress and we see a Congresswoman, a gentlewoman like you, then there are people all across America who can poke their chests out and say I am proud to be an American and I am proud to be in America because our Congress, our House of Representatives, is inclusive and not exclusive.

On a closing note, while people talk about the number of minority Members who are now Members of Congress and they talk about this uproar and this increase in numbers, there are only 40 black Members in the whole U.S. Congress, not the House of Representatives, mind you, but in the entire U.S. Congress. That is the House and the Senate.

Ms. MCKINNEY. There are 535 Members.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. There are 535 House and Senate Members, and of the 535 House and Senate Members, there are only 40 blacks. For anyone to even opine the thought that these Members are here because they were guaranteed some safety or were guaranteed seats, is absolutely wrong. The only thing they were guaranteed was an opportunity, and that was an opportunity to be able to plead their case before voters in the most diverse districts in the whole United States of America.

□ 2340

And it really frightens me today that this court would find the most diverse district in the country as a district that may be unconstitutional, and it really falls square. I mean, it just falls square on the shoulders and slaps the Voting Rights Act in its face, and it also slaps those people who have worked so hard, those people who have worked so hard to fight for the passage of the Voting Rights Act, people like Martin Luther King, people like Thurgood Marshall and people like President Kennedy, I mean, people who

just gave it all to make sure that this Congress would reflect this country.

And I want to thank the gentlewoman for her willingness to come here tonight after being up for 2 nights in row and standing on the floor of this House and talking about a significant issue like reapportionment.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this very important issue, and I would also just like to commend you for being able to prevail in such a dark period of uncertainty when I know all of the clouds of doubt and sometimes a little bit of disappointment were trying to rain on your parade, but you were able to keep your head up high, maintain your dignity and continue to function, lead in this body. I appreciate your leadership. I appreciate your leadership on this issue, and I certainly appreciate the enduring friendship that we will have as a result of our time here together.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 8 p.m., on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK, of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD, in two instances.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. COX.

Mr. HYDE.
 Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 Mr. GUNDERSON.
 Mr. HUNTER.
 Mr. SOLOMON.
 Mr. CLINGER, in two instances.
 Mr. ALLARD.
 Mrs. MORELLA.
 Mr. GILMAN.
 Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
 Mr. SHAW.
 Mr. MCINTOSH.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Friday, June 30, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1127. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1128. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the fiscal year 1996 appropriations requests for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Small Business Administration, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-88); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1129. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

1130. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend certain provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Commerce.

1131. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Commerce.

1132. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. DTC-11-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1133. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to the People's Republic of China (Transmittal No. DTC-39-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1134. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, the "Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authoriza-

tion Act of 1995," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Science.

1135. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting NASA's 1994 annual report on actions taken and planned to implement fully the metric system of measurement, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 205j-1(a); to the Committee on Science.

1136. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled, "Financial Audit: Resolution Trust Corporation's 1994 and 1993 Financial Statements" (GAO/AIMD-95-157), June 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a); jointly, to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Government Reform and Oversight.

1137. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, for 2 years; jointly, to the Committees on Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

1138. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act for 2 years; jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Ways and Means.

1139. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 2 years; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 177. Resolution providing for the further consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-167). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 179. Resolution providing for immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period (Rept. 104-168). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 180. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-169). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLING. Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. H.R. 1557. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996, 1997, 1998 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum Services; and to repeal the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 effective October 1, 1998; with an amendment (Rept. 104-170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. FURSE):

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for certain minimum requirements for group health plans with respect to obstetrical benefits; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 1956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a moratorium for the excise tax on diesel fuel sold for use or used in noncommercial diesel-powered motorboats and to require the Secretary of the Treasury to study the effectiveness of procedures to collect excise taxes on sales of diesel fuel for noncommercial motorboat use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GILLMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TORRES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FROST, Mr. STUPAK, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KLINK, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the deduction of certain interest on automobile loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN:

H.R. 1958. A bill to modify the jurisdiction of the Federal courts with respect to abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAWELL:

H.R. 1959. A bill to repeal the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1960. A bill to govern relations between the United States and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), to enforce PLO compliance with standards of international conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GORDON (for himself, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. FORD, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 1961. A bill to designate the Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1962. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for certain gratuitous transfers of employer securities for the benefit of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHUGH (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. KENNELLY,

Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. DAVIS):

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the payment of a bill, invoice, or statement of account due, if made by mail, shall be considered to have been made on the date as of which the envelope which is used to transmit such payment is postmarked; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 1964. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown Vermonters who lost his life while serving in the Continental Army in the War of Independence and who has been selected by the people of Vermont to represent all Vermont unknown soldiers; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FARR, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HORN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. KLUG, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. REED, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MANTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FRISA, Mr. FOX, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1965. A bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1966. A bill to provide for the treatment of Indian tribal governments under section 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mrs. KENNEDY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. PORTMAN):

H.R. 1967. A bill to facilitate asset securitization through the creation of Financial Asset Securitization Investment Trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 1968. A bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for a mother and child following the birth of the child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

by Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 1969. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1970. A bill to require that health plans provide coverage for minimum period of time for a mother and child following the birth of the child; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 1971. A bill to provide for aviation noise management and reduction in residential areas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WOLF, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Res. 178. Resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to release United States citizen Harry Wu unconditionally and to provide for an accounting of his arrest and detention; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 181. Resolution encouraging the peace process in Sri Lanka; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 52: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 65: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 109: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 127: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 303: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 326: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 390: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 468: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 530: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 580: Mr. ALLARD and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 616: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 739: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. TATE, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 743: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BASS, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 833: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 863: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FRAZER, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 864: Ms. DUNN of Washington and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 897: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 969: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 994: Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1006: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1023: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1073: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1074: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1099: Mr. THOMAS, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1127: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. COX, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. NEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FLANAGAN, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FRISA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr.

UPTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HORN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. BURR, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BARR, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. TATE, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1143: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1144: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1161: Mrs. FOWLER and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 1175: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 1300: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1364: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1386: Mr. STUMP, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1416: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1490: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1513: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 1514: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1532: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 1598: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1627: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. LEACH, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SPRATT, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1629: Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1656: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FOX, Mr. FROST, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1801: Mr. KLUG, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 1818: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1834: Mr. BROWNBACK, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 1853: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1855: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1876: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1884: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1898: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1903: Mr. SCHIFF and Mrs. SCHROEDER.
H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. OBEY, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. PETRI.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H. Res. 174: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of June 28, 1995]

H.R. 896: Mr. YATES.

[Submitted June 29, 1995]

H.R. 310: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 313: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

28. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Patricia S. Ticer, mayor of the city of Alexandria, VA, relative to supporting the minority par-

ty's work first proposal in the U.S. Congress and urge immediate passage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

29. Also, petition of the Council of the District of Columbia, relative to a copy of Council Resolution 11-64, the "Fannie Mae, Sallie Mae, and Freddie Mac Local Corporate Income Tax Exemption Amendment Support Resolution of 1995"; jointly, to the Committees on Banking and Financial Service and Economic and Educational Opportunities.